

CHANGES
IN THE
SYSTEM
PORTFOLIO

AQIP Action Project Task Force
“Improving the Systems Appraisal”
The Higher Learning Commission

+ Why Changes?

- Over the past nine months, AQIP has been examining ways to improve the systems portfolio and appraisal process and value to institutions.
- In other words... Quality Improvement isn't just for institutions.

+

- Insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. — *Albert Einstein*
- If you always do what you've always done, you'll always get what you've always got. — *Ed Foreman*

+ AQIP Action Project Task Force

- Barbara Keinath, Metropolitan State University, MN
- Scott Epstein, Davenport University, MI
- Kate Alley, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology, SD
- Vince Linder, Cleary University, MI
- Mary Sue Marz, Eastern Michigan University, MI
- Cathy Mullins, Shawnee State University, OH
- Marcia Sauter, University of Saint Francis, IN
- Connie Wilson, University of Indianapolis, IN
- Robert Spohr, Montcalm Community College, MI

+ When Changes Take Effect

- Optional for institutions submitting November 2012.
- To select the “option” of using the new format, an institution must notify AQIP before July 1, 2012, and AQIP will confirm participation in the “pilot” version of the new format by August 1, 2012.

+ When Changes Take Effect

- Some institutions can “opt” to use the new Portfolio features in November 2012.
- All changes will affect all institutions and Systems Appraisal teams from June 2013 onward.

+ The Overview

■ Reduced from 10 pages to 2 pages

- The first page will include important information like:
 - Student Demographics
 - Locations
 - Campuses
 - etc.
- The second page will include trends and issues that are important to the institution.

+ Where Are the Other 8 Pages?

■ For each of the nine categories the institution will include a one-page **Category Summary** that includes:

- Its perceived level of maturity on that category.
- Special activities the institution has been engaged in.
- Foci that it wants feedback on.

■ The revised Systems Portfolio Guide will provide guidance and examples.

+ Systems Maturity Example

Reacting Approaches	Systematic Approaches	Aligned Approaches	Integrated Approaches
End of course evaluations are "done" but how they are used in instructor evaluations is not defined, nor can any meta-level data analysis be done because of variations in the instrument and practice across programs.	A common end-of-course evaluation tool is used across programs, and language on instructional excellence appears in annual review docs. Department heads review all evals over time...	Teaching excellence and student success are linked strategic foci. Each program works from a common definition of instructional excellence to create program strategic criteria...	The aligned processes described for program heads involve other units of the institution, such as student affairs, retention, tutoring, placement and testing, and institutional research...

+

100-11=89? Is that enough?

- There will be no separate **Index** or **Self-Assessment**: everything about how an institution meets the Criteria and Core Components will be embedded in specific locations (under P questions).
- Because of the additional work, the maximum length will be 125 pages.

To satisfy a Criterion for Accreditation, an institution must meet *all* of its Core Components; if one or more is not met, the Criterion is not met. To meet a Core Component, an institution must *address* all of its subcomponents, but does not have to address or write to each subcomponent separately; it can address them together, in a holistic, integrated argument.

+ Embedded Criteria

Core Component	AQIP Categories Process Questions		Core Component	AQIP Categories Process Questions	
1A	5P1	5P2	3A	1P4	1P12
1B	5P3	5P8	3B	1P1	1P2
1C	1P4	1P10	3C	4P2	4P10
1D	3P3	3P5	3D	1P7	1P15
2A	4P7		3E	1P16	
2B	1P6		4A	1P4	1P13
2C	5P2		4B	1P2	1P18
2D	1P11		4C	3P1	
2E	1P11	4P7	5A	8P6	
			5B	5P5	5P9
			5C	5P2	5P6
			5D	7P2	7P4

AQIP and the New Criteria for Accreditation

Address Each Component "R" under QIP and QIP

1. The institution has the faculty and staff needed to deliver high-quality programs and student services.

The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom responsibilities of faculty, including the responsibility of providing and supervising for student development.

All institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

Institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

The institution has resources and processes for the student retention and success in their classroom and about the institution's retention and success in their classroom.

Institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

1. The institution has the faculty and staff needed to deliver high-quality programs and student services.

The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom responsibilities of faculty, including the responsibility of providing and supervising for student development.

All institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

Institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

The institution has resources and processes for the student retention and success in their classroom and about the institution's retention and success in their classroom.

Institutions are expected to understand, including those in their credit, contractual, and non-credit programs.

**Page 9
from**

AQIP and the New Criteria for Accreditation

Academic Quality Improvement Program

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2. The Institution's Mission and Vision

3. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

4. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

5. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

6. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

7. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

8. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

9. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

10. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

11. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

12. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

13. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

14. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

15. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

16. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

17. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

18. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

19. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

20. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

21. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

22. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

23. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

24. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

25. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

26. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

27. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

28. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

29. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

30. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

31. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

32. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

33. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

34. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

35. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

36. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

37. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

38. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

39. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

40. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

41. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

42. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

43. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

44. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

45. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

46. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

47. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

48. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

49. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

50. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

51. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

52. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

53. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

54. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

55. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

56. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

57. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

58. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

59. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

60. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

61. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

62. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

63. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

64. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

65. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

66. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

67. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

68. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

69. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

70. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

71. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

72. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

73. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

74. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

75. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

76. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

77. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

78. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

79. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

80. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

81. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

82. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

83. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

84. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

85. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

86. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

87. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

88. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

89. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

90. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

91. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

92. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

93. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

94. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

95. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

96. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

97. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

98. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

99. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

100. The Institution's Academic Quality Improvement Program

+ What to address?

- Institutions *MUST* answer *EVERY* P, R, & I question.
- If there's little they can say in response to a question, they should say little.
- That some questions remain OO's and O's should be obvious.

Examples of saying little

- *"We have no measures of the effectiveness of support services at this time."*
- *"We have not yet developed processes for leadership succession."*
- *"We began gathering student retention and persistence data two years ago, but have yet organized and analyzed the data so that it can inform our actions."*

Second Portfolios and later?

- Institutions submitting their second or subsequent Systems Portfolio *MUST* also answer *EVERY* P, R, & I question.
- They may refer and link to previous Systems Portfolios if nothing has changed.
- Links must take reviewers directly to the specific items within the previous Systems Portfolio.

Links must be simple, direct, and described clearly:

- *Our student assessment system measures attainment of clearly stated learning goals in every academic program, and produces data that we use to annually improve curriculum and pedagogy. (See our 2009 Portfolio on 1P1). The 2009 Systems Appraisal praised our system as an SS. (See 2009 Appraisal 1P1 response).*

Links must tell why the information there matters:

In our 2008 Portfolio (see SP2008-7R1), we reported we nearly reached consensus on measures to evaluate our IT support and data collection and storage; the Appraisal team recognized this as an OO opportunity (SA2009-7R1). We still have not reached consensus or begun actual data collection, so our OO remains critical.

+Cross-references only for additional Criteria support:

[In the institution's answer to 4P7]

■ *In addition to the support presented here and in 1P11, additional evidence of our concern for ethical practices (CC2E) is presented in 2P1, where we discuss our process for reviewing and approving human and animal research projects.*

+

Changes to the Appraisal Process

+Team Composition Changes

- One Team Leader.
 - Currently trained, or will be invited to become a team leader and will be trained.
 - Guidelines for Team Leaders to follow will be created.
- At least five trained Appraisers as Team Members (in addition to Team Leader).
- One team member will be tasked with editing.
- The corps of AQIP Peer Reviewer is being refined.

+ Giving Feedback

- Reporting the Critical Characteristics at the beginning of each category is eliminated.
- The SS, S, O, OO labels will remain
- The Team Leader (with consent of the team and AQIP) may e-mail or call the institution to get answer to questions it believes are critical to the Appraisal.

+ Giving Feedback

- Team writes summary sections introducing each category and the team's appraisal of the institution's level of maturity.

Tentative

- The Team Leader calls the institution's AQIP Liaison after the end of the appraisal to:
 - Reaffirm the team's findings and advice.
 - Debrief the liaison on the usefulness of the team's work.

+ Accreditation Issues

- If serious issues regarding the Criteria are identified, the team can recommend either:

1. The institution must provide a monitoring report (3 – 24 months) documenting that any accreditation issue has been rectified.

Tentative

2. The institution is required to host a focused visit that permits an onsite team to evaluate that the issues have been corrected.


