Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Comprehensive Reaccreditation November 5 & 6 Site Visit Open Forum: Criteria 1 and 2

Neil Pagano, Associate Provost for Accreditation and Assessment
Assurance Argument

• Assurance Argument Lock Down: October 8
• Purpose: Describe and document how CCC meets the Criteria for Accreditation
  1. Mission
  2. Integrity
  3. Teaching and Learning: Resources and Support
  4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement
  5. Resources and Planning

• "Argument"
• Evidence Files
Site Visit: Logistics

• Team Visit: November 5 and 6
• Seven Peer Reviewers (also 3 HLC Staff Observers)
• Prior to Visit (October): Read Assurance Argument and Evidence Files, Draft Schedule
• Visit: Meet with stakeholders across campus
• Post-Visit: Write report with judgement:
  • Met
  • Met with concerns
  • Not met
Schedule

• President and Cabinet
• Board of Trustees
• Provost and Deans
• Vice-Presidents
• Faculty (FT and PT separately)
• Assessment Committee
• Open Forums on Criteria
• “Areas of Focus”
Schedule (also likely)

- Students
- Campus Tour
- Faculty Senate
- Chairs
- Advising and Student Support
- Enrollment Management
Criterion 1: Mission (1.A)

• Do the academic programs reflect the mission?
• Do the planning and budgeting priorities align with the mission?
Criterion 1: Mission (1.A)

Evidence:
• Mission statement adopted in 1987
• Reflected in Strategic Plan
• Acknowledge the shift away from open admissions
Notable Evidence

Freshmen Graduation Rates by Academic Index: 2009-2011 Entering Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Entering Cohort</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Entering Cohort</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Entering Cohort</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation rates for the 2009-2011 entering cohorts show a steady increase over time, with the highest rates achieved in the 2011 cohort.
Criterion 1: Mission (1.B)

• Is the mission shared and cited?
• Does the mission manifest itself in academics?
Criterion 1: Mission (1.B)

Evidence:

• Mission published in catalog, web site, handbooks
• Mission embraced and echoed by Strategic Plan
• Mission represented in academics (“Big Chicago,” course list)
Criterion 1: Mission (1.C)

• Do you address your role in a multicultural society?
• Do your activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate to your mission?
Criterion 1: Mission (1.C)

Evidence:

• Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion one of the six goals in Strategic Plan
• Dean of DEI position
• Diverse curriculum
• DEI requirement part of Columbia Core
Key metrics of student characteristics and classroom experience: 2003 to 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
Notable Evidence

THE FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE 2016

Columbia College Chicago vs Peer Comparison Institutions

Services/Community Satisfaction

- Respect for the expression of diverse beliefs: 77%
- Racial/ethnic diversity of student body: 47%
- Availability of campus social activities: 72%
- Orientation for new students: 63%
- Overall sense of community among students: 68%
- Financial aid package: 59%
- Financial aid office: 58%

Percent responded very satisfied/satisfied
Criterion 1: Mission (1.D)

- Does your educational role reflect a public obligation?
- Are your educational responsibilities primary?
- Do you engage with external constituencies?
Criterion 1: Mission (1.D)

Evidence:
• Strategic Plan: Community Engagement
• Strategic Plan: Partner with industry and fields of creative practice
• Programming: Museum of Contemporary Photography, Dance Center, Manifest
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.A)

• Do you act with integrity?
• Is your conduct ethical and responsible?
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.A)

Evidence:

• Change in admissions practices

• Policies:
  • Student Code of Conduct
  • Faculty Manual
  • College Catalog
  • Institutional policies (Title IX, Whistleblower, contracting)
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.B)

• Do you present yourself clearly to students?
• Do you present yourself clearly to the public and prospective students?
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.B)

Evidence:

• The College Catalog
• Student Handbook
• Consumer Information on the web site
• Tuition and net-price calculator
• Assessment information
Notable Evidence: Key Performance Indicators

**LOAN DEFAULT RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Year Default Rate</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Default Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.C)

• Is the Board of Trustees autonomous to make decisions in the best interests of the institution?
• Does it delegate day-to-day management to administration?
• Does it delegate academic matters to the faculty?
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.C)

Evidence:

• Board of Trustee Bylaws
• Board purview: Budgets, capital plans, tuition rates
• Board reviews annual audited financial statements
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.D)

• Are you committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning?
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.D)

Evidence:

• Academic Freedom defined in Tenure Document and CBA with PT faculty
• Mission: College climate for students to “explore and discover”
• 82 Student Organizations
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.E)

- Do you provide oversight and support for research and scholarly practice?
- Are students offered guidance in ethical use of information resources?
- Do you have policies on academic honesty and integrity?
Criterion 2: Integrity – Ethical and Responsible Conduct (2.E)

Evidence:

• Institutional Review Board
• Academic Integrity Policy (students)
• First-Year Writing
• CCC Library
Notable Evidence: CCC Library awarded 2017 Excellence in Academic Libraries Award from Association of College and Research Libraries
Comments, Observations, Questions?

Neil Pagano,
npagano@colum.edu
x8218