



IAC Hearing Committee Report

Hearing Committee B

Session 1

August 12, 2019

Institution: Danville Area Community College, Danville, IL

Type of Evaluation: Comprehensive Evaluation Year 10 (Notice recommendation)

Staff Liaison: Eric V. Martin

Committee Members:

- Convener:** Elaine Pontillo, Professor, Global Leadership, Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne, IN
- Recorder:** Rex D. Ramsier, Executive Vice President/Chief Administrative Officer, University of Akron, Akron, OH
- Member:** Patricia A. Dolly, Senior Advisor to the President, Oakland University, Auburn Hills, MI
- Member:** Jackie L. Freeze, Administrator Emeritus/Retired VP Student Services, Western Wyoming Community College, Rock Springs, WY
- Member:** Alissa Oppenheimer, Managing Director, Chamisa Energy Storage, St. Paul, MN (Public member)
- Member:** Janet C. Perry, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Oklahoma City Community College, Oklahoma City, OK

Institutional Representatives:

- Lead: Stephen Nacco, President
- Rep: Bob Mattson, Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness & Strategic Planning
- Rep: Penny McConnell, Dean of Liberal Arts

Team Chair: Jeanne Swarthout, (Retired), Northland Pioneer College, Flagstaff, AZ

1. IAC Hearing Committee Determinations

Complete the following chart and indicate the Committee’s determination (Met, Met with Concerns, Not Met) for the Criteria and Core Components. In the “IAC Determination” Column, please identify with an asterisk each instance where the IAC determination differs from the Team’s determination. For any Criterion or Core Component where the IAC Committee’s determination differs from the Team’s determination, or where the IAC Committee agrees with the team’s determinations on a Criterion or Core Component, but disagrees with the underlying rationale, or where the IAC Committee concurs with the team’s determination of “met with concerns” or “not met,” please be sure to provide a detailed rationale in Section II. If the evaluation leading to the team’s recommendation was a focused visit, by design, not all Core Components with the Criteria for Accreditation were examined. Please note the Core Components that were not examined with N/A (not applicable).

Number	Title	IAC Determination	Team Determination
1	Mission		
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met	Met
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct		
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met	Met
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support		
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met	Met

Number	Title	IAC Determination	Team Determination
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met	Met
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement		
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met	Met
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness		
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns

2. IAC Hearing Committee Supporting Evidence, Findings and Rationale for Action or Recommendation

For all cases, note below the IAC findings with respect to each relevant Core Component with appropriate rationale. This section should be organized by Core Components. For Criteria and/or Core Components where the IAC agrees that the requirements are met, only a brief statement affirming the reasons for concurrence is required.

However, a detailed rationale is required in this section for any Criterion or Core Component where:

- The IAC Committee’s determination differs from the Team’s determination, or
- Where the IAC Committee agrees with the team’s determinations on a Criterion or Core Component, but disagrees with the underlying rationale, or
- Where the IAC Committee concurs with the team’s determination of “met with concerns” or “not met,”

In cases considering removal or continuation of a sanction, the specific Core Components which led to the sanction originally being imposed by the Board of Trustees should be referenced specifically along with the IAC findings with respect to the Core Component. Careful attention to the Board's action letter outlining the underlying reasons for the sanction, as well as the team report, institutional response and verbal responses of the institutional representatives at the hearing is required.

Rationale:

1A: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

1B: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

1C: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

1D: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

1: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Criterion is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2A: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2B: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2C: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2D: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2E: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

2: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Criterion is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

3A: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit, including information in the review of Federal Compliance.

It is clear from the Institutional Response and information shared by the institutional representatives at the IAC Hearing that Danville Area Community College (DACC) began to recognize the inconsistencies in course learning outcomes during the process of gathering evidence for the Assurance Argument for its March 2019 Comprehensive Evaluation. Since that time, DACC has appointed a part-time Director of Assessment, applied to and was accepted into the HLC Assessment Academy, and began a process of systematizing learning outcomes across multi-section courses and delivery modalities. Currently lead instructors develop master syllabi in their respective disciplines including the course-level learning outcomes.

Progress has been made to correct the issues identified by the HLC Team, but more work is needed to complete the process. Attention is being given to having consistent course-level learning outcomes that are measurable and which connect to the program-level and general education outcomes. It is imperative to fully involve departmental faculty in the development and assessment of course-level learning outcomes. As DACC begins to develop a systematic approach to assessment, it may wish to consider the need for a full-time leader of this work at the Cabinet level, one who can bring the faculty together to craft processes for developing course-level learning outcomes, tie these into the programmatic learning outcomes, and ensure that the results of assessment activities lead to improvements that can be clearly evidenced. These goals are interwoven into the 2019-2020 Strategic Planning Matrix and therefore need a leader with responsibility, authority and accountability to ensure success and sustainability.

3B: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

3C: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

3D: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

3E: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

3: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Criterion is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit, as explained in 3A above.

4A: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

4B: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

Representatives from DACC reiterated at the IAC Hearing what they had submitted in their Institutional Response – that the threat of a recommendation of a Notice sanction came as a loud wake up call. With strong financial performance as an institution in the State of Illinois, and with being a lead institution in Achieving the Dream, it was a surprise to DACC that its assessment efforts did not meet the expectations of the visiting Team. It is clear that DACC took the Team Report seriously and mobilized to begin to address the findings and to develop an assessment structure that will serve the institution and its students well.

Participating in the HLC Assessment Academy will certainly help DACC move forward in this regard, but moving the institution toward a culture of meaningful assessment will take an academic leader who can ensure a faculty-driven process with staying power. Programmatic learning outcomes need to be developed that not only map to those of general education, but that carry discipline-specific expectations of what students know and are able to do with their degree or certificate. This includes all programs: those with external accreditation; those considered technical; and those categorized as transfer oriented. The confusion across campus as to what is co-curricular versus extra-curricular needs to be resolved, so that the assessment plan can include appropriate measures. The institution should define what co-curricular means using a process that fits DACC's culture, share that information with the campus community, and assure that appropriate co-curricular experiences are available to students, documented, and adequately accessed and changed as needed. Finally, assessment needs to be tied into the annual budgeting process, and this can best happen at the Cabinet level where authority and accountability are of highest priority.

4C: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

4: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Criterion is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit, as explained in 4B above.

5A: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

5B: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

5C: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

5D: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Core Component is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit.

With respect to the data governance issue raised by the Team, DACC has developed and implemented a new Data Governance Policy #6034. This is a proactive step which acknowledges that the institution recognizes the problem and has begun to address the issues. Going forward, this involves the need to establish a strategy for collecting, analyzing, and then providing data to those who need to know, and in some cases this may include students and the public. A comprehensive and systematic approach to data governance will help DACC use analytics to provide evidence of the progress it is making in many areas, including the assessment of student learning at all levels. This is especially important in light of the Strategic Planning Matrix, which includes numerous goals and desired outcomes which will need to be reduced to tangible measurables. This will likely be impossible without a strong data governance capacity, and DACC may wish to consider focusing its efforts on achieving and tracking only those goals that are truly of the highest institutional priority.

5: The IAC Hearing Committee finds that this Criterion is met with concerns and agrees with the rationale set forth by the Evaluation Team in the Report of its March 2019 visit as explained in Core Component 5D above.

3. IAC Hearing Committee Recommendation

State the IAC's recommendation for the institution's status in this section. Where relevant, indicate the nature, timing, and scope of any interim monitoring and/or next on-site evaluation. Where no sanction is recommended, for any Core Components the IAC believes are "met with concerns," the IAC must articulate the nature, timing and scope of interim monitoring that must occur. Interim monitoring is not to be assigned where the ultimate recommendation involves a sanction.

Continued accreditation recommended

On Notice recommended – Insert date of next review:

Probation recommended – Insert date of next review:

Continuation of Probation recommended – Insert date of next review:

Withdrawal recommended

Removal of sanction recommended

Initial Candidacy recommended

Initial Accreditation recommended

Other (Describe issue:)

Conditions for Remediation if Recommending Notice or Probation (Provide HLC expectations on what the institution should demonstrate at its next review.)

Expectations: N/A

SAS Language (Next reaffirmation date is 2022-2023):

Monitoring, if applicable:

Interim Report(s). Insert description and due date(s):

Embedded Report within an upcoming Review. Insert description and identify date of the applicable review:

Focused Visit. Insert description and due date:

As noted above, the IAC Hearing Panel agrees with the findings of the site-visit Team that Core Components 3A, 4B and 5D are met with concerns. However, in weighing the recommendation of a Notice sanction, we took the following into account. First of all, the Institutional Response and the Hearing attendees all indicate that DACC has taken the cited issues seriously and moved to address them. Whereas these issues are serious, they are interconnected and will take time to resolve. DACC has done well financially in a State where that has not always been the case, and is a leader in Achieving the Dream, both of which lessen the gravity of the situation with respect to being at risk of non-compliance. In addition, although the duration over which these issues with assessment and data governance may span five years or more, they were not discernable given the lack of a systematic method to track them. In addition, DACC's positive performance with respect to student graduation was improving and masked the need to look deeper. Finally, the interconnected nature of the issues with Core Components 3A, 4B and 5D have not caused a cumulative effect that warrants a Notice sanction at this time.

We recommend that DACC host a focused visit in Fall 2021, at which time the site-visit Team will evaluate the following:

1. Evidence of a coordinated and systematic assessment plan and structure where accountability at all levels is tantamount, including leadership at the Cabinet level.
2. Evidence that course learning outcomes are consistent across sections and modes of delivery, are measurable, are being measured, and that the assessment results are being used to improve courses. This evidence should demonstrate that the faculty involved in designing and updating the courses participate in the development and implementation of the assessment plans, that the students are aware of what is expected, and therefore that the assessment effort is sustainable and can be incorporated into the institution's culture.
3. Evidence that program learning outcomes include ones which are distinct from those in general education, and that these are measurable, are being measured, and that the assessment results are being used to improve programs. Such evidence should be available for all types of programs: externally accredited; technical; and transfer. This evidence should demonstrate that the faculty involved in designing and updating the degree/certificate programs participate in the development and implementation of the assessment plans, that the students are aware of what is expected, and therefore that the assessment effort is sustainable and can be incorporated into the institution's culture.

4. Evidence that general education learning outcomes are measurable, are being measured, and that the assessment results are being used to improve the general education program. This evidence should demonstrate that the faculty involved in designing and updating the general education program participate in the development and implementation of the assessment plans, that the students are aware of what is expected, and therefore that the assessment effort is sustainable and can be incorporated into the institution's culture.
5. Evidence that co-curricular assessments have been established, and are being used to improve the student experience. This evidence should demonstrate that the staff involved in co-curricular programming participate in the development and implementation of the assessment plans, that the students are aware of what is expected, and therefore that the assessment effort is sustainable and can be incorporated into the institution's culture.
6. Evidence that there is a comprehensive data governance system in place for collection, analysis and dissemination of information to various stakeholders.

Changes to Stipulations, if applicable: Restricted to Standard Pathway

Signature Page

Convener: Clair A. Perrotta

Recorder: [Signature]

Member: [Signature]

Member: [Signature]

Member: [Signature]

Member: [Signature]