

HLC Accreditation Update

Lawrence J. Johnson
Ralph Katerberg

Self-Study Overview

- Re-accreditation is an open, evidence-based process that requires broad participation from across the university—board, students, faculty, staff, and administration.
- During this process, a team of faculty and administrators has closely examined the role of the university in five key areas, the HLC Criteria for Accreditation:
 - Mission and Integrity
 - Preparing for the Future
 - Student Learning and Effective Teaching
 - Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge
 - Engagement and Service

HLC Criteria for Accreditation

- **Criterion One: Mission and Integrity:** The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.
- **Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future:** The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.
- **Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching:** The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.
- **Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge:** The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.
- **Criterion Five: Engagement and Service:** As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Steering Team

- Lawrence J. Johnson, Dean, College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services (co-chair)
- Ralph Katerberg, Associate Professor, College of Business (co-chair)
- Cheryl Albrecht, Associate Dean, University Libraries
- Peg Allensworth, Senior Associate Vice President, Administration and Finance
- John Bryan, Interim Vice Provost, Academic Personnel
- Charles Collins, Associate Dean, College of Medicine
- Gigi Escoe, Vice Provost, Assessment and Student Learning
- Thomas Hadley, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs and Services
- Laura Kretschmer, Professor, College of Allied Health Sciences
- Beth McGrew, Associate Vice President, Campus Planning and Design
- Lee Mortimer, Director, Institutional Research
- Nelson Vincent, Associate Dean, College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services
- Tina Whalen, Department Head, Rehabilitation Sciences, College of Allied Health Sciences
- Ryan Rosensweig, Student Body President

Writing Teams

CRITERION ONE: MISSION AND INTEGRITY.

Cheryl Albrecht, Charles Collins, co-chairs

Marianne Kunnen-Jones, Karen Monzel, Nancy Creaghead,
Ann Welsh, Stacy Downing

CRITERION TWO: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE.

Peg Allensworth, Tom Cruse, co-chairs

Mary Beth McGrew, Carol Metzger, Mike Lieberman, Xinhao
Wang

Writing Teams

CRITERION THREE: STUDENT LEARNING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING.

John Bryan, Laura Kretschmer, co-chairs

Pam Person, Wayne Hall, Carol Tonge,

Brenda LeMaster, Ricardo Moena,

Amy Pettigrew, Missy Laine, Anne Bauer, Lora Arduser,

Lisa Meloncon

CRITERION FOUR: ACQUISITION, DISCOVERY, AND APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE.

Gigi Escoe, Tina Whalen, co-chairs

Lou Ann Emerson, Mitch Leventhal, Paul Bishop, Janice Denton,

Bob Zierolf, Mike Sharp

Writing Teams

CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE.

Tom Hadley, Frank Russell, co-chairs

Mary Stagaman, Dorothy Air, George Vredeveld,
Gerry Siegert, Esther Erkins, Kathy Dick

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity

EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE

- The evolution of UC|21: The New Urban Research University
- President's UC|21 Diversity Task Force Report, March 2007
- Integrated Decision-Making

FINDINGS

- We must work to more closely match enrollment strategies and student needs with faculty and resources.
- More work needs to be done to integrate UC|21, academic priorities, and the integrated plan.
- University System of Ohio: USO will need to be monitored closely for its impact on university governance and resource allocation.

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future

EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE

- The alignment of integrated planning and academic priorities
- UC's Technology Plan
- The President's UC|21 Report Card

FINDINGS

- Master planning in five, ten, and twenty year increments. The university has begun an internal master planning process to review academic priorities and support needs.
- Enrollment and Budget Committee / Performance-Based Budgeting
- UniverSIS: The continued reliance on the current student information system, UniverSIS, will prove to be a challenge over the next five years.

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE

- Assessment and program reviews
- Support for faculty development
- Student support, retention, and satisfaction

FINDINGS

- We must continue to build a standards-based approach to setting, assessing, and achieving student-learning goals in all programs.
- Balancing research, education, and community engagement continues to be a challenge, as it is at all research universities.
- Integrated planning should continue in an open and transparent way.

Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge

EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE

- Research activity, support, and funding
- General Education and assessment
- Integrated Core Learning (ICL)

FINDINGS

- The management of research operations will continue to demand a great deal of maintenance, oversight, and infrastructure.
- The process of semester conversion is both a challenge and an opportunity.
- Overall, the university has set ambitious research goals and has made significant progress since 1999.

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service

EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE

- The overall breadth and quality of engagement and service initiatives—survey results
- Center for the City
- Community partnerships, education, and service
- Strive

FINDINGS

- UC has budgetary and human resource constraints and can not respond to all requests. This is not always understood by stakeholders and community partners.
- In order to centralize engagement and service, UC must integrate and coordinate unit-based initiatives.

HLC Expectations

- The self-study is for our institution's benefit. It is a once-in-a-decade opportunity for reflection leading to continuous improvement.
- However, the target audience is the HLC consultant-evaluators.
- The consultant–evaluators study our report, use it to prepare for their visit, then prepare a written team report including their recommendations for reaccreditation.

Expectations of HLC Consultant-Evaluators

- Read the full self-study report before the campus visit.
- Carefully study assigned areas (usually criteria).
- Use on campus meetings and formal / informal discussions to “validate” the written report.
- Serve as consultants to the university about areas for which we may seek advice.
- Prepare a “tight” team report including recommendations for reaccreditation.

HLC Consultant Evaluators

- Dr. Celestino Fernandez, Professor of Sociology, University of Arizona
- Dr. Richard Alfred, Professor of Higher Education, University of Michigan
- Ms. Ingrid Gould, Associate Provost, University of Chicago
- Dr. Richard Howell, Associate Dean for Research, University of New Mexico
- Dr. James Larson, Professor of Sociology, University of North Dakota
- Dr. Nancy McCarthy Snyder, Associate Professor of Public Administration, Wichita State University
- Dr. Jean McEnery, Director of Assessment and Professor of Business, Eastern Michigan University
- Mr. Harvey Perlman, Chancellor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Dr. Douglas Priest, Associate Vice Provost, Indiana University-Bloomington
- Dr. Karen Pugliesi, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Northern Arizona University
- Dr. Dorothy Simpson-Taylor, Director of Diversity Resources, University of Iowa
- Dr. Promod Vohra, Dean and Professor of Engineering, Northern Illinois University

Structure of the Self-Study

- **Steering Committee:** meets monthly to discuss progress
- **Executive Committee:** meets weekly, provides staffing support
- **Writing Teams:** provides written examples of excellence, challenges, and action steps leading to improvement for each criterion
- **Resource Room:** provides documentation and evidence of excellence, staffed by two resource librarians
- **Communications:** develops a plan to communicate progress to stakeholders and the public
- **Graphic Design / Creative Services:** creates the design of the self-study report
- **Editorial Support:** refines drafts of the self-study report
- **Technology and Logistics:** interfaces with HLC team to make sure their technology needs are met and the campus visit runs smoothly

HLC Self-Study Timeline

- **Summer 2007:** Summer Retreat
- **Fall 2007:** Formal Campus Launch
- **Winter 2007:** Writing Teams Working on Drafts
- **February, 2007:** Wright State University Visit
- **March, 2007:** Communications Plan Finalized
- **April, 2008:** HLC Annual Meeting in Chicago
- **May, 2008:** Mary Breslin, HLC staff liason, visits UC
- **June, 2008:** Draft Report Completed
- **Fall 2008:** HLC Steering Committee Retreat
- **Winter 2009:** Final Draft and Revisions Submitted
- **February 2009:** Self-Study Report Completed
- **April 26 – 29, 2009:** Site Visit
- **Summer 2009:** President Receives Draft Report (we celebrate!)
- **Fall 2009:** President Receives Final Report

Key Upcoming Dates

- February 8-9: Preview visit by Dr. Celestino Fernandez, HLC team chair
- March 2-3: Preview visit by Elaine Klein, Assistant Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- April 26-29: HLC Accreditation site visit

How you can help

- Help build general awareness of the self-study process in preparation for the campus visit.
- During the campus visit, be available to meet with HLC consultant-evaluators.
- Read the self-study report (at least the executive summary).
- Let us know if there is an error or something that should be highlighted.
- Visit the website: www.uc.edu/hlcaccreditation.
- Be familiar with institutional improvements since the last visit (1999).
- Be familiar with key findings and talking points including:
 - Student learning and assessment.
 - Improvements in General Education.
 - Strategic, financial, and academic planning.