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What We’ll Cover

• The context and basics of accreditation
• What’s the process, who’s involved, and highlights from the development of the PRR
• What unique about conveying information to accreditors
• What constitutes evidence and good responses to MSCHE Q’s
• What’s next in the development of the PRR and Strategic Planning processes in 2016-17
Basics of Accreditation
First...
Who’s Worked on Accreditation?

Raise your hand!
Accreditation Quiz – True or False?

1. Accreditation is a process overseen by the Federal Government.
   FALSE!

2. Hostos only has one accrediting body.
   FALSE!

3. Accreditation processes never change and cycles and processes and reports always remain the same.
   FALSE!
Accreditation Quiz – True or False?

4. A college cannot lose its accreditation based on a PRR.
   FALSE!

5. PRR is a compliance document.
   TRUE

6. The PRR should be written by select representatives without input from the college community.
   FALSE!
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What is the Middle States Commission on Higher Education?
   A. An informal confederation of states in the middle of the U.S. that helped elect our new President.
   B. The feelings you experience in your stomach after eating too much turkey.
   C. A government-run organization that accredits colleges in the Mid-Atlantic United States.
   D. A voluntary, peer-based, nonprofit association that performs peer evaluation and accreditation of public and private universities and colleges in selected regions of the United States and foreign institutions of American origin.
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What is a MSCHE Self Study?
   
   A. A critical examination of oneself, particularly the psychological underpinnings for all action.
   
   B. That unease some people have when thinking about the meaning of life.
   
   C. A report that results from a process every 10 years through which progress toward standards is evaluated and future goals set.
   
   D. Currently, a decennial report that serves as the basis for on-site evaluation by a team of peer evaluators and through which an institution carefully considers its educational programs and services, determining how well its programs and services accomplish the institution’s goals, fulfill its mission, and meet the Commission’s standards.
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What is a PRR?
   A. A political righteousness rant.
   B. A retrospective, current, and prospective analysis of an institution, currently due five years after an institution's first self-study and each subsequent decennial self-study and reaffirmation of accreditation.
   C. PR that somebody misspelled and the acronym stuck.
   D. An analyses that uses evidence to demonstrate compliance with an organization's strategic plan.
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What the difference between a Self-Study and a PRR?
   
   A. A Self Study is a comprehensive evaluation undertaken by an institution, which reflects on the previous 10 years. A PRR is an interim 5-year report that reflects on the past, present and future of the institution.
   
   B. There is no difference.
   
   C. A self study is a 10-year lookback comprehensive evaluation. A PRR is an interim report. Evaluators visit at both points.
   
   D. One is done by the organization and the other is done by the accreditors.
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What is the difference between a MSCHE suggestion, recommendation, and requirement?
   A. Suggestions and recommendations are non-binding and we do not need to address them, whereas we need to provide an answer to requirements.
   B. There is no difference.
   C. A requirement indicates that an institution does not comply with one or more accreditation standards.
   D. Suggestions are verbally shared, recommendations are written down, and requirements are communicated using owls like in Harry Potter.
Accreditation Quiz – Multiple Choice

1. What the difference between a MSCHE warning and probation?
   A. There is no difference.
   B. Both require the institution to pay a fine, with probation costing the President’s first born.
   C. A warning indicates that an institution has been determined not to meet one or more accreditation standards. A monitoring report to demonstrate improvements is required as a result. Probation indicates a very serious concern on the part of the Commission and requires a monitoring report and follow-up visits.
   D. A warning is a collegial, non-binding remark by the Commission; probation is an official statement of non-compliance.
MSCHE - Mission

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education assures students and the public of the educational quality of higher education. The Commission's accreditation process ensures institutional accountability, self-appraisal, improvement, and innovation through peer review and the rigorous application of standards within the context of institutional mission.
MSCHE - Standards

There are currently 14 standards (institutional context and educational effectiveness) designed to show an institution:

- has a mission appropriate to higher education;

- is guided by well-defined/appropriate goals (student learning);

- has established conditions and procedures to realize mission/goals;

- assesses both institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes, and uses the results for improvement;
MSCHE - Standards

Currently 14 designed to show an institution (cont’d):

- accomplishes its mission and goals substantially;

- is so organized, staffed, and supported that it can be expected to continue to accomplish its mission and goals; and

- meets the eligibility requirements and the standards for accreditation of MSCHE
How MSCHE Accreditation Works Currently

- 2002: Self-Study
- 2006: PRR
- 2012: Self-Study
- 2016: PRR
- 2022: Self-Study

Annual Institutional Profile Updates
MSCHE - Proposed Process Change

- Eight year cycle
- Annual institutional updates (AIUs)
- Mid-point peer review of AIUs (no PRR)
- Self-Study punctuates the cycle
Context of Accreditation
Context of Higher Ed Accreditation

- U.S. is the only industrialized nation without an education ministry

- Congress designed our accreditation system to be led by independent orgs (not the Ed Dept.) which dictate standards

- The accreditation system is widely debated

- Legislation is pending to change it – giving the Education Dept. more power
Update on PRR
PRR Team – Who We Are

1. SVP Esther Rodríguez-Chardavoyne, ADM
2. AVP Dolly Martínez, PRES
3. Provost Christine Mangino, OAA
4. VP Nat Cruz, SDEM
5. Prof. Nelson Nuñez-Rodríguez, NAT
6. Prof. Salim Rayman, ALH
7. Prof. Elizabeth Tappeiner, Library
8. Dean Johana Rivera, SDEM
9. Daliz Pérez-Cabezas, CEWD
10. Amaris Matos, OAA
11. Pearl Shavzin-Dremaux, ADM
12. Piotr Kocik, OIRSA
PRR – Purpose

- The PRR is an essential phase of the accreditation cycle,
- It should demonstrate an institution continues to meet the standards by which the Commission reaffirms or denies accredited status.
- The preparation of a PRR, like that of a self-study, provides opportunities for constructive discussion among the institution's several constituencies.
- PRR preparation brings various points of view to the consideration of recent institutional developments and current institutional issues.
- A successful PRR process allows an institution to reflect upon and acknowledge its progress and accomplishments and to develop plans or create consensus regarding important next steps.
PRR - What We’ve Done

- 18 month process – we are a little over halfway there
- Reviewed recommendations – all 94
- Collected data/evidence and created repository
PRR – Where We Are

• Drafting the first draft!
PRR - Components

1. Executive Summary
2. Summary of Institution’s Response to Recommendations (Middle States Team; Hostos)
3. Institutions major challenges and/or current opportunities
4. Analysis of enrollment and finance data
5. Evidence of sustained and organized assessment processes (institutional effectiveness, student learning)
6. Evidence that institutional planning and budgeting processes are linked
PRR – What’s Coming

• Opportunity for Hostos community feedback

• Finalizing draft

• Using PRR to inform strategic planning
Tone, Text, and Data of Accreditation Reports
FUNDRAISING SUMMARY

- 2011 - 2012: $1,140,214
- 2012 - 2013: $1,260,431
- 2013 - 2014: $1,604,725
- 2014 - 2015: $2,032,537
- 2015 - 2016: $1,165,887
Headcount Enrollment Fall 2004 to Fall 2016

*Preliminary
Accreditation Role Play

Scenario
Accreditation Role Play

Steps:

1. Groups discuss data/develop role plays (10 minutes)
2. Present role plays.
3. Then let’s discuss – what constitutes a good response!
Good response =
1) A story – with context (not excuses)
2) Backed up by data, and
3) Processes for continuously collecting data
4) Identification of what could improve
What’s Next?
Three-year Graduation Rate and Projected Three-year Graduation Rate for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen

Aspen Prize 2015 Application Completion Agenda Defined

2011-16 Strategic Plan

SP 11-16 Extension Year

2017-2022 Strategic Plan
# PRR and SP Processes 2016-17

## Major Deadlines in PRR and SP Processes 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(data analyses, engagement, document prep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Cmte draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit to MSCHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(build on PRR analyses/engagement, document prep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP final draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Launch of SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases*</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Identify evidence-based high-level priorities | • Facilitate faculty/staff/student forums (at least 1 for each group) – discuss roles in completion, solicit evidence-based input on future plan priorities – work w/ Senate, SGA, etc. to promote  
• Create online space to upload SP updates, allow for ongoing comments  
• Convene SP Committee to review forum feedback, discuss PRR data, and outline priorities | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Undertake SWOT and data mining | • Consultant assist with review of other college websites, plans – to bring in environmental scanning/market analysis data  
• Convene SP Committee to undertake environmental scanning/SWOT analysis | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Construct strategic plan framework | • Convene SP Committee (1-2x) to establish goals, priority areas of activity focus, and measurable outcomes | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Vet framework | • Host faculty/staff/student forums to provide input into the framework  
• Solicit input from Bronx community stakeholders, working with CBNP, Bronx Corridors Project, and other community engagement avenues | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Prepare plan | • SP Committee members work with consultant to draft narrative  
• Plan narrative completed and produced  
• Plan publicly available | | | | | | | | | |
Final Questions?
We’d like your feedback
Thank You!