The Minutes of
THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The General Education Committee met Monday, October 19, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in Rothwell 208. The following were present:

Dr. Jackie Bowman   Dr. Theresa Herrick
Ms. Cheryl Chaney   Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim
Ms. Nancy Cox   Dr. Thomas Nupp
Dr. Patrick Hagge   Ms. Karen Riddell

Absent: Ms. Gwen Faulkenberry, Dr. David Roach, Dr. Jeremy Schwehm

Guests: Dr. Christine Austin

Call to Order	Dr. Bowman called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the September meeting. Dr. Herrick made a motion to approve. Dr. Hagge seconded the motion. Motion carried.
Old Business	Dr. Bowman asked Dr. Herrick if she had brought the requested information on the tabled proposal to adopt AGPS 1024 Principles of Plant Science as a general education option under the 8-hour requirement for Science. Dr. Herrick reported that, at this time, they would like to withdraw the proposal from consideration. She said that even though they did feel like the course met the requirements for general education, there were some changes occurring in the Agriculture department and that they were not comfortable at this time having the course added to general education.
Letter from Senate	Dr. Bowman told the committee that she had received a letter from the Faculty Senate requesting all committees to conduct an internal survey on the appropriateness of their missions and their effectiveness in carrying out those missions. She said that, as discussed before, the General Education Committee did not have a clearly defined mission and she thought the committee needed to discuss this and define the mission. Dr. Herrick brought to the committee's attention that there was a memo from 2008 when the General Education Committee was first proposed that might have pertinent information. Ms. Riddell told the committee that she would find a copy of that and send to them. Dr. Bowman said that she had done some research of other university's General Education Committee missions and found they were varied in content. The committee decided that a sub-committee should be established to look at the charge and define what it should be. Dr. Herrick and Ms. Chaney volunteered to serve on this sub-committee.

Dr. Bowman then asked the committee to comment on how effective they felt it had been in carrying out the mission. Dr. Herrick felt a lot was accomplished the first year that she was on the committee (2013) getting the assessments in place. Dr. Bowman agreed, but felt that the committee had been struggling since then. Dr. Herrick felt the committee also needed to go through the steps of assessing the goals again. She thought that the committee should assess some each year, but not all of them every year. Dr. Bowman felt that the committee should look over all of the goals first and make sure they were all still appropriate. The committee then discussed whether to have a sub-committee look at the goals or have the committee as a whole look them over and decided that the whole committee should look over the goals to see if they are still appropriate. The committee would then look over the assessment piece. At the next meeting, the committee will look over the goals in their entirety.

The committee then discussed a need for an orientation for new members of the General Education Committee. Dr. Bowman said that she would get together with Ms. Riddell to possibly put together some notebooks and put some of the information online. Dr. Bowman said once the orientation materials were put together, she would like to have a new member and an experienced member to look the materials over to see if it is complete.

The committee then discussed the General Education Accountability Executive Summary. Dr. Bowman said that the previous Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness was having the department heads submit the assessment reports for the general education courses that she identified as being part of their departments. Dr. Bowman did not feel that most of the department heads had the time to do that and that it was not really their job. She felt that it should be the responsibility of the General Education Committee to submit those reports. She also was not sure that TracDat was the most appropriate method to use for these reports. Dr. Bowman then asked Dr. Austin for her input on this. Dr. Austin said that the reports can be done through TracDat, but the information would actually be pulling from ARGOS and being put into TracDat. The reports may need to be customized for general education. Dr. Bowman did not feel that reporting on every general education course was the best way to run these reports and that it might be better to run a report on each goal instead. Dr. Bowman also felt that it was not necessary to report on every goal every year. Dr. Bowman said that she had looked over the HLC Assumed Practices document that Dr. David Underwood had sent to the committee and she felt that it went along with the parameters that the committee was serving when looking at general education. Dr. Bowman told Dr. Austin that the committee would need to work with her to get TracDat set up the way they wanted it and that was most appropriate.

The committee then talked about the end of year reports that needed to be done each year. Ms. Riddell had brought the reports from the last few years and gave those to Dr. Bowman for reference. Dr. Bowman thought the committee needed to come up with an outline for these future reports. Dr. Bowman asked the committee if anyone else had any questions about what the committee needed to be doing. Dr. Hagge asked, if the committee had recommendations about changing the general education goals, who would they then pass those recommendation on to? Dr. Bowman told him it would be the Curriculum Committee and then the Faculty Senate. Dr. Bowman said that she would like to see the goals become more all-inclusive. She said that when the original goals were written, she felt like the university was more departmentalized than it is now. She thought that departments tended to have ownership of certain goals, but felt that is less the case now. She felt that it was time to start looking at the goals without the rule that a goal was owned by a department and start looking at them as more general.

Request from NHS

Dr. Bowman then presented to the committee a concern from the Dean of Natural and Health Science. Dr. Robertson had told Dr. Bowman that they had had a student with 130 hours, but only three hours in Fine Arts and Humanities and was told her graduation would be delayed by a semester so that she could complete the three extra hours. She had taken some courses that were somewhat related but because of the way general education is set up, she was going to have to take three extra hours. This issue was worked out, but it had to go all the way to Dean's Council to get resolved. The committee discussed that there can be substitutions for general education courses, but that it was hard to do if the general education course was not in your department. Dr. Bowman felt like this was something the committee could look at once they have redefined the goals and made the goals more inclusive of the university as a whole rather than a goal belonging to a specific department. Dr. Austin asked if the implementation of the new Degree Works software would help with this matter since this particular case seemed to be a case of being misadvised. The committee felt this would probably be of help. Dr. Herrick then asked how the committee was going to respond to Dr. Robertson's concern. Dr. Bowman said that this particular issue had already been resolved, but Dr. Robertson just wanted the committee to look at solutions regarding general education courses and substitutions.

For the next meeting, Dr. Bowman asked the committee to take a look at some other university's general education goals and that the sub-committee look at what our mission is and more precisely what our charge is since it is not well defined anywhere except in the 2008 document. Dr. Herrick mentioned that we also need to get in an assessment rotation for the goals. Once we get these things set in a framework, then those really become the by-laws of the committee. This will help the chair of each year

know exactly what they need to be doing and not have to start over from scratch. The committee also discussed putting the end of year reports from the committee chair on the web. This would help to remind everyone that those needed to be done. They also discussed who the report needed to be turned in to at the end of the year. That needs to be determined. The committee then discussed that these reports, along with any other evidence of what was being done, were very important for the upcoming HLC visit.

Dr. Bowman then went over the letter from the senate to see if they had covered everything. The first thing was what had been accomplished in recent memory. Dr. Bowman will look at that. Some of this is covered in the General Education Accountability Executive Summary. The next was what could and should be accomplished in the future. These had been covered:

1.   Clearly define a mission/charge and by-laws

2.   Develop an orientation for new members to the committee

3.   Review the general education goals to see if they are still appropriate

4.   Get the goals on an assessment rotation (assess 2 goals each year for 3 years or assess 3 goals each year every 2 years)

5.   Make sure that the end of year reports are completed and turned in to the appropriate people

The committee then talked about what resources might need to be added to enable them to efficiently carry out their duties. One thing mentioned was the orientation for new members which had already been discussed. Another resource mentioned was a graduate assistant to help with data input. Dr. Bowman said that she would ask about that.

Dr. Bowman will report this information back to the Faculty Senate once she has looked over the 2008 report that Ms. Riddell will be sending.

Dr. Bowman asked if there were any other concerns that the committee wanted to discuss. Dr. Austin asked if she was considered an ad-hoc member of the General Education Committee. The committee told her that they would like for her to come to all the meetings as an ex-officio member and Dr. Austin agreed to do that. Dr. Bowman then reminded everyone to look at the goals carefully for the next meeting and come with recommendations of any changes they felt were needed. Dr. Bowman and Ms. Riddell will start working on the orientation for the new members. Dr.

Herrick and Dr. Chaney will be working on defining the mission and report back to the committee at the next meeting.

The committee then discussed the meeting for November and asked Ms. Riddell to send out the scheduler for the second week of November to determine a date and time.

Adjournment   The meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm

Dear Colleagues,

Following is a quotation from Part III of our Faculty Handbook:

"Faculty committees facilitate the orderly functioning of the institution by employing the many talents of the faculty, students, and administration working together."

As we are all aware, many of our committees have responsibilities that have evolved and/or devolved over the decades. The ATU Faculty Senate, at the September 8th meeting, requested that I contact all elected faculty standing committees and request that each committee conduct an internal survey as to the appropriateness of the committee's mission and effectiveness of carrying out that mission. Many appointed standing committees have already gone through a review process. It is only appropriate that all university committees join in this effort to invigorate our participation in self-governance.

As the Senate is the "Committee on Committees", and each elected and appointed standing committee is tasked to send the President of the Senate a copy of it's minuets, I am requesting that your committee meet as soon as possible to conduct an internal survey and send me the results of that survey within your next committee meeting minuets. Please include what has in recent memory been accomplished, what could and should be accomplished in the future, and what resources would be necessary to enhance your effectiveness as a committee. I would appreciate former committee members "chiming in" by sending me any comments you might wish to make concerning any of your past committee service.

I have attached a concise list of this years committees.

I realize that this request is " just one more thing" added to an already full workload. Please consider that this is an opportunity to define our role in both university governance and the orderly functioning of our institution.

Thank you.

Ken Futterer
President – ATU Faculty Senate

General Education Accountability Executive Summary

Dr. Monica Varner, Director of AIE and CETL

February 18, 2015

Results:

- 16 General Education courses have assessment data for fall 2014
- 26 General Education courses have no assessment data for fall 2014
- 5 General Education courses submitted data in Spring 2014, academic cycle 2013, 2012, and 2011
- 6 General Education courses were asked to participate in the Quality Assessment Peer Review Process Pilot Study for academic cycle 2013-2014
- 3 General Education courses submitted an Assessment Report for academic cycle 2013-2014-Pilot Study (TracDat Unit)
- 3 General Education courses did not submit an Assessment Report for academic cycle 2013-2014-Pilot Study (TracDat Unit)
- The last time the General Education Committee reviewed the General Education Program was in 2009
- From 2011-2013, 10,033 students were not assessed for the achievement of General Education Learning Goals (duplicated head count-represents the number of students enrolled for a two year academic cycle, courses which did not assess student learning).

Highlights:

- 7 General Education courses were add to the CPGE system in 2014
- 3 General Education courses completed a student learning assessment report in their TracDat Course Unit
- 18 General Education courses submitted student learning data in fall and/or spring 2014

Challenges That Must Be Addressed:

- General Education courses must participate in the assessment of student learning and submit student learning data annually in the CPGE system.
- General Education courses must identify the General Education Learning Goals being assessed and include them in the course syllabus.
- General Education courses must submit a student learning assessment report annually in the course TracDat unit (*vertical evaluation process*).
- The General Education Committee must review the assessment of student learning annually, and evaluate student achievement of General Education Learning Goals through the Peer Review Assessment Process (*horizontal evaluation process*).

- The General Education Committee should evaluate the chair position, to ensure that each chair has assessment competency and understanding of the General Education Program.
- The university should consider having the General Education Committee Chair serve for three years to ensure continuity and consistency in the evaluation of the General Education Program.
- The General Education Committee, the faculty, department heads, and deans should adhere to the Higher Learning Commission assessment of student learning guidelines which can be found on page six, Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning Quality, Resources, and Support-Core Components 3.B, 3.B1 and 3.B2, and page seven, Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning Evaluation and Improvement-Core Components 4.B, 4.B1, 4.B2, 4.B3, and 4.B4.
- Academic departments, colleges, and eTech should evaluate student achievement of General Education Learning Goals and compare student performance in online and face to face teaching formats.
- Academic departments, colleges, and eTech should evaluate concurrent enrollment student achievement of General Education Learning Goals in courses which are taught online to high school students or offered in area high schools.
- Global assessment of student achievement of General Education Learning Goals should occur every three years (Educational Testing Services), and student performance should be compared to peer institutions (global evaluation process).
- An assessment peer review process for student achievement of General Education Learning Goals should be shared by department heads, deans, and faculty. There are presently 43 general education courses. The university should establish 10 General Education Assessment peer review teams, with 3-4 faculty members, totaling 30-40 faculty members. Each team will review 4 courses annually. Academic program assessment peer review teams (university Assessment Committee) could also serve in this capacity with General Education Committee members.

2014 General Education Program Accountability Report
The following General Education Accountability Report is NOT a quality assurance of student learning report. Quality assurance of student learning will be reviewed by members of the General Education Committee assessment peer review teams. The accountability report detects if a General Education course is completing student learning assessment by submitting student data in the CPGE system. The accountability report also detects if courses are participating in the assurance of learning-quality assurance process and completing student learning assessment reports.

General Education Program Assessment Accountability					
General Education Courses N=43	Most Recent Assessment Data Submitted Fall 2014	Most Recent Assessment Data Submitted	2015 Assessment Report (TracDat) Pilot Study	CPGE Assessment System Active Set Up Completed	2011-2013 Student Enrollment
ENGL 1013 Comp I	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	3768
ENGL 1023 Comp II	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	3454
Math 1003 Coll Math	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	368
Math 1113 Coll Alegbra	Fall 2014	2014	Submitted Assessment Report 1/30/2015	Yes	3374
BIOL 1014 Intro Bio Sci	Fall 2014	2014	Did not Submit Assessment Report	Yes	1804
PHSC 1013L Intro Phys Sci	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	1026
CHEM 1113 Surv Chem	Fall 2014	2014	Did not Submit Assessment Report	Yes	409
CHEM 2124 Gen Chem I	None	Spring 2014		Yes	597
GEOL 1014 Phys Geol	None	Spring 2014	Did not Submit Assessment Report	Yes	207
PHYS 1114 Appl Phys	None	None		No	53
PHYS 2014 Phys Prin I	None	None		No	157

PHYS 2024 Phys Prin II	None	None		**No**	**125**
PHYS 2114 Gen Phys I	None	None		**No**	**242**
PHYS 2124 Gen Phys II	None	None		**No**	**190**
PHSC 1053L Astronomy	None	**Fall 2013**		Yes	22
PHSC 3053L Astronomy	None	None		**No**	**12**
HIST 1903 Surv Am Hist	None	**Spring 2012**		Yes	1694
HIST 2003 US Hist I	Fall 2014	2014	Submitted Assessment Report 1/30/2015	Yes	706
HIST 2013 US Hist II	None	**Spring 2011**		Yes	632
POLS 2003 Am Gov	Spring 2014	2014	Submitted Assessment Report 1/30/2015	Yes	1006
SPH 1003 Into Sph Comm	None	None		Yes Set Up-F2014	142
SPH 2003 Pub Speaking	None	None		Yes Set Up-F2014	1056
SPH 2173 Bus/Prof Sph	None	None		Yes Set Up-F2014	805
AMST 2003 Am Stud	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	237
ANTH 1213 Intro Anthropol	None	None		**No**	**865**
ANTH 2003 Cul Anthropol	None	None		**No**	**774**
ECON 2003 Prin Econ I Macro	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	983
ECON 2013 Prin Econ II Micro	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	325
GEOG 2013 Reg Geog World	None	None		**No**	**757**
HIST 1503 World Civ I	None	None		**No**	**1227**

HIST 1513 **World Civ II**	**None**	**None**		**No**	**1006**
PSY 2003 **Gen Psych**	**None**	**None**		**No**	**2674**
SOC 1003 **Intro Soc**	**None**	**None**		Yes Set Up-F2014	2128
ART 2123 Exper Art	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	737
ENGL 2003 Intro World Lit	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	651
ENGL 2013 Intro Am Lit	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	733
ENGL/JOUR 2173 Intro Film	Fall 2014	2014		Yes	1630 Eng 126 Jour
MUS 2003 **Intro Music**	**None**	**None**		**No**	**589**
PHIL 2003 **Intro Phil**	**None**	**None**		**No**	**1180**
TH 2273Intro **Theatre**	**None**	**None**		Yes Set Up-F2014	**182**
AGBU 2063 **Prin Agri** **Macroeconomics**	**None**	**None**		Yes Set Up-F2014	New Course Added 2014
AGBU 2073 **Prin Agri** **Microeconomics**	**None**	**None**		Yes Set Up-F2014	New Course Added 2014

Policy Title: Assumed Practices

Number: CRRT.B.10.020

Please note: *This policy will sunset on August 31, 2017. The* <u>revised Assumed Practices</u> *adopted June 2015 will be effective for all institutions on September 1, 2017.*

Foundational to the Criteria and Core Components is a set of practices shared by institutions of higher education in the United States. Unlike Criteria and Core Components, these Assumed Practices are (1) generally matters to be determined as facts, rather than matters requiring professional judgment and (2) unlikely to vary by institutional mission or context.

A. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

1. The institution has a conflict of interest policy that ensures that the governing board and the senior administrative personnel act in the best interest of the institution.
2. The institution has ethics policies for faculty and staff regarding conflict of interest, nepotism, recruitment and admissions, financial aid, privacy of personal information, and contracting.
3. The institution provides its students, administrators, faculty, and staff with policies and procedures informing them of their rights and responsibilities within the institution.
4. The institution provides clear information regarding its procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students and other constituencies, responds to them in a timely manner, and analyzes them to improve its processes.
5. The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:
   a. statements of mission, vision, and values
   b. full descriptions of the requirements for its programs, including all pre-requisite courses
   c. requirements for admission both to the institution and to particular programs or majors
   d. policies on acceptance of transfer credit, including how credit is applied to degree requirements. (Except for courses articulated through transfer policies or institutional agreements, the institution makes no promises to prospective students regarding the acceptance of credit awarded by examination, credit for prior learning, or credit for transfer until an evaluation has been conducted.)
   e. all student costs, including tuition, fees, training, and incidentals; its financial aid policies, practices, and requirements; and its policy on refunds
   f. policies regarding academic good standing, probation, and dismissal; residency or enrollment requirements (if any)
   g. a full list of its instructors and their academic credentials

h. its relationship with any parent organization (corporation, hospital, or church, or other entity that owns the institution) and any external providers of its instruction.

6. The institution assures that all data it makes public are accurate and complete, including those reporting on student achievement of learning and student persistence, retention, and completion.

7. The institution portrays clearly and accurately to the public its current status with the Higher Learning Commission and with specialized, national, and professional accreditation agencies.

    a. An institution offering programs that require specialized accreditation or recognition by a state licensing board or other entity in order for its students to be certified or to sit for the licensing examination in states where its students reside either has the appropriate accreditation and recognition or discloses publicly and clearly the consequences to the students of the lack thereof. The institution makes clear to students the distinction between regional and specialized or program accreditation and the relationships between licensure and the various types of accreditation.

    b. An institution offering programs eligible for specialized accreditation at multiple locations discloses the accreditation status and recognition of the program by state licensing boards at each location.

    c. An institution that provides a program that prepares students for a licensure, certification, or other qualifying examination publicly discloses its pass rate on that examination, unless such information is not available to the institution.

8. The governing board and its executive committee, if it has one, include some "public" members. Public members have no significant administrative position or any ownership interest in any of the following: the institution itself; a company that does substantial business with the institution; a company or organization with which the institution has a substantial partnership; a parent, ultimate parent, affiliate, or subsidiary corporation; an investment group or firm substantially involved with one of the above organizations. All publicly-elected members or members appointed by publicly-elected individuals or bodies (governors, elected legislative bodies) are public members.[1]

9. The governing board has the authority to approve the annual budget and to engage and dismiss the chief executive officer.[1]

10. The institution documents outsourcing of all services in written agreements, including agreements with parent or affiliated organizations.

11. The institution takes responsibility for the ethical and responsible behavior of its contractual partners in relation to actions taken on its behalf.

[1]*Institutions operating under federal control and authorized by Congress are exempt from these requirements. These institutions must have a public board that includes representation by individuals who do not have a current or previous employment or other relationship with the federal government or any military entity. This public board has a significant role in setting policy, reviewing the institution's finances, reviewing and approving major institutional priorities, and overseeing the academic programs of the institution.*

B. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

1. Programs, Courses, and Credits
   a. The institution conforms to commonly accepted minimum program length: 60 semester credits for associate's degrees, 120 semester credits for bachelor's degrees, and 30 semester credits beyond the bachelor's for master's degrees. Any variation from these minima must be explained and justified.
   b. The institution maintains structures or practices that ensure the coherence and quality of the programs for which it awards a degree. Typically institutions will require that at minimum 30 of the 120 credits earned for the bachelor's degree and 15 of the 60 credits for the associate's degree be credits earned at the institution itself, through arrangements with other accredited institutions, or through contractual relationships approved by the Commission. Any variation from the typical minima must be explained and justified.
   c. The institution's policy and practice assure that at least 50% of courses applied to a graduate program are courses designed for graduate work, rather than undergraduate courses credited toward a graduate degree. (Cf. Criterion 3.A.1 and 2.) (An institution may allow well-prepared advanced students to substitute its graduate courses for required or elective courses in an undergraduate degree program and then subsequently count those same courses as fulfilling graduate requirements in a related graduate program that the institution offers. In "4+1" or "2+3" programs, at least 50% of the credits allocated for the master's degree – usually 15 of 30 – must be for courses designed for graduate work.)
   d. The institution adheres to policies on student academic load per term that reflect reasonable expectations for successful learning and course completion.
   e. Courses that carry academic credit toward college-level credentials have content and rigor appropriate to higher education.
   f. The institution has a process for ensuring that all courses transferred and applied toward degree requirements demonstrate equivalence with its own courses required for that degree or are of equivalent rigor.
   g. The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the student's program. Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded. (Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions.)
   h. The institution maintains a minimum requirement for general education for all of its undergraduate programs whether through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor's degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any variation is explained and justified.

2. Faculty Roles and Qualifications
   a. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, the institution defines a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process that is used in the appointment process.
   b. Instructors teaching at the doctoral level have a record of recognized scholarship, creative endeavor, or achievement in practice commensurate with doctoral expectations.
   c. Faculty participate substantially in:
      a. oversight of the curriculum—its development and implementation, academic substance, currency, and relevance for internal and external constituencies;
      b. assurance of consistency in the level and quality of instruction and in the expectations of student performance;
      c. establishment of the academic qualifications for instructional personnel;
      d. analysis of data and appropriate action on assessment of student learning and program completion.
3. Support Services
   a. Financial aid advising clearly and comprehensively reviews students' eligibility for financial assistance and assists students in a full understanding of their debt and its consequences.
   b. The institution maintains timely and accurate transcript and records services.

C. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

1. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) have the authority for the assignment of grades. (This requirement allows for collective responsibility, as when a faculty committee has the authority to override a grade on appeal.)
2. The institution refrains from the transcription of credit from other institutions or providers that it will not apply to its own programs.
3. The institution has formal and current written agreements for managing any internships and clinical placements included in its programs.
4. A predominantly or solely single-purpose institution in fields that require licensure for practice is also accredited by or is actively in the process of applying to a recognized specialized accrediting agency for each field, if such agency exists.
5. Instructors communicate course requirements to students in writing and in a timely manner.

6. Institutional data on assessment of student learning are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.
7. Institutional data on student retention, persistence, and completion are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.

D. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

1. The institution is able to meet its current financial obligations.
2. The institution has a prepared budget for the current year and the capacity to compare it with budgets and actual results of previous years.
3. The institution has future financial projections addressing its long-term financial sustainability.
4. The institution maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using institutional information.
5. The institution undergoes an external audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency that reports financial statements on the institution separately from any other related entity or parent corporation. For private institutions the audit is annual; for public institutions it is at least every two years.[2]
6. The institution's administrative structure includes a chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and chief academic officer (titles may vary) with appropriate credentials and experience and sufficient focus on the institution to ensure appropriate leadership and oversight. (An institution may outsource its financial functions but must have the capacity to assure the effectiveness of that arrangement.)

[2]*Institutions under federal control are exempted provided that they have other reliable information to document the institution's fiscal resources and management.*

The Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components

HLC's Board of Trustees consider clarifying modifications to the Criteria, including the Assumed Practices, annually, usually with first reading in February and second reading in June.

The Core Components
The institution meets the Core Component if the Core Component:

a. is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Component; or
b. is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Component, but performance in relation to some aspect of the Component must be improved.

The institution **does not meet** the Core Component if the institution fails to meet the Component in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more aspects of the Component that the Component is judged not to be met.

The Criteria for Accreditation
The institution meets the Criterion if the Criterion:

a. is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Criterion; or
b. is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Criterion, but performance in relation to some Core Components of the Criterion must be improved.

The institution **does not meet** the Criterion if the institution fails to meet the Criterion in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more Core Components of the Criterion that the Criterion is judged not to be met.

The institution meets the Criterion only if all Core Components are met. The institution must be judged to meet all five Criteria for Accreditation to merit accreditation.

HLC will grant or continue accreditation (with or without conditions or sanctions), deny accreditation, or withdraw accreditation based on the outcome of its review.

The Criteria for Accreditation are the standards of quality by which the Commission determines whether an institution merits accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation. They are as follows:

Criterion One. Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Components

1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

> 1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
>
> 2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
>
> 3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.

> 1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
>
> 2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
>
> 3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

> 1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
>
> 2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

1.D. The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

> 1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
>
> 2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
>
> 3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity

allow.

Criterion Two. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct
The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Components

2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

2.E. The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students, and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Criterion Three. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support
The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Components

3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

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

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional

policies and procedures.

4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation **and Improvement**
The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Components
4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational

programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.

3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

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

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

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.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission,

student populations, and educational offerings.

2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Components

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

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage *its internal*

constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.

3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.