CARL ALBERT STATE COLLEGE

HLC SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE

Approved June 17, 2010
Revised March 14, 2012

CARL ALBERT STATE COLLEGE HLC SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE Approved June 17, 2010; *Revised March 14, 2012*

Visit: 2012-2013**; Site Visit Date:** February 25-27, 2013
Focus Year: 2010-2011

HLC   Steering Committee for 2011-2012

Dr. James Yates, Self-Study Coordinator

1. Dr. Kathy Harrell
2. Leah McLaughlin
3. Ramona Buckner
4. Dr. Linda Pearson
5. Kathy Quirk
6. Bill Gann
7. Steve Hughes
8. Michelle White
9. Kendal Repass
10. Sherry Scott-Smith
11. Marcus Blair
12. Michael Martin
13. Judi White
14. Julie Shubert

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CASC HLC STEERING COMMITTEE

Appointments to the Steering Committee are made by the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The **primary** tasks of the Steering Committee are:

1. to assist the President and Vice-President of Academic Affairs in the development of the CASC Self-Study Plan,
2. to coordinate the implementation of the CASC Self-Study Plan,
3. to oversee the preparation of the CASC Self-Study Report.

In addition to these primary responsibilities, the Steering Committee is charged with specific tasks, such as but not limited to:

1. analyzing the last HLC/CASC Self-Study Report
2. taking on an active, evaluative role in ascertaining the state of the institution
3. identifying and categorizing pertinent materials and relevant data for the Self-Study
4. establishing the institutional goals for the Self-Study process
5. obtaining concurrence of institutional constituencies

Most importantly, members of the Steering Committee will need to provide assurance that the **Core Components** and **Assumed Practices** confirm that Carl Albert State College has addressed the five NCA Criteria for Accreditation.

Steering Committee Organization

1. Criterion #1: Mission – **Leah McLaughlin**, Chair

2. Criterion #2: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct – **Marcus Blair**, Chair

3. Criterion #3: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support – **Dr. Linda Pearson,** Chair

4. Criterion #4: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement – **Bill Gann**, Chair

5. Criterion #5: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness – **Ramona Buckner**, Chair

6. Assessment & Resources – **Steve Hughes**, Chair

7. Federal Compliance – **Michelle White**, Chair

8. Visit & Events Committee – **Kathy Quirk**, Chair

9. Writing/Editing/Design Team – **Chuck Cole** and **Marc Willis, Judi White**

Rationale for Selection:

Previous HLC Steering Committee experience
Faculty experience
Campus Leadership experience
Specific Area Expertise
Writing Ability

HLC Self-Study MUST be faculty-driven!

The Higher Learning Commission Criteria for Accreditation

In its review of institutions, the Higher Learning Commission seeks a culture of aspiration and continual improvement rather than satisfaction of minimum requirements. It also seeks to acknowledge the great diversity of its member institutions. For these reasons it uses the term "criteria" rather than "standards." The accreditation process is governed by the **Criteria for Accreditation**. Within the Criteria there are **Criterion Statements** and **Core Components** that ensure institutional effectiveness. Underlying the Criteria and Core Components is a set of assumptions shared by the community of practice within higher education and made explicit in the section on **Assumed Practices**. Finally, the Commission articulates **Obligations of Affiliation**, which are behavioral requirements for its member and candidate institutions, including the requirement that they abide by Commission policies.

Guiding Values

The Criteria for Accreditation reflect a set of guiding values for institutional accreditation. The Commission articulates these guiding values so as to offer a better understanding of the Criteria and the intentions that underlie them. Institutions are not expected to address these values: they are offered as explanation.

The Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components

The Criteria are designed to seek evidence of continual improvement and aspiration on the part of member institutions rather than to define minimum qualifications. Each Criterion begins with a broad statement of Commission expectations related to the Criterion. The Core Components identify areas of particular these Core Components are further elaborated or explicated in sub-components. The sub-components are not comprehensive: they elaborate certain aspects of the Core Component that the Commission seeks to ensure are not overlooked, but they do not fully constitute the Component. Some of the Core Components do not have sub-components because such elaboration has not appeared necessary. An institution provides evidence with regard to those sub-components of the Core Components that apply to the institution. An institution has the opportunity in its documentation and a team has the option in its review to identify topics or issues related to a Core Component other than those specified in the sub-components.

In preparation for accreditation and reaffirmation of accreditation, an institution provides evidence that it meets all the Criteria and all the Core Components. The distinctiveness of an institution's mission may condition the strategies it adopts and the evidence it provides that it meets the Criteria. The Commission reviews the institution against the Core Components and Criteria through its evaluation processes according to the following evaluative framework.

The Core Components

The institution meets the Core Component if the Core Component: a) is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Component; or b) is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Component, but performance in relation to some aspect of the Component must be improved.

The institution does not meet the Core Component if the institution fails to meet the Component in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more aspects of the Component that the Component is judged not to be met.

The Criteria for Accreditation

The institution meets the Criterion if the Criterion: a) is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Criterion; or b) is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Criterion, but performance in relation to some Core Components of the Criterion must be improved. The institution does not meet the Criterion if the institution fails to meet the Criterion in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more Core Components of the Criterion that the Criterion is judged not to be met. The institution meets the Criterion only if all Core Components are met. The institution must be judged to meet all five Criteria for Accreditation to merit accreditation. The Commission will grant or continue accreditation (with or without conditions or sanctions), deny accreditation, or withdraw accreditation based on the outcome of its review.

The Assumed Practices

Higher education functions within a community marked by shared practices among colleges and universities, practices that have developed out of shared experience, are basic to higher education in the United States, and have been tested over time. Institutional accreditation evolved within these shared practices and it relies upon the assumption that institutions follow them.

The Assumed Practices are foundational to the Criteria for Accreditation. Unlike the Criteria and Core Components, they are generally matters to be determined as facts, rather than matters requiring professional judgment, and they are unlikely to vary by institutional mission or context. Because accredited institutions engage in these Assumed Practices as a matter of course, the Commission does not ask that an accredited institution explicitly address them in an evaluation process except where specifically required to do so to ensure continuing conformity. Such circumstances include when an institution is undergoing a Change of Control, Structure, or Organization, and when an institution is in the process of removal from probation or an order of show-cause. When it discovers that an accredited institution is not following an Assumed Practice, the Commission initiates a review, in accordance with its policy and procedure, to determine whether the institution remains in compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. The Commission also requires that the institution take action to bring its practice into conformity with the Assumed Practices.

An accredited institution that finds through its own processes that its practice is departing from the Assumed Practices should take immediate steps to correct the deficiency; it is not required to disclose its finding to the Commission provided that it moves quickly to initiate a remedy.

Obligations of Affiliation and Commission Policies

The Institutional Obligations of Affiliation describe behavioral requirements on the part of ember institutions, including the requirement to abide by Commission policies. Among those policies, the Obligations draw particular attention to the requirements for transparency as to specified outcomes of the Commission's reviews for accreditation. While the Commission makes information about these reviews public, this information concerns the accreditation relationship of institutions; hence institutions have an obligation to accept such publication and also have an obligation to represent this information accurately. The Institutional Obligations of Affiliation are absolute and the Commission may take immediate administrative action in the event that an institution fails to meet any of them.

Criterion Committees

<u>**Criterion One: Mission -- Leah McLaughlin, Chair**</u>

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Components

1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

> 1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
> 2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
> 3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.

> 1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
>
> 2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research,   application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
>
> 3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.
> 1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
>
> 2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

1.D. The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

> 1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
>
> 2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
>
> 3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Members:

1. Leah McLaughlin
2. Kendal Repass, Co-chair
3. Rob Wylie
4. Mandy Roberts
5. Marc Willis
6. Dr. Kathy Harrell
7. Jennifer Billingsly
8. Chuck Lewis
9. Bobette Guillory
10. Bob Hendricks
11. Norma Hall
12. student

Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct – Marcus Blair, Chair

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Components

2. A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

2. B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

2. C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

> 1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
>
> 2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
>
> 3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
>
> 4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

2. D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

2. E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Assumed Practices:

A. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

1. The institution has a conflict of interest policy that ensures that the governing board and the senior administrative personnel act in the best interest of the institution.

2. The institution has ethics policies for faculty and staff regarding conflict of interest, nepotism, recruitment and admissions, financial aid, privacy of personal information, and contracting.

3. The institution provides its students, administrators, faculty, and staff with policies and procedures informing them of their rights and responsibilities within the institution.

4. The institution provides clear information regarding its procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students and other constituencies, responds to them in a timely manner, and analyzes them to improve its processes.

5. The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:
   a. statements of mission, vision, and values

   b. full descriptions of the requirements for its programs, including all pre-requisite courses

   c. requirements for admission both to the institution and to particular programs or majors

   d. policies on acceptance of transfer credit, including how credit is applied to degree requirements. (Except for courses articulated through transfer policies or institutional agreements, the institution makes no promises to prospective students regarding the acceptance of credit awarded by examination, credit for prior learning, or credit for transfer until an evaluation has been conducted.)

   e. all student costs, including tuition, fees, training, and incidentals; its financial aid policies, practices, and requirements; and its policy on refunds

   f. policies regarding academic good standing, probation, and dismissal; residency or enrollment requirements (if any).

   g. a full list of its instructors and their academic credentials

   h. its relationship with any parent organization (corporation, hospital, or church, or other entity that owns the institution) and any external providers of its instruction.

6. The institution assures that all data it makes public are accurate and complete, including those reporting on student achievement of learning and student persistence, retention, and completion.

7. The institution portrays clearly and accurately to the public its current status with the Higher Learning Commission and with specialized, national, and professional accreditation agencies.

> a. An institution offering programs that require specialized accreditation or recognition in order for its students to be certified or to sit for licensing examinations either has the appropriate accreditation or discloses publicly and clearly the consequences to the students of the lack thereof. The institution makes clear to students the distinction between regional and specialized or program accreditation and the relationships between licensure and the various types of accreditation.

> b. An institution offering programs eligible for specialized accreditation at multiple locations discloses the accreditation status of the program at each location.
> c. An institution that advertises a program as preparation for a licensure examination publicly discloses its licensure pass rate on that examination, unless such information is not available to the institution.

8. The governing board and its executive committee, if it has one, include some "public" members. Public members have no significant administrative position or any ownership interest in any of the following: the institution itself; a company that does substantial business with the institution; a company or organization with which the institution has a substantial partnership; a parent, ultimate parent, affiliate, or subsidiary corporation; an investment group or firm substantially involved with one of the above organizations. All publicly-elected members or members appointed by publicly-elected individuals or bodies (governors, elected legislative bodies) are public members.[1]

9. The governing board has the authority to approve the annual budget and to engage and dismiss the chief executive officer.[1]

10. The institution documents outsourcing of all services in written agreements, including agreements with parent or affiliated organizations.

11. The institution takes responsibility for the ethical and responsible behavior of its contractual partners in relation to actions taken on its behalf.

[1] *Institutions operating under federal control and authorized by Congress are exempt from these requirements. These institutions must have a public board that includes representation by individuals who do not have a current or previous employment or other relationship with the federal government or any military entity. This public board has a significant role in setting policy, reviewing the institution's finances, reviewing and approving major institutional priorities, and overseeing the academic programs of the institution.*

Members:

1.   Marcus Blair
2.   Vicki Hill

3.   Jean Ann Barlow
4.   Midge Blue
5.   Leslie Bain
6.   Hali Repass
7.   Jamie Henson
8.   Beverly Afzali
9.   Jeri Hobday
10.   Cherish Harris
11.   Student

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning : Quality, Resources and Support – Dr. Linda Pearson, Chair

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Components

3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, postgraduate, and certificate programs.

3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college educated person should possess.

3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

> 1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

> 2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Assumed Practices:

B. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

1. Programs, Courses, and Credits

> a. The institution conforms to commonly accepted minimum program length: 60 semester credits for associate's degrees, 120 semester credits for bachelor's degrees, and 30 semester credits beyond the bachelor's for master's degrees. Any variation from these minima must be explained and justified.

> b. The institution requires that 30 of the last 60 credits earned for a bachelor's degree that the institution awards and 15 of the final 30 for an associate's degree it awards be credits earned at the institution.2 Institutions that do not maintain such a requirement, or have programs that do not, are able to demonstrate structures or practices that ensure coherence and quality to the degree. (Consortial arrangements are considered to be such structures. In addition, an institution that complies with the criteria for academic residency requirements of the Service members Opportunity Colleges (SOC) will not be deemed out of conformity with this Assumed Practice provided that its policy is an exception for active-duty service members and not for students in general.)

> c. The institution's policy and practice assure that at least 50% of courses applied to a graduate program are courses designed for graduate work, rather than undergraduate courses credited toward a graduate degree. (An institution may allow well-prepared advanced students to substitute its graduate courses for required or elective courses in an undergraduate degree program and then subsequently count those same courses as fulfilling graduate requirements in a related graduate program that the institution offers. In "4+1" or "2+3" programs, at least 50% of the credits allocated for the master's degree – usually 15 of 30 – must be for courses designed for graduate work.)

> d. The institution adheres to policies on student academic load per term that reflect reasonable expectations for successful learning and course completion.

> e. Courses that carry academic credit toward college-level credentials have content and rigor appropriate to higher education.

> f. The institution has a process for ensuring that all courses transferred and applied toward degree requirements demonstrate equivalence with its own courses required for that degree or are of equivalent rigor.

g. The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the student's program. Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded. (Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions.)

h. The institution maintains a minimum requirement for general education for all of its undergraduate programs whether through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor's degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any variation is explained and justified.

2. Faculty Roles and Qualifications

a. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, the institution defines a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process that is used in the appointment process.

b. Instructors teaching at the doctoral level have a record of recognized scholarship, creative endeavor, or achievement in practice commensurate with doctoral expectations.

c. Faculty participate substantially in:

1) oversight of the curriculum—its development and implementation, academic substance, currency, and relevance for internal and external constituencies;

2) assurance of consistency in the level and quality of instruction and in the expectations of student performance;

3) establishment of the academic qualifications for instructional personnel;

4) analysis of data and appropriate action on assessment of student learning and program completion.

3. Support Services

a. Financial aid advising clearly and comprehensively reviews students' eligibility for financial assistance and assists students in a full understanding of their debt and its consequences.

b. The institution maintains timely and accurate transcript and records services.

Members:

1. Dr. Linda Pearson
2. Mike Riley, Co-chair
3. Bill Carroll
4. Nathan Billy
5. Crystal Robertson
6. Paula Reif
7. Kelly St. John
8. Dee Ann Dickerson
9. Dee Steele
10. Linda Bradbury
11. Jack Armstrong
12. Student

Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement– Bill Gann, Chair

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Components

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.

3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates

to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Assumed Practices:

C. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

1. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) have the authority for the assignment of grades.
(This requirement allows for collective responsibility, as when a faculty committee has the authority to override a grade on appeal.)

2. The institution refrains from the transcription of credit from other institutions or providers that it will not apply to its own programs.

3. The institution has formal and current written agreements for managing any internships and clinical placements included in its programs.

4. A predominantly or solely single-purpose institution in fields that require licensure for practice is also accredited by or is actively in the process of applying to a recognized specialized accrediting agency for each field, if such agency exists.

5. Instructors communicate course requirements to students through syllabi.

6. Institutional data on assessment of student learning are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.

7. Institutional data on student retention, persistence, and completion are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.

Members:

1.   Bill Gann
2.   Heather Hoyle
3.   Steve Hughes
4.   Terri Carroll
5.   Sherry Scott-Smith
6.   Natalie Maxwell
7.   Belinda Westfall
8.   Michael Fulks
9.   Dr. James Yates
10.   Jackie Wallace
11.   Kerrie Blair
12.   Student

Criterion Five: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness – Ramona Buckner, Chair

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Components

5.A. The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

> 1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.

2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

3. The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Assumed Practices:

D. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

1. The institution is able to meet its current financial obligations.

2. The institution has a prepared budget for the current year and the capacity to compare it with budgets and actual results of previous years.

3. The institution has future financial projections addressing its long-term financial sustainability.

4. The institution maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using institutional information.

5. The institution undergoes an external audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency of its own financial and educational activities and maintains audited financial statements. For private institutions the audit is annual; for public institutions it is at least every two years.3

6. The institution's administrative structure includes a chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and chief academic officer (titles may vary) with appropriate credentials and experience and sufficient focus on the institution to ensure appropriate leadership and oversight.
3 *Institutions under federal control are exempted provided that they have other reliable information to document the institution's fiscal resources and management.*

Members:

1.   Ramona Buckner
2.   Brooke Wirsieg
3.   Tommy Smith
4.   David Holt
5.   Michael Martin
6.   Terri Cox
7.   Jay Falkner
8.   Kathy Quirk
9.   Heather Baldwin
10.   Deborah Herr11.
11.   Student

Assessment Committee   Membership 2011-12

1. Steve Hughes, Chair
 2. Dr. Jim Yates, ex officio
3. Bill Gann, Division Chair
4. Bob Hendricks, Division Chair
5. Jerry Holton, Division Chair
6. Leroy Nolan, Division Chair
7. Dr. Linda Pearson, Division Chair
8. Dee Ann Dickerson, Registrar
9. Leah McLaughlin, VP Student Affairs
11. Michael Martin, IT Director
12. Linda Bradbury, Cont. Ed.
13. Heather Hoyle, Dev. Ed. faculty
14. Maxcine Warren, Tutoring Director
15. Mike Riley, CASE director
16. Dr. Kathy Harrell, VP-Sallisaw
17. Belinda Westfall, faculty
18. Kelly St. John, TRIO
19. Kendall Repass, faculty/Service Learning
20. Natalie Maxwell, Sallisaw faculty
21. Marc Willis, faculty

Federal Compliance Committee   Membership 2011-12

1. Michelle White-Chair
2. Kim Hughes, Co-Chair
3. Lois Gotes
4. Anita Sutter
5. Robin Benson
6. Melinda Pierce
7. Garry Ivey
8. Paul Marshall
9. Judi White
10. Hank Austin
11. Rita Thomas
12. Bob Hendricks

HLC Self-Study Timeline: 2010 - 2013

2010   Focus Year : Fall 2010

Spring: Self Study Coordinator/Administration attend Self Study
             Workshop/Annual Meeting (April 9-13).

Summer: Appoint Steering Committee.
             Steering Committee Organizes/Selects Principle Sub-
             Committees.

FOCUS YEAR: 2010-2011

*Fall: Campus Kickoffs.
             Steering Committee commences Committee meetings.
             Sub-committees meet and plan.

2011   Focus Year: Spring 2011

Spring: Sub-committees begin gathering data.
             Steering Committee participates in Workshop on Self-
             Study and other Annual Meeting Programs (April 8-12).
             Steering Committee receives Alpha version of Revised
             Criteria.
             Steering Committee confirms date of visit and other
             organizational information.

Summer: Subcommittees gather data, analyzes information, and
             develop draft reports for submission to steering committee
             Steering Committee receives Beta version of Revised
             Criteria
             Submits Self Study plan/design.

Fall: Subcommittees gather data, analyzes information, and
             develop draft reports for submission to steering committee

             Steering committee analyzes information, prepares,
             completes studies, prepares rough draft of the self-study
             report.
             Steering Committee sends to HLC information suggesting
             desired team competencies.

2012

Spring:	Steering Committee prepares and revises drafts of the self study report, circulates and receives reactions to draft reports.
	Steering Committee receives Final Version of Revised Criteria.
	Steering Committee participates in Workshop on Self-Study and other Annual Meeting Programs (March/April).
Summer:	Writing/Editing Team compiles/submits final self-study report electronically to HLC.
Fall:	Send comments on proposed team members to HLC.
	Duplicate self-study report, etc.
	Prepare for team visit.
	Send one complete set of evaluation materials to each team member of the evaluation Team and to the HLC staff liaison.

2013

Spring:	Evaluation Visit takes place: February 25-27
Summer:	Respond to draft team report with corrections of errors of fact.
	Send response to team report to HLC.

Proposed Writing Deadlines:

First Rough Draft – November 30, 2011
Second Rough Draft – February 15, 2012
Third Draft – April 16. 2012
Fourth draft – May 23, 2012
Final Draft – July 16, 2012
Policy/Procedure Manual revision: January, 2012
Assessment Plan update: January, 2012
Mission draft: June 15, 2011
Academic Plan: August 1, 2011
Planning Document: Jan. 30, 2012
HLC/Assessment Faculty Workshops: Monday -- Friday, January 9-13