

# CIHE Standards Revision

*ACRL Meeting*

*April 4, 2016*

# A timeline so far – and plans for the future

June 2014	Initial discussion at Commission retreat
Fall 2014	Regional meetings and feedback
December 2014	Report at the Annual Meeting
Spring 2015	Themes <del>or first draft</del> prepared and discussed
June 2015	Commission meeting for a rough draft
Fall 2015	Draft Standards public and discussed
November 2015	Commission review of feedback + revisions
December 2015	Report at the Annual Meeting + final draft
January 2016	Commission adopts the Standards
July 2016	New Standards in effect
Fall 2016	New Standards implemented

# Characteristics of the Standards

- Mission-centric – institutional autonomy
- Aspirational standards to be met at least minimally
- Non-prescriptive
- Largely qualitative
- Evaluation for improvement
- Anticipate the future

*Still important*

# The Context for Standards revision

## Public Expectations:

- ✓ Lower Cost
- ✓ More degrees
- ✓ Higher quality
  
- ✓ More students on Pell, please
- ✓ More transparency, please

## In a time of

- Financial and demographic challenges
- Lower trust in social institutions
- More government scrutiny

# The Context for Standards revision, cont'd

Diversity in the models:

- Disaggregation of the faculty role
- 'Credits from elsewhere'
- MOOCs and badges and bootcamps
- Competency-based education
- Full-time, residential, parent support = 25%
- The Master's degree. . . .

# The Current Environment

“We are concerned that accreditors are not doing enough to protect students.”

“Lawmakers have a duty to make sure students spend their federal aid at good college. We need to find a way to make accreditation work better.”

“As it stands, where Congress has asked for little accountability, accreditors have provided little. For the most part, accreditation organizations are the watchdogs that don’t bark.”

“The collapse of Corinthian College shows that we all need to do more for students to ensure that quality is verified, students are protected and taxpayer dollars are well spent.”

Ted Mitchell, Lamar Alexander, Arne Duncan, Patty Murray

# Commission starting point, #1

1. Continue to be mission-centric
2. Emphasize outcomes increasingly, much more than inputs, especially student learning
3. Leave plenty of room for innovation (which should be mission-compatible)
4. Increase the expectation for accountability
5. Increase the expectation for transparency

# Commission starting point, #1, cont'd

6. Consider having fewer standards – by combining and revising current standards
7. Keep a simple, clear process so that institutions focus on the content and not the process
8. Consider whether to separate compliance from improvement
9. Ensure the standards allow for a differentiated process with institutions
10. Reflect expectations for quality in competency-based education



# Format Changes

- From 11 Standards to 9 Standards
- **Institutional Effectiveness** is no longer a subheading – now incorporated into the Standard
- Some new subheadings: for clarity and ease of use

## *Standards for Accreditation*

1. Mission and Purposes
2. Planning and Evaluation
3. Organization and Governance
4. The Academic Program
5. Students
6. Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship
7. Institutional Resources
8. Educational Effectiveness
9. Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure

# Three major changes

- 1. Less emphasis on inputs/resources:**  
Combine most of 7, 8, 9 + a focus on staff  
= *Institutional Resources*
- 2. Add *Educational Effectiveness*:** Combine parts of 2, 4, 6
- 3. Combine 10 and 11:** *Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure*: More emphasis on what is owed to the public

# Other Key Changes

4. **Faculty:** Models continue to diversify
5. **Library:** Focus mainly now on outcomes
6. **'Assuring Academic Quality':** section in *The Academic Program*
7. **'Institutional Effectiveness':** incorporated into each Standard

## Some Other Key Changes

8. Academic staff explicitly recognized
9. Competency-based education included (e.g., 4.30, 4.33)
10. Credit for prior learning and non-collegiate learning now possible at the graduate level
8. Multiple student bodies recognized (5.1)

# Feedback on first public draft from

## Meetings

- 206 Institutional representatives
- 16 Interested others (SHEEO's, etc)
- 19 Librarians
- 17 Experienced evaluators
- 19 NEASC Trustees + Directors

## Phone Calls

- 5 Callers on 4 offered calls

## Letters and emails

- 192 Letters and email messages

+ ~ 460 earlier participants

# Feedback enormously helpful

## Liked

- “The standard on educational effectiveness”
- “Moving more to outcomes, away from resource auditing”
- “The process is inclusive and transparent”
- “The effort to shorten the Standards”
- “The standards continue to be aspirational”
- “The mission-centric approach”
- “The emphasis on transparency”
- “The value of co-curricular learning has been elevated”

# Feedback enormously helpful

Want more consideration to:

- “better equipping students to understand their repayment obligations”
- “We are devoted to innovation, so we need standards that allow and support it.”
- “Clarity and flexibility about CBE”
- “Strengthening governing boards.”
- Title IX issues
- How ‘scholarship’ and ‘research’ are addressed



# Feedback enormously helpful

## Not clear agreement

- **Prior Learning Assessment**
  - “Don’t keep the 25% limit on credit for non-collegiate experiences”
  - “Don’t get rid of the 25% max on outside – however defined – credit”
- **Faculty**
  - “The faculty role is changing – much different!”
  - “Please recognize the importance of full-time faculty in my small institution.”
  - “I like the wider definition of who ‘faculty’ are.”
- **Library**
  - “Don’t ignore the feedback on ‘the library’ and its role in our institutions”
  - “Don’t re-emphasize the library”

## Changes since the first public draft include:

- The “standards ~~do not preclude~~ welcome perceptive and imaginative innovation” (Preamble)
- Add feedback from “other relevant constituencies” (2.7)
- Added **Governing Board** and **Internal Governance** subheadings (Standard 3)
- Board orientation and professional development (3.8)
- The institution exercises restraint in requiring credits above the minimum for undergraduate degrees. (4.29)
- Credit for prior learning and experiential education @25% for credentials of 30 or fewer credits (4.35)

## Changes since the first public draft include:

- Reference to “badges and other forms of academic recognition” (4.49)
- Reference to ethical behavior in recruitment as well as admissions (5.3)
- Better language for students who need assistance to be successful in collegiate-level study (5.5)
- Revised language on student services (5.9-5.12, 5.15)
- Stronger language re cost and debt for students (5.14, 8.6, 9.25)
- Opportunities as well as expectations for athletes (5.16)

## Changes since the first public draft include:

- Change Standard 6: ~~Support for Teaching, and Learning, and Scholarship~~
- Clearer support for part-time and adjunct faculty (6.1, 6.19)
- Clearer support for libraries and librarians (6.2, 7.24)
- Added: “The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by ensuring satisfactory levels of student achievement on mission-appropriate student outcomes”  
*Educational Effectiveness, Statement of the Standard*
- Clearer statement for quantitative measures of student success (8.6, 8.7)

*Libraries, librarians,  
and  
information literacy*

4.12 Expectations for student achievement, independent learning, information literacy, skills in inquiry, and critical judgment are appropriate to the subject matter and degree level and in keeping with generally accepted practice.

4.15 Graduates successfully completing an undergraduate program demonstrate competence in written and oral communication in English; the ability for scientific and quantitative reasoning, for critical analysis and logical thinking; and the capability for continuing learning, including the skills of information literacy. They also demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific, historical, and social phenomena, and a knowledge and appreciation of the aesthetic and ethical dimensions of humankind.

7.21 The institution has sufficient and appropriate information, physical, and technological resources necessary for the achievement of its purposes wherever and however its academic programs are offered. It devotes sufficient resources to maintain and enhance its information, physical, and technological resources. (See also 4.10)

7.22 The institution provides access to library and information resources, services, facilities, and qualified staff sufficient to support its teaching and learning environments and its research and public service mission as appropriate

6.2 There are an adequate number of faculty and academic staff, including librarians, advisors, and instructional designers, whose time commitment to the institution is sufficient to assure the accomplishment of class and out-of-class responsibilities essential for the fulfillment of institutional mission and purposes. Responsibilities include instruction, accessibility to students, and the systematic understanding of effective teaching/learning processes and outcomes in courses and programs for which they share responsibility; additional duties may include, e.g., student advisement, academic planning, and participation in policy-making, course and curricular development, research, and institutional governance. (See also 3.15)



## Standard Eight

# Educational Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates its effectiveness by ensuring satisfactory levels of student achievement on mission-appropriate student outcomes. Based on verifiable information, the institution understands what its students have gained as a result of their education and has useful evidence about the success of its recent graduates. This information is used for planning and improvement, resource allocation, and to inform the public about the institution. Student achievement is at a level appropriate for the degree awarded.

**Time for your  
comments and  
questions.**