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Roles of the ALO
Roles of the ALO

Communication link between NWCCU and your institution

NWCCU <> Institutional Liaison <> ALO <> Institution
Roles of the ALO

Understands and is an advocate for the role of accreditation in higher education
Roles of the ALO

Ensures that Institution meets NWCCU deadlines

- Annual Reports
- Mid-Cycle Report with Visit
- Year 6 PRFR Report
- Year 7 EIE Report with Visit
- Ad Hoc Reports
Roles of the ALO

Knows what the institution needs to have completed in order to meet accreditation requirements

- General Education
- Assessment
- Financial Stability
- Eligibility Requirements
- Student Success
- Enrollment
- Disaggregated Data
- Approval and Communications

Helps others to understand as well
Roles of the ALO

Works with the needed teams to make sure the work gets done

- General Education
- Curriculum: Undergraduate and Graduate
- Assessment
- Budget and Finance
- Institutional Research
- Communications
- Governance
ALO Workload
Annual Reports – Due August 1 (new date)
Annual Reports – cyclical workload

The ALO doesn’t do all the work, but ensures that it gets done
Mid-Cycle Report (Year 3)

The goal is to have the mid-cycle be a formative review. This should mean less preparatory work.
PRFR Report (Year 6)

PRFR: Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review
EIE Report (Year 7)

EIE: Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness
Combined Workload
Combined Workload

- Highly seasonal
- You cannot do it all yourself
- You need to work with teams
In summary, the ALO is the go-to person for
- Accreditation
- Assessment
- Student success
- Curriculum changes
- Accreditation reporting requirements

The ALO knows how their institution is using accreditation processes to improve student outcomes
The ALO has the contact information for their Institutional Liaison at NWCCU, to get help in all of these areas

425-558-4224

- pgoad@nwccu.org
- mpowell@nwccu.org
- sgrace@nwccu.org
- rlarson@nwccu.org
Accreditation Liaison Officer
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What does it mean to be an NWCCU ALO?
The Accreditation Liaison Officer

- Focal person
- Record Keeper
- Responder
- Leader
- Assistant
- Notifier

CHANGE IS GOOD
## Comparisons with last two sets of Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Mission and Goals, Planning and</td>
<td>1-Mission, Core Themes, and</td>
<td>1-Student Success and Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Mission and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Educational Program and</td>
<td>2-Resources and Capacity</td>
<td>1-Student Learning (Ed. Program) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Library and Information Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Library and Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Governance and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Governance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Physical Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Physical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Institutional Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Institutional Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Planning and Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Effectiveness and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation and</td>
<td>*2 – Governance, Resources, and Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2 – Governance, Resources, and Capacity
Engagement

• Hold Information Meetings
• Campus Accreditation Information Easily Assessible
• Meet with Leadership & Stakeholders
• Working Groups with Broad Campus representation
# The Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL REPORT</th>
<th>MID-CYCLE REPORT</th>
<th>POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND FINANCIAL REVIEW (PRFR)</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (EIE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated Data</td>
<td>Report and Onsite Review</td>
<td>Report and Offsite Review</td>
<td>Report and Onsite Review of Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Achievement</td>
<td>• Assessment</td>
<td>• Financial Performance</td>
<td>• Institutional Mission and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financials</td>
<td>• Data Collection and Analysis</td>
<td>• Policies and Regulations</td>
<td>• Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff review of evaluation reports for Commission Meeting consent agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Findings reported to EIE Team in Year 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review findings from PRFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Commission Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions
Understanding Student Learning and Building Faculty Engagement: Practical Strategies for Accreditation

Dr. Daniel McInerney, Utah State University
Daniel.McInerney@usu.edu
UNDERSTANDING STUDENT LEARNING & BUILDING FACULTY ENGAGEMENT:
PRACTICAL STRATEGIES FOR ACCREDITATION

Dr. Daniel McInerney
Department of History
Utah State University
Logan, UT
daniel.mcinerney@usu.edu
Key suggestions:

Learn from our initiatives on learning

Approach your work as we expect faculty to approach their work
Think of yourself teaching “Accreditation 101”
~~ a foundational Gen Ed course ~~
 focused on the culture of higher ed

What’s one of the first questions any instructor in an intro course should ask?
“Who are my students?”

You’re not leading a classroom filled with majors (they’re not even minors)
-probably little or no pedagogical training
-or training in data collection/analysis on learning

What approach do you take toward your students?
Focus on their deficits?

Recognize their assets

The students themselves

*Smart, engaged, committed, professionally-trained partners in higher education*

What do they know about your work?

*Generalists, at best, in your field --- but experts in theirs*

*Probably unfamiliar with your vocabulary, methods*

What do they *suspect* about your work?

*Possibly some traumatic memories about past work*

*May think accreditation is your job, not theirs*

*(useful to ask what they assume, anticipate, and fear)*
Some helpful ways to begin:

- Decode your discipline; make the implicit explicit
- Avoid arcane jargon; define key terms (a glossary might be helpful)
- Follow guidance to all teachers about “assignments”
  ~~ clarify purposes, tasks, criteria ~~
  ~~ scaffold assignments ~~

Start with your students’ expertise

- Disciplinary insights into learning
- Work outward from those distinctive insights and build up to broader and more inclusive learning goals
- Expect different levels of strength from your students:
  with “outcomes”, with “data,” with a “narrative”
- Some are beginning, emerging, developed, advanced
Some helpful ways to begin:

What are the questions your students are interested in?
- ask questions they care about
- understand the reporting and projects they already do on student learning and achievement
- build on . . . rather than adding to this work

As with all students, their learning about accreditation evolves / develops / proceeds in fits and starts
- formative assessments needed
- expect that they won’t get it “right” the first time
- recognition / incentives / rewards
Some helpful ways to begin:

- Decode your discipline; make the implicit explicit
  ~~~ clarify purposes, tasks, criteria ~~~
  ~~~ scaffold assignments ~~~

Start with *their* expertise
- Disciplinary insights into learning

What are the questions they’re interested in?
- *ask questions they care about*
- *build on . . . rather than adding to this work*

Your students’ learning about accreditation evolves / develops / proceeds in fits and starts
- *formative assessments needed*
Imagine a first meeting of the academic year where no one talked about budgets, assessment, course assignments, or parking.

What if we all started the year discussing what disciplinary ideals link us in our fields -- and how we might best introduce those goals to our students?

Anne Hyde
University of Oklahoma
Like many college professors, I find the rhetoric of "outputs" and "outcomes" artificial, a fake metric that feeds the bureaucratic machine.

Six or seven years ago, I mentioned this to an undergraduate class at Duke University.

I said: "You will not find any trite and clichéd ‘outcomes’ on my syllabus."

One student responded: "Will I find serious and meaningful ones?"
I realized that most students have no idea what they are supposed to be learning in a classroom beyond the "content" level –

nor do they know why the content is valid in and of itself nor what use or application or purpose it will have beyond the final exam.

I now frequently ask my students to collaboratively think about what outcomes they would like from a particular class and compose their own learning outcomes.
“BEGIN WHERE PEOPLE ARE, NOT WHERE YOU WANT THEM TO BE.”

Public Agenda, a NYC mediating agency

1. WHAT IF SOME OF YOUR STUDENTS ARE JUST STARTING TO EXAMINE QUESTIONS LEARNING, ACHIEVEMENT, AND EQUITY?

2. WHAT IF SOME OF YOUR STUDENTS THINK PROJECTS OF ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION HAVE NO BEARNING ON THEIR WORK?

3. WHAT IF SOME STUDENTS FIXATE ON PAST PRACTICES IN ASSESSMENT & ACCREDITATION?
PAST PRACTICE

top-down, compliance driven

one size fits all

isolated from the rest of the world
focused on collecting (but not learning from) data

reliant on add-on standardized tests (over course work)

disconnected from faculty;
(Shhh – maybe it’ll all just go away)
REMIND YOUR STUDENTS WHERE WE ARE NOW
Assessment has been “mired in a culture of compliance.”

- needs to be embedded in the ongoing work of teaching and learning,

*using* evidence to improve the educational experience of students
“return assessment to the faculty relying on work done in the regular contexts of teaching and learning rather than turning to ‘add on’ instruments and approaches that are externally developed and administered.”

Pat Hutchings
“assessment is ongoing and decentralized.

It occurs every time a faculty member examines a particular student response to an exam, demonstration, or assignment.”

Peter Ewell
Standardized testing is antithetical to assessing adaptive and inventive competencies. Standardized tests often disguise rather than illuminate what students can actually do with nonstandard problems. Yet nonstandard problems are the ultimate test of students’ competence—at work, at life, and in the community.

Preparing students to tackle nonstandard, unscripted problems and questions...where “right answers” are not known and where the nature of the problem itself is likely uncertain at best, and often actively contested.

College must prepare learners to deal with the complex and uncertain, not just with the rote and routine.
WHAT’S AT THE CENTER OF THE WORK TODAY?

- **High stakes learning** (focused on actual students in actual classes with actual faculty on actual assignments)

- The **development** of student learning – and of our own analyses of student learning

- **What we learn** from studying student learning – and continuously apply in courses and programs

- Faculty disciplinary experts **central** to the work – not marginal
When students come to college, they face a dizzying array of choices. Which course should I take? What should I major in? How do the gen ed courses fit into what I’m supposed to do?

**MAJORS PATHWAY**

Students who want to understand the nature of politics can satisfy their general education requirements, and lead their interests, by taking at least one course from each box:

**AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS**
- ECON 100: Understanding economic institutions, including property rights, markets, wealth, and taxes
- HIST 200: Development of American society, economy, culture, and politics up to 1877
- POLS 200: The United States, the world, and the future
- PSY 100: The study of behavior and mental processes

**CREATIVE ARTS**
- ANTH 100: Exploring the nature of art, and how art expresses nature and culture
- HUM 100: For students in the humanities program

**LIFE SCIENCES**
- CHEM 100: Basic concepts of physical science, including structure of matter and the forces of nature
- ENS 100: Scientifically based, identifying potential threats, and implementing solutions
- PSY 100: The power of thought and behavior

**PHYSICAL SCIENCES**
- PHYS 100: Basic concepts of physical science, including structure of matter and the forces of nature
- PSY 100: The power of thought and behavior

**EXPLORATION**
- ANTH 100: Understanding of science, technology, and cultural change and diversity
- ENV 100: Understanding of science, technology, and cultural change and diversity
- JCOM 100: The influence of mass media on society
- PUB 100: Political parties and elections

**CORE COURSES:**
- BUS 100: Humanities
- BUS 1040: Humanities
- Bus 1050 or STAT 1040
- ENGL 1010 + ENGL 1020

**MAJORS IN:**
- American Studies, Liberal Arts, Philosophy, Languages, Religious Studies, History, Journalism, Communication Studies
- English, Languages

**POLITICS PATHWAY**

- Understanding the nature of art, and how art expresses nature and culture
- HUM 100: For students in the humanities program
- CHEM 100: Basic concepts of physical science, including structure of matter and the forces of nature
- PSY 100: The power of thought and behavior
- BUS 100: Humanities
- BUS 1040: Humanities
- Bus 1050 or STAT 1040
- ENGL 1010 + ENGL 1020
Whatever our campus position, we are all simultaneously instructors & learners:

*In the work of accreditation:*

Learn from our initiatives on learning

Approach your work as we expect faculty to approach their work
Break-out Session 1

By Dr. Daniel McInerney
WORKSHOP:

TWO SUGGESTIONS FOR ADDRESSING ISSUES OF EQUITY AND ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

Dr. Daniel McInerney
Department of History
Utah State University
Logan, UT
daniel.mcinerney@usu.edu
Key takeaways:

1. Start where students begin: examine data from your institution’s foundational courses

2. Invite faculty to discuss the assignments they create for their intro courses
1. Start where students begin: examine data from your institution’s foundational courses
Improving student learning and success in high-enrollment, foundational, introductory courses (“100”/“1000 level; GenEd) -that are high risk (high rates of D / F / W / I grades -especially for low-income, first-generation, and historically underrepresented students -and remain commonly unexamined (in content, structure, delivery, evaluation, and expectations)
Introductory U.S. history courses:

failure rates 20%-100% higher for students of color, first-generation students, and/or low-income students
(compared to those of white, non-first-generation, and non-low-income backgrounds)

Higher rates of failure directly correlated with significantly greater rates of college departure, particularly for students who were otherwise in good academic standing

TAKEWAY: failing even 1 foundational-level course was correlated with leaving college -- even if the student was otherwise doing well academically
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Course</th>
<th>B. Number of Institutions</th>
<th>C. No. of Students Across the Courses</th>
<th>D. Average DFWI Rate</th>
<th>E. African American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>F. Native American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>G. Latino / Hispanic DFWI Rate</th>
<th>H. White / Caucasian DFWI Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17,538</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20,987</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96,258</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (U.S. Survey)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27,666</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Algebra</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,075</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Calculus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91,108</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Rates of D, F, W and I Grades by Course and Selected Race / Ethnicity Designations
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<th>C. No. of Students Across the Courses</th>
<th>D. Average DFWI Rate</th>
<th>E. African American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>F. Native American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>G. Latino / Hispanic DFWI Rate</th>
<th>H. White / Caucasian DFWI Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17,538</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
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<td>47.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
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<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
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<td>34</td>
<td>91,108</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Rates of D, F, W and I Grades by Course and Selected Race / Ethnicity Designations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Course</th>
<th>B. Number of Institutions</th>
<th>C. No. of Students Across the Courses</th>
<th>D. Average DFWI Rate</th>
<th>E. African American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>F. Native American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>G. Latino / Hispanic DFWI Rate</th>
<th>H. White / Caucasian DFWI Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17,538</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20,987</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96,258</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (U.S. Survey)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27,666</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Algebra</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,075</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Calculus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91,108</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Rates of D, F, W and I Grades by Course and Selected Race / Ethnicity Designations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Course</th>
<th>B. Number of Institutions</th>
<th>C. No. of Students Across the Courses</th>
<th>D. Average DFWI Rate</th>
<th>E. African American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>F. Native American DFWI Rate</th>
<th>G. Latino / Hispanic DFWI Rate</th>
<th>H. White / Caucasian DFWI Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17,538</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td><strong>42.7%</strong></td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Biology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td><strong>41.9%</strong></td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20,987</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td><strong>47.2%</strong></td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>96,258</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td><strong>27.7%</strong></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (U.S. Survey)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27,666</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td><strong>42.4%</strong></td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Algebra</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55,075</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td><strong>49.9%</strong></td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math - Calculus</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td><strong>47.8%</strong></td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td><strong>47.9%</strong></td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91,108</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td><strong>40.2%</strong></td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Rates of D, F, W and I Grades by Course and Selected Race / Ethnicity Designations
Attentive to the changing profile of our students and evolving notions of equity for those we serve

https://knocking.wiche.edu/


https://www.luminafoundation.org/resources/todays-student-infographic
According to recent research, faculty development can be more effective than remedial courses as a pathway to student success.

The AHA will work with history faculty to rethink what it means to be "introduced" to history at the post-secondary level, and to implement necessary curricular change.

**CORE QUESTION:** What are we trying to achieve in our disciplinary intro course?
Key takeaways:

1. Start where students begin: examine data from your institution’s foundational courses

2. Invite faculty to discuss the assignments they create for their intro courses
• Focus: projects, papers, tasks faculty regularly assign in courses
• We know assignments often privately-held
  disconnected from stated outcomes
  opaque in purpose, task, criteria
• But this is where “high stakes” learning takes place
• Goal: construct intentionally designed, outcome-aligned, peer-reviewed assignments that are central for assessing student learning
• a faculty-driven approach to assessment through thoughtfully-constructed assignments that faculty require of their students

• integral to teaching and learning process

• more likely to lead to improvements in student learning than “add-on,” standardized, compliance-driven approaches

• collaborative work on assignments is a powerful professional development experience
How does an assignment workshop operate?

• Call for faculty to select a course assignment they’d like to discuss with 4-5 colleagues at a table
• 30-minute discussion per assignment
  – 5-minute overview of assignment (course, students, outcomes, directions)
  – 25-minute conversation about the assignment in the group
  – 5-minute period for colleagues to write out responses/suggestions
• Questions discussed . . .
assignment workshops

http://www.assignmentlibrary.org/

- collaborative discussion of course exercises
- build on campus efforts already underway
- provides models and examples that others can learn from, adapt, borrow
- demonstrate that high-stakes, faculty-built assignments provide key information on student learning (compared to other, more distant forms of assessment)
- honors and makes visible the intellectual work of assignment design
• Especially helpful for generating cross-disciplinary discussions in foundational, General Education courses
• Good idea to have a mix of disciplinary colleagues at the table
• Can work best if organized by a “neutral” party – your librarians!
• NILOA provides a “kit” with everything you need to hold the workshop on your campus
  -even letters of invitation!
• And, yes, faculty DO relax and engage in meaningful discussions
Assignment Charrettes

NILOA has been fostering the use and development of intentionally designed assignments through a faculty-driven, collaborative peer review process—the assignment charrette. Developed in partnership with faculty and experts in the field, our Assignment Charrette Toolkit provides tools, materials, and resources to adapt to local and regional context, along with institutional examples and relevant resources. Click on each banner to expand the selection and access each resource.


Making the Case for Assignment Charrettes

Part one of the assignment charrette toolkit introduces the NILOA assignment initiative, presents the case for why assignments, discusses the importance of alignment, and presents elements of effective assignments.

Resources for Conducting an Assignment Charrette

Part two of the assignment charrette toolkit provides a complete set of resources to assist in conducting an assignment charrette, addressing planning a charrette, invitation emails, agendas and timing, guidelines for facilitators and unfacilitated charrettes, and feedback and evaluation forms including follow-up surveys.

Charrette Handouts

Part three of the assignment charrette toolkit includes a zip file of handouts commonly utilized with faculty during an assignment design charrette including feedback forms, review instructions, readings, and additional resources for reflection.
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Tools for Campus Discussions with Faculty

- crafting meaningful outcomes (Tuning/DQP)
- gathering useful information of student achievement (LMS features)
INTRODUCTION TO TUNING AND THE DQP
KEY QUESTION:
When students complete a program or a degree, what should they know, understand, and be able to do?
Discussion of the knowledge, understanding, and skills we intend students to develop in a field of study

Discussion of the knowledge, understanding, and skills we intend students to develop in a degree program
TUNING & DQP: not “formulas” but flexible tools

• Guide & Improve Student Learning
• Bring Clarity & Intentional Design High Quality Degrees
• Help Faculty At What They Know Field of Study Requires
• Help Administrators Coordinate Projects for Learning
• Make the Implicit Goals of Education Explicit
• Offer a Meaningful Vocabulary for Our Discussions
KEY ELEMENTS OF TUNING
define the discipline core

talk with stakeholders

outline career paths

revisit & revise

share & implement
TUNING
WHAT SHOULD STUDENTS KNOW, UNDERSTAND, AND BE ABLE TO DO WHEN THEY COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF STUDY IN A DISCIPLINE?

WHAT SHOULD STUDENTS KNOW, UNDERSTAND, AND BE ABLE TO DO WHEN THEY COMPLETE A DEGREE?
5 AREAS OF PROFICIENCY:
• Specialized Knowledge
• Broad, Integrative Knowledge
• Intellectual Skills
• Applied & Collaborative Learning
• Civic & Global Learning

3 DEGREE LEVELS:
• Associate’s
• Bachelor’s
• Master’s
• Supports Unique Institutional Missions
USES

• Review & align learning outcomes
• Curriculum mapping
• General education
• Transfer between 2 and 4 year campuses
• Program development
• Accreditation
• Strategic planning
• Assessment of student learning
instructor-centered work \(\rightarrow\) student-centered experience

“my course” \(\rightarrow\) “our curriculum”

time in a classroom seat \(\rightarrow\) focus on performance

exclusive focus on content \(\rightarrow\) addt’l concern with skills

settled, stationary students \(\rightarrow\) mobile and dynamic

inward focus on institution \(\rightarrow\) outward understanding of accountability and connections to society

concentration on teaching \(\rightarrow\) broader concern with learning
Work that is:

**collaborative**

my course → our curriculum

**reflective**

WHY do we structure courses & curricula the way we do?

**intentional**

make the implicit explicit
Workshop Questions

• Take a moment to look through the terminology in the materials

• What might be:
  – Strengths
  – Weaknesses
  – Opportunities
  – Questions
EXPLORE THE ASSESSMENT FEATURES OF YOUR LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Canvas, Blackboard, Moodle, Google Classroom

- **Canvas “Learning Mastery”** probably the most sophisticated
  - Even Google Classroom can incorporate rubrics

- **Capability of displaying rich and meaningful data** to faculty, students, assessment officers, and accreditors

- **Recognize:** requires considerable time to set up
  - faculty will need considerable tech support
  - best to work first with “champions” who’ll help
  - guide faculty colleagues down the road
1. Define the learning outcomes of the course (hopefully, linked with institu./program outcomes)

**Historical knowledge:** student demonstrates an understanding of the key historical events related to the thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent mastery: The paper displays: clear understanding of events; complex grasp of causation; analyzes a range of factors shaping the sequence and outcome of events; situates issues within larger contexts.</th>
<th>Good mastery: Sound chronological framework; good grasp of causation; omits some key informing factors shaping events; some effort at contextualizing the question; proposes a sufficient range of larger themes.</th>
<th>Some mastery: Some chronological confusion; weak causal analysis; narrow range of informing factors in the discussion; weak contextualization; little discussion of broader themes.</th>
<th>Minimal mastery: Many chronological errors; simplistic causal analysis; few informing factors tied to the discussion; little to no discussion of wider context of events; thin discussion of wider themes.</th>
<th>No mastery: Paper explores its subject in a historical vacuum with little commentary on causation, context, and larger themes.</th>
<th><strong>Total Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Points</td>
<td>7.9 Points</td>
<td>5.9 Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Create a rubric (formed around course learning outcomes) to evaluate student assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome rubric for senior thesis HIST 4990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>You've already rated students with this rubric. Any major changes could affect their assessment results.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical knowledge: student demonstrates an understanding of the key historical events related to the thesis threshold: 8.0 pts</td>
<td>Excellent mastery: The paper displays clear understanding of events; complex grasp of causation; analyzes a range of factors shaping the sequence and outcome of events; situates issues within larger contexts; reflects on larger themes informing specific events. 10.0 pts</td>
<td>10.0 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical thinking: student frames historical questions in a thoughtful, critical manner threshold: 8.0 pts</td>
<td>Excellent mastery: The paper addresses a clearly-stated and significant historical question. Focuses on critical analysis rather than mere description. Key terms defined. Student clarifies the significance of the question. The question is of manageable scope, logically formulated, and precisely stated. 10.0 pts</td>
<td>10.0 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics:</td>
<td>Good mastery: The paper addresses a significant historical question that is clearly stated. Focus rests largely on critical analysis. Key terms usually defined. Question is of manageable scope, posed with minimal logical flaws in framing of the question; offers evidence for claim 8.0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Some mastery: The paper addresses a historical question that can be identified with some difficulty; Focus shifts between critical analysis and mere description. Some key terms left undefined. Significance of question unclear. Lapses in logical framing of the question. Vague, unsupported assertions. 7.0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Minimal mastery: No identifiable historical question; paper offers broad, unsupported generalizations. 5.0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>No mastery: No identifiable historical question; paper offers broad, unsupported generalizations. 0.0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>No mastery: Demonstrates little to no understanding. 0.0 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Students’ assignments submitted – and graded – online through Canvas

highest prized virtues of antebellum women – motherhood. Married women were expected to become mothers, regardless of race or socioeconomic status. A lack of children brought heartache, sorrow, and social difficulties to a woman’s life. For an elite, white woman, barrenness could lead to being scorned by peers, and to feeling a sense of shame and failure.² For slave women, childlessness could lead to being sold, and result in complete separation from the world they grew up in – away from their family and friends.³ Regardless of race, the inability to bear children would impact the way a woman of the nineteenth century was treated and viewed by those around her.

Only recently have historians examined questions of women, family, and childbirth in the antebellum South. The accounts referenced for this study have fallen into three main categories: descriptive overviews of the lives of women of the nineteenth century, studies focusing on childbirth and the circumstances surrounding it, and works researching the history of the practice of gynecology. Deborah Gray White’s 1985 study, Ain’t I a Woman, was one of the earliest works to examine lives and concerns of southern slave women.² White focused on the entire life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Secondary ID</th>
<th>Bibliography Out of 100</th>
<th>Topic / Historiography / thesis Out of 100</th>
<th>Outline Out of 100</th>
<th>Public presentation of thesis Out of 100</th>
<th>Final thesis Out of 100</th>
<th>Attendance Out of 100</th>
<th>Bibliography 5.00% of grade</th>
<th>Topic 5.00% of grade</th>
<th>Outline 10.00% of grade</th>
<th>Presentation 10.00% of grade</th>
<th>Final Thesis 60.00% of grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Jake</td>
<td>A0131406</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossley, Jaime</td>
<td>A01530721</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch, Shyanne</td>
<td>A01640104</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop, Clint</td>
<td>A01798886</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyner, Tell</td>
<td>A01643923</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavitt, Melissa</td>
<td>A01488948</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makin, Danielle</td>
<td>A01004398</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall, Chase</td>
<td>A01449561</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Jessica</td>
<td>A02043662</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td><strong>83.5</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood, Taylor</td>
<td>A01764971</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolcott, Haley</td>
<td>A01252795</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Grades appear in two displays:
toggle to performance on outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
<th>Historical Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jake Anderson</td>
<td>7 / 8</td>
<td>6.98 / 8</td>
<td>6.35 / 8</td>
<td>7 / 8</td>
<td>12.3 / 12</td>
<td>7.65 / 8</td>
<td>11.65 / 12</td>
<td>6.68 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimee Croosley</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>8.38 / 8</td>
<td>8.3 / 8</td>
<td>9.48 / 8</td>
<td>13.65 / 12</td>
<td>8.65 / 8</td>
<td>13.47 / 12</td>
<td>8.15 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shyanne Hatch</td>
<td>9 / 8</td>
<td>9.83 / 8</td>
<td>7.05 / 8</td>
<td>7.7 / 8</td>
<td>13 / 12</td>
<td>6.4 / 8</td>
<td>12.35 / 12</td>
<td>7.38 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Jessop</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>9.5 / 8</td>
<td>9 / 8</td>
<td>13 / 12</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>14 / 12</td>
<td>8.5 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Joyner</td>
<td>7.68 / 8</td>
<td>6.83 / 8</td>
<td>5.65 / 8</td>
<td>7.83 / 8</td>
<td>11.3 / 12</td>
<td>6.33 / 8</td>
<td>9.95 / 12</td>
<td>6.33 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Leavitt</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>9.68 / 8</td>
<td>9.15 / 8</td>
<td>13.65 / 12</td>
<td>9.48 / 8</td>
<td>13.65 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Makin</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>8 / 8</td>
<td>5 / 8</td>
<td>6 / 8</td>
<td>0 / 12</td>
<td>7 / 8</td>
<td>0 / 12</td>
<td>7 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Randall</td>
<td>8.35 / 8</td>
<td>8.97 / 8</td>
<td>9 / 8</td>
<td>8.33 / 8</td>
<td>12.68 / 12</td>
<td>9 / 8</td>
<td>13.82 / 12</td>
<td>8.68 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Thompson</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>9.65 / 8</td>
<td>8.65 / 8</td>
<td>8.65 / 8</td>
<td>10.37 / 12</td>
<td>9.48 / 8</td>
<td>11.7 / 12</td>
<td>8.03 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Underwood</td>
<td>5.85 / 8</td>
<td>10 / 8</td>
<td>8.78 / 8</td>
<td>8.65 / 8</td>
<td>14 / 12</td>
<td>8.15 / 8</td>
<td>13.65 / 12</td>
<td>7.65 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley Wolcott</td>
<td>7.7 / 8</td>
<td>8.03 / 8</td>
<td>6.3 / 8</td>
<td>7.65 / 8</td>
<td>12.65 / 12</td>
<td>7.95 / 8</td>
<td>10.98 / 12</td>
<td>6.98 / 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Faculty can capture the image and text for an overview & for an assessment

### Historical skills: well-substantiated argument; proper citation of evidence

- **Excellent mastery:** The writer correctly and thoroughly cites sources using Chicago Manual of Style format in endnotes; the paper includes a separate bibliography listing all sources consulted for the paper.
- **Good mastery:** Cites sources using the Chicago Manual of Style format in endnotes and provides separate bibliography; however, some gaps in citation, errors in their construction, and inaccuracies in the bibliography.
- **Some mastery:** Offers partial citation of sources; spotty verification.
- **Minimal mastery:** Offers little to no citation of sources; no verification of works consulted.
- **No mastery:** Is not aware of need to cite or verify sources.
### Historical skills: mechanics

- **Excellant mastery**: Spelling, punctuation, grammar all correct; proper sentence and paragraph construction
- **Good mastery**: Occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction; not severe enough to hinder an understanding of the paper’s main points.
- **Some mastery**: Weaknesses in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make sections of the paper unintelligible.
- **Minimal mastery**: Problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction make multiple sections of the paper unintelligible.
- **No mastery**: Problems in spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence & paragraph construction so severe as to make the paper unintelligible.
6. Assessment report: performance on an outcome combined with brief narrative

Historical skills: student employs a range of primary sources appropriate to the informing thesis of the paper

- Excellent mastery: Makes thorough use of all relevant online and print databases to identify primary source literature; all available primary sources identified. All sources in bibliography used thoroughly in text.
- Good mastery: Makes good use of relevant online and print databases; some gaps in primary source base. A few sources in bibliography not fully used.
- Some mastery: Makes some use of online or print databases; significant gaps in source base; paper based on only a few of cited sources.
- Minimal mastery: No evidence of using databases to establish source base; source base very limited. Major sources unknown or not employed. Little evidence that author has used works listed in bibliography.
- No mastery: No evidence of using databases; sources entirely insufficient and inappropriate to paper topic.

Mastery set at: 12

Comment: Students were quote frank with me (and their colleagues) as they talked about the range of primary sources they drew on for the papers. Most freely acknowledged that they had not pursued as wide a variety of documentary evidence as they should have for the project. The key reason they gave for this shortcoming? Time that simply ran out in the final weeks of the semester. I need to pay more attention to this concern and provide more useful suggestions to students on how to obtain and use a satisfactory range of supporting evidence.
Workshop Questions

• What LMS are on your campus?

• What work do you have using your LMS tools?

• How is Professional Development Target in this area?
Breakout Sessions on Student Learning Outcomes

Tools for Campus Discussions with Faculty

Meaningful Faculty Participation
Accreditation Liaison Officer Training Workshop

Tuesday, March 3, 2020

Wifi Password: NWCCU2020
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Resources

Mac Powell, NWCCU Senior Vice President
mpowell@nwccu.org
ALO Resources

Mac Powell, Senior Vice President
Resources

• Accreditation Handbook
• Visit Logistics Handbook
• Models
• Rubrics
• Ongoing trainings
• Guidelines for Reports
• Box.com
• Connect with your assigned NWCCU liaison
• Send additional questions to info@nwccu.org
The Revised Standards

• Why Revised Standards?
• The Standards Revision Process
• Feedback and Member Institution Vote
• Transition and Pilot Period
• Purpose not Process
Mid-Cycle versus the EIE

Mac Powell, Senior Vice President
New Standards

STANDARD ONE
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

• Institutional Mission
• Institutional Effectiveness
• Student Learning
• Student Achievement
New Standards

STANDARD TWO
GOVERNANCE, RESOURCES, AND CAPACITY

- Governance
- Academic Freedom
- Policies and Procedures
- Institutional Integrity
- Financial Resources
- Human Resources
- Student Support Resources
- Library and Information Resources
- Physical and Technology Infrastructure
Measures of Student Achievement Derived from the Higher Education Act (HEA)

- Graduation Rate
- Retention Rate
- Persistence Rate
- Student Loan Cohort Default Rate
## The New Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Cycle Review</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review (PRFR)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Submitted</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Site Visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ANNUAL REPORT</strong></th>
<th><strong>MID-CYCLE REPORT</strong></th>
<th><strong>POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND FINANCIAL REVIEW (PRFR)</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (EIE)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Disaggregated Data  
- Student Achievement  
- Financials | - Report and Onsite Review  
- Assessment  
- Data Collection and Analysis  
- Planning | - Report and Offsite Review  
- Financial Performance  
- Policies and Regulations | - Report and Onsite Review of Student Success  
- Institutional Mission and Effectiveness  
- Student Learning  
- Student Achievement |
| - Annual Submission  
- Staff Review | - Onsite peer review in Year 3  
- Staff review of evaluation reports for Commission Meeting consent agenda | - Offsite peer review in Year 6  
- Findings reported to EIE Team in Year 7 | - Onsite peer review in Year 7  
- Review findings from PRFR  
- Commission Decision |
Important to Note for Mid-Cycle

- Addition of Student Achievement Discussion
- Addition of Institutional Effectiveness Measures
- Addition of Benchmarked or Comparator Institutions
- Request for Two Programs Evaluated to be Institutionally Representative Efforts (and not Programmatically accredited Under a CHEA-Recognized Agency’s Format)
- Send additional questions to info@nwccu.org
Important to Note for EIE Visits

• Focus on Student Success (Student Learning and Student Achievement)
• PRFR and Transition Framework
  • Attestation of Met Eligibility Requirements
• Team Size and Assignments
• Utilize Checklists and Rubrics for Discussion
• Support the Process of Engagement and Feedback
• Send additional questions to info@nwccu.org
Thank you
Project Managing a Team

Amy Luke, NWCCU Chief of Staff & Director of External Relations
aluke@nwccu.org
Announcements & Updates
Connect With Your Institutional Liaison

Dr. Pamela Goad, PGoad@nwccu.org
Dr. Mac Powell, MPowell@nwccu.org
Dr. Ron Larsen, RLarsen@nwccu.org
Dr. Selena M. Grace, SGrace@nwccu.org
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Training Workshop

Tuesday, March 3, 2020

Wifi Password: NWCCU2020
Thank you for joining us today!

Look for a feedback survey in your inbox later this week, we want to hear from you.