

Transcript

Loretta Waldron:

Welcome back to the CHEA Recognition Process Tutorials. I am Loretta Waldron, CHEA Vice President for Recognition Services. In the first tutorial, we considered CHEA recognition, how it differs from the US Department of Education and an overview of the recognition process. In this session, we will go in depth on Standard 1, Academic Quality and Student Achievement, and its four substandards and Standard 2, Accountability and Transparency, and its four substandards, as well as suggested evidence to demonstrate compliance.

What is academic quality? In key terms, academic quality is defined as the evidence of performance associated with teaching, learning, research, and service, including the integrated way in which learning, practice and discovery are fostered by institutions and programs. Academic quality includes the expectations that institutions or programs have of students and the effort those institutions or programs, accord to the promotion of student success.

Standard 1 focuses on Academic Quality and Student Achievement, and states Advancement of academic quality and continuous improvement are at the core of accreditation. .

To be recognized the accrediting organization provides evidence that it implements and enforces standards, policies and procedures which advance academic quality using quantitative and/or qualitative measures, detail how it supports the autonomy of an institution or program in determining academic quality as it relates to the mission of the institution or program, require resources specific to ensuring adequate student preparation and health and safety and support implementation of innovative practices.

In Standard 1 A, the accrediting organization addresses how it advances academic quality using quantitative and/or qualitative measures, and provides supporting evidence of how it implements and enforces standards, policies and procedures to advance academic quality. In the narrative portion of the application, the accrediting organization may provide its definition of academic quality or describe the characteristics or attributes of how it views academic quality. Within the narrative should be examples of instances where an institution or a program does and does not meet its definition of academic quality. For programmatic accrediting organizations, the characteristics or attributes should include the knowledge, skills, practices, and habits of mind it expects of graduates.

The narrative should be supported with evidence of the specific standards, policies, and procedures of the accrediting organization that advance academic quality and identify how it is measured or determined at the institutional or program level. How the accrediting organization implements and enforces the identified standards, policies, and procedures to advance academic quality should be clearly stated within the narrative.

In Standard 1 B, the accrediting organization details how it supports the autonomy of an institution or program in determining academic quality as it relates to the mission of the institution or program. The accrediting organization may describe how it supports the autonomy of an institution or program in determining academic quality as related to the mission, identify the specific standards, policies, and procedures related to the mission and academic quality, and provide evidence of how these are

implemented and enforced. Examples of how the standards, policies, and procedures are applied to institutions and programs with different missions should be provided..

In Standard 1 C, the accrediting organization provides evidence that it implements and enforces standards, policies, and procedures that require resources specific to ensuring adequate student preparation and health and safety. The accrediting organization may describe the rationale for standards that specify resource requirements, such as budget, faculty, equipment, physical facilities. The rationale should include information and/or data that supports the need with specified resource requirements, identifying how the rationale was substantiated and how the resource is related to academic quality and student success. If the accrediting organization does not have specific resource requirements, provide examples of how determinations are made that institutions and/or programs demonstrate that the resources are adequate.

Lastly, in Standard 1 D, the accrediting organization provides evidence that it implements and enforces standards, policies, and procedures that support implementation of innovative practices. Innovation is included in key terms. It is described as designing, implementing, and/or supporting new initiatives that advance academic quality. In the narrative, the accrediting organization should identify and provide the specific standards, policies, and procedures that support innovative practices related to student achievement and advancement of academic quality. As appropriate, examples of innovative practices that institutions or programs have implemented should be provided.

Standard 2 focuses on Accountability and Transparency and states the accrediting organization implements and upholds standards, policies or procedures that require the accrediting organization to inform the public of the institution's or program's accreditation status and the reason for the accreditation action within 30 days of the organization's decision making meeting in a readily accessible manner. Accredited institutions and programs to provide current, readily accessible, accurate data to the public regarding student learning outcomes and/or achievement data, a timely response to all public concerns and complaints regarding an institution, a program, or the accrediting organization and the accrediting organization to take timely action to prevent substantially underperforming institutions or programs from maintaining accreditation. Before we discuss the standards, key terms identifies readily accessible as the ease with which information provided by institutions, programs, or accrediting organizations can be identified, located, and obtained by the intended public.

In Standard 2 A, the accrediting organization implements and upholds standards, policies and procedures that require it to inform the public of the institution's or program's accreditation status and the reason for the accreditation action within 30 days of the organization's decision making meeting in a readily accessible manner.

The narrative may describe the process used to inform the public of the accreditation actions and decisions, and identify the timeframe for making that information public. Ways of making the information public include official accrediting organization board communication to the institution or program regarding the final decision, official decisions by the accrediting organization on the accrediting organization's website, and/or a platform that is readily accessible to the community of interest, any response to public inquiry regarding an accreditation decision and definitions of accreditation statuses used by the accrediting organization inclusive of the meeting of different reporting requirements. In addressing this standard, the accrediting organization may provide a list of accredited institutions or programs that includes the accreditation status, the reasons for the accreditation decision, and any

reporting requirements. An example is provided. Keep in mind that the public is to be notified within 30 days of the decision-making meeting. The notification should include the dates of the decision making meeting, the date the information was made public, the term of accreditation, the reason for the term, such as all standards have been met at the time of the decision, and when any reports are due. If standards are identified, for example, as in needing more information or being non-compliant, either the entire standard or description of the standard, not just the number, is to be identified.

In Standard 2 B, the accrediting organization implements and upholds standards, policies or procedures that require accredited institutions and programs to provide current, readily accessible accurate data to the public regarding student learning outcomes and/or achievement data. The application narrative may include a description of data and whether the data reflect the intended expectation of academic quality as identified in Standard 1 A or a description of how the accrediting organization monitors the published information and provides feedback to institutions or programs.

The accrediting organization may identify the standards, policies, and procedures that require an institution or program to post on its website or in a readily accessible platform, student qualitative and/or quantitative student achievement data, as well as the data required. This data on student learning and/or achievement is readily accessible from the institution or program's homepage. The name on the link should be easily understood by the public and the information should have context.

In Standard 2 C, the accrediting organization implements and upholds standards, policies or procedures that require a timely response to all public concerns and complaints regarding an institution, a program, or the accrediting organization itself. In its narrative, the accrediting organization may describe its process or procedures, including the time delineation for addressing and reconciling public concerns and complaints regarding the institutions or programs accredited, site visitors, members of the decision-making body, staff, or the accrediting organization, as well as identifying any policies related to addressing public concerns and complaints. The narrative may further identify where the concern/complaint policies or procedures may be found (that is, on the website, in a policy or procedures manual), and how a member of the public would find this information. If complaints or concerns have been raised examples that reflect the accrediting organization's implementation of the policies and procedures specific to complaints or concerns should be included, as well as clear identification of the timeline for processing the complaints or concerns. In

Standard 2 D, the accrediting organization implements and upholds standards, policies or procedures that require it to take timely action to prevent substantially underperforming institutions or programs from maintaining accreditation. The narrative may describe how the accrediting organization documents warnings and procedures for correction of low performing institutions and programs, or communicates with state or federal entities that have oversight for higher education to receive information they may have that might affect the institution's or program's accreditation status. This narrative may highlight policies and/or procedures the organization would use if it became aware of poor performance in between formal or comprehensive reviews. The policies and/or procedures should include timelines for processing and responding to monitoring reports such as follow up reports, progress reports, or annual reports, or any other actions required of institutions or programs.

This wraps up our session on Standards 1 and 2, some key terms in the standards and how to use suggested evidence when completing the application narrative. The next session will address Standards 3 and 4. You may contact me via email waldron@chea.org or at 202.372.9254.