

# Audio Set Up

- **Set up audio**
- Once you've been launched into session, you will be prompted to set up your audio.
- **To use your computer's mic and speakers:**
  - Click **Computer audio**.
  - Use the drop-down menus to select the desired audio devices.
  - Click **Continue**.
- **To use your telephone to dial in:**
  - Click **Phone call**.
  - Use your telephone's keypad to dial the provided phone number and enter the codes when prompted.
- Click **Continue**.



# Criterion 4

## OVERVIEW AND EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE

Stephanie Brzuzny: Higher Learning Commission

Rex Ramsier: University of Akron

April 2022

## Revised Criteria Effective September 1, 2020

HLC is required to initiate a review of its Criteria for Accreditation every five years. In 2018, HLC published draft alpha and beta versions of the revised Criteria and received feedback from the membership and peer reviewers. HLC's Board of Trustees adopted the final version at its February 2019 meeting. The new Criteria will go into effect September 1, 2020.

### [New Criteria for Accreditation Booklet](#)

This publication includes the new Criteria language, a crosswalk between the current and revised Criteria, an updated glossary of Criteria terminology, and an overview of how the Criteria will be updated in the Assurance System.

### [Criteria for Accreditation: Policy Change Adopted on Second Reading](#)

This document shows the changes that were made to the current Criteria in the revised version.

### [Crosswalk Between the Current and Revised Criteria](#)

### [Providing Evidence for the Revised Criteria](#)

This document provides suggestions to assist institutions in thinking about possible

Ci

Q

Cc

80

# Revisions to the Criteria

**FROM THE CURRENT CRITERIA TO THE REVISED CRITERIA**

Current Criteria	Revised Criteria
<b>Criterion 1</b>	
1.A.	1.A.
1.B.	1.A.
1.C.	1.C.
1.D.	1.B.
<b>Criterion 2</b>	
2.A.	2.A.
2.B.	2.B.
2.C.	2.C.
2.D.	2.D.
2.E.	2.E.
<b>Criterion 3</b>	
3.A.	3.A.
3.B.	3.B.
3.C.	3.C.
3.D.	3.D.
3.E.	2.B.
<b>Criterion 4</b>	
4.A.	4.A.
4.B.	4.B.
4.C.	4.C.
<b>Criterion 5</b>	
5.A.	5.B.
5.B.	5.A.
5.C.	5.C.
5.D.	5.C.

**FROM THE REVISED CRITERIA TO THE CURRENT CRITERIA**

Revised Criteria	Current Criteria
<b>Criterion 1</b>	
1.A.	1.A. and 1.B.
1.B.	1.D.
1.C.	1.C.
<b>Criterion 2</b>	
2.A.	2.A.
2.B.	2.B. and 3.E.
2.C.	2.C.
2.D.	2.D.
2.E.	2.E.
<b>Criterion 3</b>	
3.A.	3.A.
3.B.	3.B.
3.C.	3.C.
3.D.	3.D.
<b>Criterion 4</b>	
4.A.	4.A.
4.B.	4.B.
4.C.	4.C.
<b>Criterion 5</b>	
5.A.	5.B.
5.B.	5.A.
5.C.	5.C. and 5.D.

## Criterion 4

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 Component 4A

The institution ensures the quality of its educational offerings.

# Core Component 4A: Overview

- Regular program review process
- Evaluation of quality of all transcribed credit
- Maintains and exercises authority over prerequisites, dual credit courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning and faculty qualifications
- Specialized accreditation for certain programs
- Evaluation of success of graduates

Download.hlcommission.org/ProvidingEvidence2020\_INF.pdf



HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

RESOURCE

## PROVIDING EVIDENCE FOR THE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

Updated for Revised Criteria for Accreditation, Effective September 1, 2020

An institution has to provide a narrative and supporting evidence that demonstrate it meets HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. A team of peer reviewers evaluates the institution to validate its argument and determine if each Core Component of the Criteria is met. HLC provides suggestions to assist institutions in thinking about possible sources of evidence. This document should not be viewed by institutions or peer reviewers as an exhaustive list or be used as a checklist when preparing



# 4A Examples of Evidence

- Program review: guidelines, templates, cycle, reviewing bodies, common data, external review, benchmarks, repository of self-studies, reports, actions, program advisory boards, curriculum review
- Transcribed credit: transfer, PLA, AP, CLEP, credit by exam, international, catalog/handbook, articulation agreements, course equivalency guides, transfer student office/support, transcripts

# 4A Examples of Evidence

- Academic integrity of courses/programs: internal/external curriculum review, substitutions, co/pre-requisites, compliance (State, accreditors), new program approval process, faculty hiring, faculty credentials, dual enrollment practices

# 4A Examples of Evidence

- Specialized accreditation: necessary/optional, status, monitoring/sanction, actions taken
- Graduate success: employment, further degrees, fellowships, internships, special programs, exit/alumni surveys, licensure/certification results, employer feedback, process for tracking graduates

# Sample Assurance Argument Narrative

- “Institution” maintains a program review process which involves faculty and administrators, with oversight by the **University Assessment Council**. Reviews are completed every five years, evaluated by appropriate undergraduate/graduate faculty committees, the Provost, and then the Board of Directors. The most recent **reviews** resulted in calls for specific action related to deficiencies in assessment and two recommendations for program discontinuation. In addition, annual assessment reporting is now rolled into the five-year program reviews.

## Core Component 4B

The institution engages in ongoing assessment of student learning as part of its commitment to the educational outcomes of its students.

# Core Component 4B: Overview

- Effective processes for the assessment of student learning, both academic and co-curricular
- Utilizes information gained from assessment to improve student learning
- Processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty, instructional and other relevant staff members

*This slide is a brief summation of the subcomponents for this Core Component.*

*For elaboration, see full text of subcomponents at [hlcommission.org](http://hlcommission.org)*

## 4B Examples of Evidence

- Effective processes: assessment plan, templates, cycle, SLOs - Gen. Ed./course/program/institution, SLOs - co-curricular, SLOs – known to students, rubrics, curriculum maps, direct measures, indirect measures, annual reports, faculty review, assessment/curriculum committee(s), faculty senate, assessment office/coordinator/director, data, data, data

## 4B Examples of Evidence

- Closing the loop with actions: employer feedback, licensure exams, curricular changes, revisions (SLOs, measures, rubrics), agendas/minutes (program, Gen. Ed., institution)
- Participation: agendas/minutes, training, faculty hiring, faculty evaluations, assessment office, instructional designers, Chairs/Deans/Provost, student affairs personnel



# Core Component 4C

The institution pursues educational improvement through goals and strategies that improve retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

# Core Component 4C: Overview

- Defined goals for retention, persistence and completion
- Collects data and analyzes information on retention, persistence and completion
- The institution uses the information for improvements
- The institution's processes and methodologies reflect good practice

# 4C Examples of Evidence

- Goals: well-defined metrics/terminology, measurable, tailored to institution/program/student sub-groups, baseline/current data for each, ambitious goals, self-consistency
- Data collection and analysis: standardized/centralized, data governance, DFW/probation/suspension, credits earned vs. attempted, sequence courses, dissemination to appropriate units/committees/etc.

# 4C Examples of Evidence

- Using the information: agendas/minutes, action items, follow through and tracking, advising practices, enrollment management, modified rules/policies, implementation of new student support services
- Good practices: all of the above, benchmarking, consortia, TRIO, national organizations/initiatives, HLC

# Potential Pitfalls, Criterion 4B

- Don't try to assess *everything, every semester*
  - Decide on what is most important
  - Decide how you can best assess these areas
  - Be methodical, have a plan, and stick to it
- Don't strive for *best practice*, rather, make it meaningful
  - Assessment doesn't have to be fancy
  - Assessment does need to inform change for the better

# Evaluation Data

- 104 institutions completed a Comprehensive Evaluation in 2020-2021
  - 46 % merited reaffirmation with areas of concern → report or visit
- Top cited core components:
  1. 4B Assessment of Student Learning
  2. 5B Resources
  3. 5C Planning
  4. 4A Quality of Educational Offerings
  5. 3C Quality of Faculty and Staff
- 27 Institutions had 4B met with concerns, 2 not met

# Additional Information:

HLC's website:  
[www.hlcommission.org](http://www.hlcommission.org)