Accreditation:

Quality Assurance through Peer Review

Elizabeth Vogt
AVP Accreditation
University of North Texas
Agenda

• Accreditation – A very brief history
• Why accreditation is important
• Where we often go wrong
• QEP
• Success and lessons learned at UNT
• Recommendations
Brief History
Accreditation

• Accreditation through the peer review process has been around for over 100 years

• 1965 Higher Education Act: Accrediting agencies reviewed every 5 years by the federal government

Accrediting Accreditors: National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI)
Accreditation Now

- Extensive government oversight of accreditation
  - More than 200 billion in higher education (HE) funding
  - Rising cost of HE
  - Public Accountability
- Accrediting agencies act as a buffer
  - Attempt to keep the focus on quality and improvement

Accreditation provides:

- A public assurance of quality
- An assurance that our degrees meet standards and have value in the marketplace
- Access to federal financial aid
- Opportunities for students to transfer credit
- Assurance of fiscal responsibility
- Assurance that we are investing in continuous quality improvement
Where do institutions go wrong?

• By not addressing every part of every standard

• Lack of proof for an ongoing systematic process for compliance
  • A single year’s worth of evidence will not show an ongoing process

• By not providing enough detail-
  Proof = Evidence
Accrediting agency places University of Texas Rio Grande Valley on probation

The brand new University of Texas Rio Grande Valley has been placed on probation by the commission that handles accreditation for southern universities.

Tusculum Placed On Probation By Accrediting Agency

By Eugenia Elites Staff Writer  Jul 9, 2019

Wiley College issued warning by accreditation agency

North Idaho College, found out of compliance by accreditation agency, receives warning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% of Institutions in Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>6.2.a (Faculty Qualifications)</strong></td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>13.2 (Financial Documents)</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>8.1 (Student Achievement)</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>6.3 (Faculty Appointment &amp; Evaluation)</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>6.2.b (Program Faculty)</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>8.2.a (Student Outcomes: Ed Programs)</strong></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>13.7 (Physical Resources)</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>13.8 (Institutional Environment)</strong></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>8.2.b (Student Outcomes: Gen Ed)</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>12.4 (Student Complaints)</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% of Institutions in Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>7.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>6.2.a (Faculty Qualifications)</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>13.3 (Financial Responsibility)</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>8.2.b (Student Outcomes: Gen Ed)</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>13.1 (Financial Resources)</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>11.2 (Library &amp; LIR Staff)</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>6.2.b (Program Faculty)</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>6.2.c (Program Coordination)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>8.2.a (Student Outcomes: Ed Programs)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% of Institutions in Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>13.3 (Financial Responsibility)</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>8.2.a (Student Outcomes: Ed Programs)</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>13.1 (Financial Resources)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>13.4 (Control of Finances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>13.6 (Federal and State Responsibilities)</strong></td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

- Derived from an institution’s ongoing comprehensive planning and evaluation process
- Focus is on an issue the institution considers important to improving student learning and/or student success
- Must have broad-based support
- Should impact a significant student population
- Must have resources committed
- Must have an assessment plan
- Use the SACSCOC suggested format: Page 40-
DO: Submit 7.2 information to the off-site for review!
DO: Research potential candidates to be the QEP lead evaluator* (Due 3+ months before visit)

Our Success at UNT

- Annual process for outcomes assessment
- Biannual process for general education (Texas Core)
- Teamwork

Lessons Learned

- Use headings liberally
- Leave time to review
- Highlight important areas in your report
- Judicious use of consultants
• Deadlines
• SLO reporting- Move up the due date!
• Have a draft of your QEP (7.2) for the off-site review
• Be vocal about your QEP- Ensure all constituents know about it
• Be detailed in your faculty credentials
Questions