HLC Town Hall Meeting
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Importance of Accreditation

- HLC accreditation since 1915 (100 year anniversary)
- Eligibility for Title IV funding
- Celebrate our successes!
- Recognize our challenges
Purpose of Town Hall Meeting

Educational
- Process
- Timeline
- Accreditation Criteria and Core Components

Feedback
- Are there strengths or concerns missing from the list?
- Is there evidence (documents, reports) missing from the report that should be included?
- Are there concerns from the 2005 report that we have neglected?
HLC Steering Committee
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Rachelle Darabi      Sarah Nyquist
Thomas Dicke         Don Simpson
Steve Foucart        Elizabeth (Libby) Rozell
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Cynthia Hail         Derek Yost

Sherry Jones, Administrative Assistant
Pathways to Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Open Pathway – 10 year cycle

- Requires annual reports by Institutional Research and Chief Financial Officer
- Requires that we notify HLC of significant changes.
- Requires a Quality Improvement Project – proposal and final report
- Requires updated assurance argument with evidence in years 4 and 10.
- Requires a site visit in year 10 by a trained peer review team.
Missouri State University must provide evidence and a narrative (the assurance argument) that we meet all five criteria and core components.
Missouri State is invited to participate in the Open Pathway (process for reaffirmation of accreditation). Requires a quality improvement project to be completed between 2012 and 2015 and an assurance report to be submitted in 2015 prior to the site visit.

2012 HLC Steering Committee formed to prepare for site visit in 2015

October 1, 2014 First draft of assurance document will be available for campus review. Collect feedback through November 1.

January 15, 2015 Second draft of assurance document will be available for campus review. Collect feedback through March 1.

Spring 2014 Subcommittee Reports are complete. Town Hall Meeting

May 1, 2015 Final draft of assurance document will be complete

2015 Site visit (team of 3-4) will visit campus for two days!

Quality improvement project is in progress.

Annual financial and enrollment reports submitted to HLC

HLC changes monitored, concerns reviewed from 2005
Five Criteria

**Criterion One. Mission**
The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

**Criterion One Subcommittee**
Victor Matthews—Chair. Members—Bill Cheek, Ken Coopwood, Cynthia Hail, Cathy Pearman, Joshua Smith.
Five Criteria

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

**Criterion Two Subcommittee**
Five Criteria

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

Criterion Three Subcommittee
Rachelle Darabi—Chair. Members—Andrew Cline, Crystal Gale, Rob Hornberger, Dianne Slattery, Colette Witkowski.
Five Criteria

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.

Criterion Four Subcommittee
Keri Franklin—Chair. Members—Members - Lynn Cline, Tom Dicke, Angela Kohnen, Ken Vollmar, Rebecca Woodard.
Five Criteria

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.

Criterion Five Subcommittee
Etta Madden—Chair. Members—Michael Foster, Steve Foucart, Kathleen Kennedy, Matt Morris, James Scott.
Findings of the Steering Committee

- Concerns from 2005
- Accomplishments since 2005
- Current concerns
Review of Concerns—2005 Report

- Diversity
- Public affairs mission is not embedded into general education curriculum.
- Valuing of assessment is not consistent across campus.
- Program review process needs attention.
- Recommend external reviewers for promotion and tenure.
- Pay attention to transfer students. Write articulation agreements.
- Fee structure seems overly complex.
Celebrating our Successes!
Strengths/Accomplishments from 2005–present

Criterion One. Mission

- Mission statement integrated into long range plans and public documents.
- Budget priorities support the mission of educating persons.
- Defining learning outcomes for public affairs mission and integration into the curriculum.
- Co-curricular, signature events/activities that support the public affairs mission.
- Serving the public good is a foundation for the community engagement.
Strengths/Accomplishments from 2005–present

Criterion Two. Integrity

- The online policy library
- MSU internal auditor (direct report to the BOG) and external auditor annually review finances and processes.
- Hired a VP for Diversity and Inclusion
- MSU information security officer protects critical information and privacy.
- MSU publications highlight our mission—“The Mind’s Eye”, “eJournal of Public Affairs”
Strengths/Accomplishments from 2005–present

Criterion Three. Teaching/Learning-Quality/Resources/Support

- MSU has outstanding faculty.
- Master Advisor Program to help ensure quality.
- General education program now aligns with public affairs mission.
- Program review process.
Strengths/Accomplishments from 2005–present

Criterion Four. Teaching/Learning-Evaluation and Improvement

- Enhanced program review/accreditation cycle and calendar posted on website.
- Reinvented the Office of Assessment to focus on institutional assessment.
- Grad Track software—Career Center
- Departments have adopted student learning outcomes for each program.
Strengths/Accomplishments from 2005–present

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

- Planning process in place since 1995.
- Budget process transparency increased in 2005.
- MSU has a well-planned and implemented financial reserve system.
- Communication has improved with the addition of the President’s blog, Provost Communiqué, Twitter feeds and committee process.
Concerns and Challenges

- Continue to work on the challenges of integrating diversity into university’s social fabric.
- Maintain momentum in promoting the public affairs mission.
- Fee structure remains complicated.
- Continue to address infrastructure needs for online/blended academic programming.
- Continue to monitor course overload inconsistencies across colleges.
- Continue to strengthen internal audit.
- Provide evidence that policies and syllabi differentiate between graduate and undergraduate student learning outcomes.
Concerns and Challenges

- Monitor policies and practices for review and support of per course faculty.
- Continue to provide high impact practices and improve promotion to students.
- Accountability and improvement of student learning.
- Opportunities to learn from one another about the results of assessment efforts.
- Continue to have conversations around post-graduate success.
- The university’s deferred maintenance list is long.
Key Websites

- Higher Learning Commission
- Missouri State University websites:
  - HLC website
  - HLC Steering Committee
  - QIP Information
  - Accreditations
What we need from you!

- Are there strengths or concerns missing from the list?
- Is there evidence (documents, reports) missing from the report that should be included?
- Are there concerns from the 2005 report that we have neglected?
- Contact any HLC Steering Committee member to provide feedback.
- Read drafts of the report as they are posted in the coming year and provide feedback.