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Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Mid-Cycle Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

This is the Year 4 Review for UW-Superior with an embedded Monitoring Report and Federal Compliance Review. The campus has the designated liberal arts mission within the UW system. During the period since the last Comprehensive Review UWS has been creative in addressing a significantly reduced State budget appropriation to the UW system, a massive campus flood, and enrollment and retention related issues. The campus has worked collaboratively, transparently, and extremely hard to address these challenges while staying true to its mission and values. The leadership of the Chancellor is apparent in these initiatives and the approaches adopted under stressful times.

Interactions with Constituencies

- Dr. Renee Wachter, Chancellor
  - Credentials: PhD Philosophy, Business Management, Information Systems
- Jenice Meyer, Academic Staff, Academic Planner and Interim Director CCEL, ALO
  - Credentials: MEd in Community Counseling
- Dr. Maria Stalzer Wyant Cuzzo, Faculty, Professor of Legal Studies/HLC Co-Coordinator, Program Coordinator, LSTU/CJUS Department of HBJD
  - Credentials: PhD in Political Science, JD, Mediator
• Dr. Jackie Weissenburger, Interim Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
  ○ Credentials: Doctor of Philosophy Educational Psychology  
• Emily Zobel, Academic Staff, Director of Institutional Effectiveness  
  ○ Credentials: MEd in Education and Human Services  
• President Ray Cross, UW System, President  
  ○ Credentials: Doctorate of College and University Administration  
• Regent Ed Manydeeds, BOR, BOR Member  
  ○ Credentials: Juris Doctor  
• Harry Anderson, Academic Staff, Dean of Students  
  ○ Credentials: MS in Strategic Leadership  
• Nicholas Bursik, Academic Staff, Interim Athletic Director  
  ○ Credentials: BS Business Management  
• Dr. Brenda Harms, Interim Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management  
  ○ Credentials: PhD Human Services  
• Georgette Koenig, Vice Chancellor, Finance, Administration  
  ○ Credentials: MA in Business Administration  
• Jeanne Thompson, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
  ○ MA Management  
• Robert Waksdahl, Academic Staff, Controller  
  ○ Credentials: BA in Accounting  
• Dr. Dean Yohnk, Administration, Dean of Academic Affairs  
  ○ Credentials: PhD Theatre Arts  
• Jeffrey Kahler, Academic Staff, Administrative Officer, Administration and Finance  
  ○ Credentials: MBA in Business Administration  
• Dr. Nicholas Danz, Associate Professor – Plant Science, Department Chair, Natural Science Department  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in Natural Resources, Science and Management  
• Dr. Jeffrey Schuldt, Chair, General Education Committee, Professor of Natural Sciences  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in Forestry  
• Glenn Carlson, Assistant Professor, HHP, General Education  
  ○ Credentials: MAEd in Health and Physical Education  
• Dr. Gregory Moore, Faculty, Professor, Music, Music Department, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: DMA Music  
• Dr. Raychel Reiff, Professor, English, World Languages, Culture & Literature Department, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in English  
• Dr. Joel Sipress, Professor, English, World Languages, Culture & Literature Department, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in History  
• Dr. Jamie White-Farnham, Associate Professor, Writing, Department of Writing and Library Science, Assessment Coordinator, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in English  
• Janie Campbell, Academic Staff, Associate Administrative Program Specialist, working title of Transfer Specialist, Registrar’s Office, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: MA Management  
• Dr. Rubana Mahjabeen, Assistant Professor, Economics, Business and Economics Department, General Education Committee  
  ○ Credentials: PhD in Economics  
• Jerel Benton, Academic Staff, Director of Equity, Diversity and Inclusivity, Campus Life and Leadership  
  ○ Credentials: MA Adult and Higher Ed  
• Steven Marshall, Academic Staff, Interim Human Resources Director
- Ivy Vainio, Academic Staff, Associate Student Services Coordinator, working title of Multicultural Student Affairs Coordinator, Office of Multicultural Affairs
  - Credentials: BA in History
- Tammy Fanning, Academic Staff, Associate Dean of Students, Campus Life and Leadership
  - Credentials: MEd, Community Counseling
- Gabriela Theis, Academic Staff, Student Services Specialist, Office of Multicultural Affairs
  - Credentials: MA in Educational Leadership
- Monte Stewart, Academic Staff, Associate Student Services Coordinator, VNSC (Veterans and Non-Traditional Student Center)
  - Credentials: MS in Strategic Leadership
- Gary Johnson, Assistant Professor, First Nations Studies, Department of HBJD, Director, First Nations Center
  - Credentials: MEd in Professional Development
- Dr. Daniela Mansbach, Associate Professor, Political Science, Department of Social Inquiry
  - Credentials: PhD in Politics
- Donna Dahlvang, Academic Staff, Director, Financial Aid Office
  - Credentials: MBA
- Jeff Kirschling, Academic Staff, Registrar
  - Credentials: MS in Education
- Leah Kohlts, Academic Staff, University Relations Specialist, working title of Marketing Manager, University Relations
  - Credentials: BA in Communication
- Amy Missinne, Academic Staff, University Executive Staff Assistant, Provost
  - Credentials: MS in Training and Development
- Dr. Matthew TenEyck, Academic Staff, Assistant Scientist and Director, LSRI, Lecturer, Coordinator IACUC
  - Credentials: PhD in Water Resources Science
- Dr. Jeanean O’Brien, Assistant Professor, Biology, Natural Sciences Department, IACUC
  - Credentials: PhD in Cancer Biology
- Dr. Eric Edwards, Assistant Professor, Sociology, Department of Social Inquiry, Chair, IRB
  - Credentials: PhD in Sociology
- Dr. Lynn Goerdt, Associate Professor, Social Work, Department of HBJD, Global Awareness HIP Coordinator, IRB
  - Credentials: EdD
- Yvonne Rutford, Associate Professor, Writing and Library Science, IRB
  - Credentials: MFA in Writing
- Dr. Andre Breckenridge, Associate Professor, Natural Science Department, IRB
  - Credentials: PhD Geology
- Dr. Vanessa Hettinger, Assistant Professor, Psychology, Department of HBJD, IRB
  - Credentials: PhD in Psychology
- Dr. Monica Roth Day, Associate Professor, Social Work, Department of HBJD
  - Credentials: EdD Educational Policy and Administration
- Cortney Alexander, Academic Staff, Director, Academic Advising, Career Services, and Educational Success Center
  - Credentials: MA Gender Studies
- Mark MacLean, Academic Staff, International Student Services Program Manager III with a working title of Director, International Programs, Office of International Programs
  - Credentials: MA in Teaching of English as Second Language
- Esther Gieschen, Academic Staff, Outreach Program Manager I, Center for Continuing Education & Extension (CCE); Interim Director
  - Credentials: MA in Management
- Benjamin Mooney, Academic Staff, Associate Outreach Specialist, CCE  
  - Credentials: BS in History
- Dr. Karen Heikel, Academic Staff, Executive Director, Alternative Delivery and Outreach, Distance Learning Center  
  - Credentials: EdD Educational Policy and Administration
- Dana Luzaich, University Staff, University Services Program Associate, Center for Continuing Education & Extension (CCE)  
  - Credentials: AA in Administrative Assistant
- Dr. Steven Rosenberg, Professor, Math and Computer Science Department, Chair of APRC  
  - Credentials: PhD Math
- Dr. Chad Scott, Professor, Math and Computer Science Department, Chair of Department  
  - Credentials: PhD Math
- Dr. Jonathan Dyess, Academic Staff, Associate Advisor, Academic Advising  
  - Credentials: PhD, Geology
- Mike Raunio, Academic Staff, Associate Advisor, Academic Advising  
  - Credentials: PhD, Geology
- Kristin Jasperson, Academic Staff, Associate Advisor, Academic Advising  
  - Credentials: BA English
- Taylor Walkky, Academic Staff, Associate Advisor, Educational Leadership  
  - Credentials: MA Psychology
- Tom Barbano, University Staff, University Services Program Associate, Career Services and Center for Academic Advising  
  - Credentials: BA Social Work
- Brent Notbohm, Chair of Faculty Senate, Chair Communicating Arts Department, Professor, Film and Video, Faculty Advisor  
  - Credentials: MA Film
- Dr. Brett Jones, Incoming Chair, Music Department, Associate Professor, Percussion, World Music, Faculty Advisor  
  - Credentials: PhD Music Performance
- Dr. Nick Sloboda, Chair, World Languages, Culture, and Literature Department, Professor English, Faculty Representative, UW System, Faculty Advisor  
  - Credentials: PhD
- Dr. Mary Churchill, Associate Professor, Teacher Education, Department of Educational Leadership, faculty advisor  
  - Credentials: PhD Education
- Dr. Shevaun Stocker, Associate Professor, Department Chair, Psychology, HBJD Department, faculty advisor  
  - Credentials: PhD Psychology
- Dr. Meg Krausch, Assistant Professor, Sociology, Department of Social Inquiry, assessment committee  
  - Credentials: PhD Sociology
- Dr. Kenna Bolton Holz, Associate Professor, Psychology, Department of HBJD, assessment committee  
  - Credentials: PhD Psychology
- Dr. Amanda Zbacnik, Assistant Professor, Special Education, Department of Educational Leadership, assessment committee  
  - Credentials: PhD Educational Leadership
- Michael Buncher, Academic Staff, Associate Student Services Coordinator, Department of Educational Leadership  
  - Credentials: MA Applied Communication Theory and Methods
- Jessica Mansfield, Academic Staff, Associate Administrative Program Specialist, working title of Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Effectiveness  
  - Credentials: MS Psychology
- Students- n=20 (included distance learning and a variety of majors)
- Faculty- n=45 (included 12 non-administrative department chairs)
- Staff- n= 56 (included academic staff and support staff)

**Additional Documents**

- Addendum materials as requested
- Supplemental information for Federal Compliance Review
- Program Reviews from Academic programs
- Co-curricular program reviews
- Samples of ways in which data has driven decision-making and has been used to close the feedback loop
1 - Mission

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

1.A - Core Component 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.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Following a process required by the University of Wisconsin system, UW-Superior revised its mission statement, adding “engages the community and region” to this statement. The institution also revised its vision and values statements along similar lines so that they now capture a “commitment to partnerships and the region.” This commitment aligns with both the institution’s activities, which include service-learning, and constituents, which are primarily students coming from northern Wisconsin and northeastern Minnesota (where UW-Superior has a reciprocity agreement). The process for revising the mission statement, as well as the other two statements, included ample opportunities for campus input, including an “All-Campus Meeting” in December 2013, a comment period lasting two weeks, another campus meeting in February 2014, another comment period, a “Feedback Session” at a third campus meeting in April 2014, and a final comment period. The process also included a survey of employers, alumni, and students, as well as an alumni focus group.

UW-Superior’s academic programs, which include many traditional liberal arts disciplines (English, history, philosophy, etc.) and promote growth in appropriate areas (communication, diversity, etc.), are in line with its mission. Support Services include a writing center, tutoring, and counseling services, which can help to serve its student population (which includes many first-generation, nontraditional, and veteran students) and thus advance the interests of its region. Career Services provides a career fair, along with workshops and consultations, and thus supports the “career preparation” part of the mission statement. During the very well-attended on-campus sessions with faculty and staff, a number of respondents indicated that the mission aligned with their work. Staff members, for example, used terms such as “student-centric” and “community engagement” in their remarks.
UW-Superior’s four strategic goals are appropriate for its mission. The first three refer to learning, service to the region, and diversity—all key components of the mission—and the fourth refers to continuous improvement, an overarching goal relevant to the first three.

The new Integrated Planning and Budgeting Process (IPBP) explicitly calls for consideration of the strategic plan: “SPCT identifies budget FY priorities based on the Strategic Plan and makes recommendations to the Chancellor.” The budget request form requires reference to a relevant initiative identified in the strategic plan for each new funding request. The wish list for one-time funding requests does not require such reference, however. UW-Superior may want to add this requirement to this portion of the form.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
1.B - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior’s mission statement appears in numerous electronic and physical locations, including its website, catalog, campus profile, and signs throughout campus. Vision and values statements are also public. The revision of the mission statement in 2015 is evidence of the institution’s commitment to keeping it current. The components address various emphases (on career preparation, community engagement, and most importantly serving the individual student). The new shared advising model provides professional and faculty members for each student, assuring students receive individualized advising.

The enrollment profile is consistent with its mission. As a small liberal arts institution, UW-Superior's enrollment is around 2500. It enrolls students from 46 countries. Its student enrollment is consistent with the area demographics.

The Center for Community Engaged Learning provides avenues for students to engage with the community. While staff have been involved in the community, it was undocumented. We learned UW-Superior will conduct an internal survey to determine what staff is doing. Also, we were informed that a new policy has been implemented whereby staff can submit an application to receive time off to volunteer in the community. These efforts will further demonstrate UW-Superior's commitment to the community.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.C - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The institution’s commitment to diversity is apparent in both its mission statement, which refers explicitly to “respect for diverse cultures and multiple voices,” and its value statement, which describes commitments to both “inclusivity” and “global awareness.” Strategic Initiative III in the strategic plan, furthermore, is “The University will be a diverse community that attracts, supports, and recognizes high-achieving students and employees.” Notably, UW-Superior’s General Education program requires coursework related to both diversity and “study of at least one non-European or non-Euro-American society, country, or region.” The institution offers more than 100 courses addressing at least one of these subjects. The institution also has a Diversity Fellow who is the Director of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, as well as a Diversity and Inclusion Committee, which will work with the director to develop a diversity plan and already is working on a project related to bias recognition. As a member of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the EDI director has the opportunity to participate in high-level decision-making for the institution. An Affirmative Action Plan is in process. Search committees attend “Red File” meetings, in which they learn about search protocols, appropriate questions to ask an interview setting, etc., and HR monitors searches, checking every application and following up with search committees to determine why applicants did not advance in the search process. The institution offers mandatory training regarding sexual harassment, as well as optional professional development program called Global Awareness and Inclusivity Community of Practice. Finally, UW-Superior demonstrates an impressive array of resources, including the Gender Equity Resource Center and First Nations Center, to promote diversity to students outside the classroom.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.D - Core Component 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.

Rating
Met

Evidence

UW-Superior’s commitment to the public good is evident in its mission statement, revised in 2015 to make explicit reference to engagement of the “community and region.” Strategic Initiative II, furthermore, addresses this commitment. Indeed, Goal 1 of this initiative is “Become the region’s premier institution for community engagement.” One impressive resource for achieving this goal is the new Center for Community Engaged Learning, which the design team calls “a one-stop shop that focuses primarily on getting students involved in the local community through volunteering, academic service-learning, internships, applied research, creative activities, and other unique partnership opportunities” (10 May 2016 memorandum). For example, the CCEL connects community entities with students who can build websites or newsletters for them. Furthermore, the strategic plan refers to plans to incentivize “place-based research,” showcase scholarly and creative work, and increase financial support for undergraduate research and creative work. Financial constraints have restricted the amount of funding available to support faculty research, but the institution is pursuing support from the foundation. The Employee Community Service Volunteer Policy allows employees to spend up to 12 hours of paid leave time per year on community service. The university provides numerous programs (concerts, drama, day camp, etc.) that are open to the community.

A policy on “Segregated University Fees” restricts expenditures to “items and activities that are related to the mission of the institution and to the purposes of the organization.”

“Data on Partnerships at UW-Superior” indicates that members of the UW-Superior community served 124 community organizations with service-learning, volunteer work, or research and that the institution provided assistance with business development to 46 community organizations. The assurance argument notes that 12 departments offered nearly 100 service-learning courses, resulting in more than 34,000 hours spent in service to nearly 150 community organizations in 2015-2016. UW-Superior research centers, such as the Transportation and Logistics Research Center, serve the region with reports, toxicity testing, classes for students in K-12 schools, and more. The Department of Student Involvement connects students with volunteer opportunities in the community, and student-athletes serve the community by volunteering in a variety of ways. Finally, the institution
offers numerous certificate programs and classes for members of the community.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

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

Evidence

The mission statement and strategic plan were developed through campus-wide involvement.

UW Superior’s mission is clearly articulated and publicly accessible on its website and through other public documents including the course catalogue. The new shared advising model provides professional and faculty members for each student assuring students receive individualized advising.

The enrollment profile is consistent with its mission. As a small liberal arts institution, its enrollment is around 2500. UW Superior enrolls students from 46 countries. Its student enrollment is consistent with the area demographics.

The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society with the courses it offers through diversity and global awareness courses. It recently hired a Director of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion who has already begun assessing the institution and has created some initiatives for the campus.
2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

2.A - Core Component 2.A

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

The “Statement of Expectation of Board Members” lays out expectations for ethical conduct by members of the Board of Regents in areas of conflict of interest, financial disclosures, confidentiality, etc. Similarly, the board’s “Code of Ethics” describes “Standards of Conduct” in regard to conflict of interest, including nepotism. An “Employee Ethics/Public Records Management” brochure discusses policies regarding use of university resources, conflict of interest, and the like. The institution also has a “Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct Policy Statement,” which describes reporting requirements, confidentiality, protection against retaliation, etc., as well as protection for “whistleblowers” (“HR Whistleblower”). An Institutional Ethics Committee provides “consultation and advice” to members of the unclassified staff (“UW-Superior Unclassified Staff Handbook”). Checks on financial operations include internal audits, as well as requirements to report external sources of income (“Reporting Outside Activities”) and, in the case of employees with contract authority, to complete and submit a “Statement of Economic Interests.” The University of Wisconsin has a hotline that employees and others can use to report fraud and abuse. Faculty, staff, and students all have a voice in the operations of the institution through bodies such as the Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Senate, Distance Learning Advisory Board, and Student Government Association, including the Segregated University Fee Allocation Committee. The president of the SGA, in fact, regularly meets with the chancellor. In the student session during the site visit, several students reported opportunities for input on fees, faculty recruitment, the strategic plan, and more. Some of the students who attended this session sit on an advisory board that has direct communications with the academic dean. UW-Superior has a process for addressing academic misconduct. Students can find “Student Academic Disciplinary Procedures” online, and faculty can find guidance on enforcing the rules on academic misconduct in “A Guide to Handle Academic Misconduct for Instructors.” The “Undergraduate and Graduate Student Complaint Process,” available online, provides guidance for appealing a grade, as well as contact information for students who wish to file complaints about courses, discrimination, sexual misconduct, and other matters.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)
No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.B - Core Component 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.

**Rating**

Met

**Evidence**

UW-Superior publicizes its programs, faculty and staff, accreditation relationships, etc. through a variety of means. Its website (uwsuper.edu) features lists of majors, minors, concentrations, etc. Similarly, the UW-Superior catalog, which is available online, features lists of majors, minors, etc., along with a faculty directory. Other sources of information include the Admissions Viewbook, Admissions Visit Book, and Transfer Admissions Viewbook, all available in both hard copy and digital versions. The UW-Superior Catalog and Admissions website both describe admissions considerations, including both academic and non-academic considerations. The registrar’s website describes graduation requirements. The checklist in the Advising Syllabus makes it easier to visualize General Education requirements than the registrar’s website; UW-Superior may wish to post a checklist like this one on the website. The section of the catalog for the Office of the Bursar lists specific dollar figures for tuition and fees, as does the online “UW System Costs.” The website for the Board of Regents describes the authority of the board in approving budgets, granting tenure, appointing chancellors, etc. The Human Resources website provides access to organizational charts for Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Student Affairs, University Advancement, etc., as well as policies regarding conflict of interest, break time for nursing mothers, the “Policy on the Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse Neglect,” etc. Both UW-Superior’s website and its online catalog note its HLC accreditation and list other accreditors, such as the Council on Social Work Education. It might be wise to include a link to accreditations in the “About” pop-up menu of the website to make this information more prominent. “University Accreditation and Licensure” provides information about UW-Superior’s licensure and exemptions in regard to online programs it can offer in other states. A “Web Publishing Policy” covers consistency in design, accessibility requirements, etc., and “Website Content Ownership and Oversight” discusses ownership of webpages, appropriate images and language, etc. Finally, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes data related to persistence, retention, and graduation, as well as information about participation in learning communities, service-learning, etc. from NSSE. Interviews with various constituents validated that information was used in decision-making and relied upon as a valid source by all stakeholders for referrals and actions.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
2.C - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The “Statement of purpose and mission” and “Responsibilities” sections of Chapter 36 of the Wisconsin Statutes testify to the commitment of the Board of Regents to serve the mission of education and research, particularly the “search for truth.” Minutes from Board of Regents meetings show discussions of legitimate matters of concern to internal and external stakeholders. Minutes from 2016, for instance, describe discussions of post-tenure review, time to degree, and the budget, including fee increases and revenue. Expectations to avoid conflicts of interest and file financial disclosure statements help protect Board members from “undue influence” by external entities. Wisconsin State Statute 36.09(3)(a) delegates to chancellors of the UW institutions the role of “executive heads of their respective faculties and institutions” and gives the faculty “the primary responsibility for advising the chancellor regarding academic and educational activities and faculty personnel matters.”

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.D - Core Component 2.D

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

Rating

Met

Evidence

The evidence suggests that UW-Superior is committed to truth and expression. The description of the mission of the UW system in Chapter 36 of the Wisconsin Statutes explicitly refers to such a commitment, saying, “Basic to every purpose of the system is the search for truth.” Furthermore, in Resolution 10600, dated December 11, 2015, the UW Board of Regents described “its commitment to the principle of academic freedom” and affirmed “its commitment to the principle of freedom of expression.” Evidence of UW-Superior’s own commitment to freedom of expression can be found in its mission statement, which says that the institution “embodies respect for diverse cultures and multiple voices,” as well as the “Professional Code of Ethics” in the institution’s Unclassified Staff Handbook and the University Pledge found in the UW-Superior Student Handbook. Faculty may file complaints in regard to academic freedom (or other matters) with the chancellor (who may delegate consideration of the complaint to the Faculty Personnel Council). Chapter 7 of the Unclassified Staff Handbook describes procedures for staff to seek informal resolutions or file grievances.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution’s policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior helps to ensure ethical and responsible research through the operations of its Institutional Review Board, which provides both expedited and full board reviews, depending on factors such as the inclusion of minors in a project. Faculty receive online training in IRB protocols, but there does not appear to be a system to confirm that each faculty member has completed the required training. The institution may want to develop some mechanism to provide this confirmation. Students who receive McNair fellowships receive training in ethical research conduct, and other students have the opportunity to learn about research ethics from their faculty mentors.

All students can find ample guidance in the use of source material in the Writing 102 requirement, Writing Center resources, a syllabus attachment, the online guide “Ethics in College Writing” (sponsored by the Office of International Programs), and library webpages on copyright and fair use. Faculty have access to “A Guide to Handle Academic Misconduct for Instructors” (available online). Distance Education students are required to secure proctors for exams taken off campus. Because no faculty members are receiving federal funding for research on invertebrates, the institution is not required to have an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, but a proposal to establish an IACUC has been drafted.

Information related to handling of academic honesty and integrity flows from policies at the UW system level. These policies are contained in the UW-Superior Student Handbook and include both the policies for academic honesty and non-academic situation integrity. The enforcement is also described. As a part of the Federal Compliance review it was noted that there were no complaints related to management of disciplinary actions for academic honesty/integrity issues although the campus has had to follow-up on 27 Title IX complaints during the past four years.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

Evidence

The evidence gathered from the assurance argument, documentation, and site visit make a persuasive case for the UW-Superior’s integrity, transparency, autonomy, as well as its commitment to freedom of expression, pursuit of truth, and ethical research practices. Students, staff, and faculty have ample opportunities to offer input into the direction and financial operations of the institution.
3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

3.A - Core Component 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 undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, 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).

Rating

Met

Evidence

The UW-Superior has degree programs that are appropriate to higher education and the institution's mission. The institution has a process to review relevance of curriculum through the catalog update process. The general education course work (reframed as University Studies) is appropriate to the liberal arts mission of the college.

The institution has recently updated their general education student learning goals. While in the process of modifying the learning goals based on feedback from the previous HLC visit, the General Education Committee took the opportunity to review the general education program. It was through this process that the move to University Studies was researched, modified, and approved through governance structures. In addition graduate student learning outcomes and learning outcomes are present as well. Programmatic student learning outcomes are posted for each academic program on the institution's website.

The student learning outcomes are the same for courses taught in either the face-to-face, hybrid, or online formats and assessed in each mode of delivery. The online sections for the general education pilot assessments projects were included in the process.

The assurance argument mentions dual credit, but evidence on site revealed that very few courses (math) are being delivered in this format. The courses and dual credit faculty use a common syllabus with common student learning outcomes. The team cautions the institution to be mindful of the need to ensure common general education outcomes if dual credit is expanded to other programs.

Interviews with faculty and students validated that program quality and learning goals are consistent
across all modes of instructional delivery and all sections of courses. However, during the audit of syllabi for the Federal Compliance Review inconsistencies were found in some syllabi. To address that issue the Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs has already asked the Dean of Academic Affairs to audit all syllabi to assure they are consistent regarding type or mode of delivery; contain measurable learning outcomes; specify which shared learning goal the course is intended to address; contain sufficient detail of expected student engagement to support the assignment of credit hour and course level; and document course and program learning alignment. This assignment is to be completed by July 1, 2017 so that a process for quality assurance can be in place prior to the start of Fall 2017.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior has a general education that is appropriate to the liberal arts mission of the university. After the HLC visit four years ago, the General Education Committee took on the charge of revising the general education outcomes. During the research, mission revision, and discussion process, the committee realized that a modification of their general education process was necessary as well. The committee recommended a change to the University Studies Program and new general education outcomes which were approved through governance structures. The new outcomes were piloted and changes to courses in the first pilot group have occurred (changes to grading group work for example). The process has resulted in a course proposal form that requires faculty teaching in the University Studies Program to agree to the collaborative model, syllabi are required to have the outcomes and are now more consistent, and the committee works with the Assessment Committee to develop the rubrics used. The team would like to recognize the collaborative, faculty led process that resulted in this change. We believe that the process has helped in shifting the assessment culture on campus in a positive direction. Since the University Studies Program requires a collaborative and integrated assessment process, the committee should make a concerted effort to put in place processes to ensure assessment practices are maintained in dual credit courses should those opportunities expand at the university.

Every degree engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information. These are represented in the Undergraduate Student Learning Goals and Outcomes and in the Graduate Student Learning Goals and Outcomes. These outcomes also incorporate elements of inquiry or creative work.
and skills to adapt to changing environments. In addition, the university also requires undergraduate students to take courses in a Diversity category and in a Global Awareness category.

There are three undergraduate minors that incorporate diversity: Global Studies, Gender Studies, and First Nations Studies. Courses in Special Education and Psychology also incorporate elements of diversity. The graduate learning goals reflect diversity and a course in graduate education directly relates to diversity.

Faculty contribute to scholarship and creative works. The tenure policy requires faculty to make contributions as a condition of the tenure process and faculty are reviewed annually by a UW-Superior process. The institution has committed to support for scholarly activity through grants for faculty development and scholarship. Although faculty are fully committed to active scholarly engagement, the heavy service workloads necessitated by recent state budget shortfalls and cuts have limited time available for productivity and resources to support some faculty release efforts.

The university provides students the opportunity to participate in research and creative work as well. One of the institution's high impact practices is Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity which provides students the opportunity to participate in research through programmatic curriculum. There is also a Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship which provides students the opportunity to participate in funded research. The McNair Scholars Program is also available to students at UW-Superior. In addition, students at UW-Superior have the unique opportunity to participate in research associated with the Lake Superior Research Institute, the Great Lakes Maritime Research Institute, the Transportation and Logistics Research Center, and the Lake Superior National Estuarine Research Reserve.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
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 qualified, 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.

**Rating**

Met

**Evidence**

The university has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty to provide effective instruction and non-teaching responsibilities required of faculty members. The stated faculty-to-student ratio is 16:1 which is comparable to peer institutions and well below that of the other universities in the UW system. The university has gone through turnover in faculty ranks in the past 5 years due to resignations and retirements. In the faculty session, it was mentioned that faculty are being asked to increase non-teaching duties to compensate for additional work with new initiatives and a lack of mid-level administrative staff. In addition, the university has recently undergone program prioritization and has had to endure state level budgetary cuts and tuition freezes. Despite this, it was very apparent in the faculty session that the faculty at UW-Superior are deeply committed to the students and their success.

Faculty maintain control of curriculum. Faculty curricular change or development moves from the department to the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council to the Senate. New programs require approval through administrative levels: Dean of Faculties and Graduate Studies, Provost, Chancellor, and/or the Board of Regents. Student learning outcomes are faculty driven and are available at the course level, and for general education and programs. The high impact practices associated with each program are also selected by faculty within the program.

UW-Superior has a policy to ensure minimum qualifications of faculty meet HLC guidelines and requires the policy be upheld with all faculty on campus, in consortial/contractual relationships, and
with faculty teaching dual credit courses. In addition the UW system has requirements for approval of dual credit faculty. All faculty files are maintained in the Dean's office.

Faculty are evaluated through student course evaluations and peer evaluations and the strategic plan uses the evaluation process to recognize excellence. There are policies that state expectations for promotion, review, tenure, and post-tenure review. Instructional academic staff are reviewed annually via procedures set out by human resources. The UW system maintains personnel rules that must be adhered to as well.

Faculty at UW-Superior are provided opportunities for professional development. Sessions have been held for development and training associated with the new general education learning outcomes assessment process, there are opportunities available through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, travel grants and faculty development grants are available, and there is a sabbatical process. The Distance Learning Center also offers funds to faculty for professional development in distance education. New faculty are mentored and are required to participate in Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Learning orientation. Finally, faculty development funds are included as part of the capital campaign. Faculty confirmed these opportunities in the open session.

Faculty are available to students. The institution requires faculty maintain 5 office hours per week. In discussions with students, many mentioned that faculty are available for them and also mentioned that faculty 'get to know you' and that the faculty are very invested in their success. Faculty also mentioned that they are committed to the students and participate in activities outside of class: *residence halls with cookies*, campus events, field trips, etc.

Student support staff are adequately qualified for their positions. Instructional academic staff meet the faculty minimum qualifications policy, but their qualifications are different within the policy. Non-instructional academic staff are administrative positions with qualifications and expectations established through the Wisconsin Administrative Code for all universities in the Wisconsin state system. University staff have position descriptions with outlined requirements and credentials which follow guidelines outlined at the Wisconsin System level.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.D - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior provides student support services that meet the needs of the students. The institution has an Educational Success Center which provides support: TRIO, ADA services, tutoring, testing, and the bridge program. In discussions with students, the services here are widely used and well received. The university also provides services for minority students through the Office of Multicultural Affairs, First Nations Center, and the Office of International Programs. Students that utilize these services mentioned that they are helpful and provide opportunities that they would not have otherwise. The institution lists numerous other services available to students in their assurance argument and students affirmed their satisfaction with services that they have used.

There is support for the academic needs of students. The university has recently moved to a shared advising model to support students in completing academic programming. Students are placed into appropriate courses and programs with the assistance of the Admissions, Registrar's and Advising offices. Incoming students are tested for placement in math and English courses and summer SOAR sessions orient incoming freshmen and transfer students to the university. Also, as part of retention efforts, supplemental instruction has been implemented for courses that have shown difficult for students in the past.

The team would like to recognize the shared academic advising model as an example of a collaborative process that was fully vetted in the governance process. While the success of the program can only be evaluated at this point with student satisfaction survey data (98% of students satisfied with the process) and discussions with faculty and staff (the first cohort of students is now moving through), the team is confident that there is commitment and enthusiasm to move this change forward.
The university has an infrastructure and appropriate resources available to support effective teaching and learning. It is mentioned in the assurance argument that the technology infrastructure is in need of updating. It was also mentioned that IT department staff are stretched due to system level budgetary constraints. UW-Superior has included IT as an initiative through the Foundation. The library had a set-back a few years ago due to flooding, but the university is working diligently to recover lost materials. Despite this, the library maintains a collection of online databases and resources, and a well functioning interlibrary loan process.

Students are provided the opportunity to use research and information sources through research application courses, research methods courses, undergraduate research high impact practices integrated into academic programs, and research fellowships. The library provides support and learning opportunities to educate students in use of research resources and proper use of information.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.E - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior has a wide variety of co-curricular opportunities for its students: clubs, study abroad, career services, a leadership certificate, service learning, and undergraduate research. Many offices across campus also provide services for students: Campus Recreation, Residence Life, Multicultural Affairs, Veteran and Nontraditional Student Center, Athletics, Gender Equity Resource Center, and the First Nations Center. Students expressed satisfaction in their co-curricular experience both in climate surveys and in the on-site student session. Beginning in 2016 co-curricular activities were assessed for their contributions to the achievements of the student learning outcomes through an Assessment Day hosted by the Dean of Students. Working with the Assessment Committee Chair these results are being integrated into the overall institutional assessment data.

In the assurance argument, UW-Superior outlines its community engagement through the Center for Community Engaged Learning. This center was mentioned as an example of a strategic plan initiative and as a use of data to drive decision making during the federal compliance session during the visit. The Center for Community Engaged Learning houses Academic Service-Learning and is co-located with career services and the undergraduate research program. It collaborates with the research centers, continuing education, credit-based internships, and all co-curricular community involved learning. The university hopes to achieve the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification by 2020.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Evidence

UW-Superior provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered. The university has degree programs that are appropriate to its mission and demonstrates learning skills integral to its programs. The university was charged by the HLC team four years ago with modifying general education outcomes to reduce redundancy. The new University Studies Program is the result of that charge, and the team commends the faculty for the collaborative, faculty-driven work that led to new outcomes and syllabi standardization for courses in the program. The undergraduate and graduate student learning outcomes reflect a commitment to diversity, communication, and inquiry.

The university provides a wide array of co-curricular activities for students, and the incorporation of six high impact practices into academic programming enhances student learning and success in the liberal arts tradition. The new shared advising model is supported by faculty and student services staff as seems, at this stage, to be satisfactory to students.

Finally, though budgetary issues at the system level have led to lean years on campus and a concomitant increase in non-teaching duties for faculty and additional duties for student services staff, the faculty and staff of the university are deeply committed to the success of the students, and it was readily apparent to the team during the visit.
4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

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.

4.A - Core Component 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, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
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).

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior has a regular process for program review. The UW system requires all system institutions to complete program review. The UWS has a template for completion, a timeline, and a council of the Senate that reviews the reports and a methodology to evaluate the process. UW-Superior also considers their annual review of student learning outcomes as part of their program review process. The team was able to view the guidelines, template, review cycle document, and submitted reports. The team would challenge the institution to consider adding in an external review to the program review process, maybe every other cycle.

UW-Superior has specific policies for awarding of credit through prior learning outlined in detail in
the catalog. UW-Superior awards credit via credit through portfolio (CTP), CLEP, DANTES, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and through department examination.

The institution also outlines the policy for transfer credits in the catalog for domestic and international credits. An individual at US-Superior, the Transfer Specialist, works with college departments on campus if an international course needs to be evaluated by the syllabus.

The institutions has an established process for setting and validating course prerequisites. Faculty, through councils of the Senate, control the setting of the prerequisites which when coded in PeopleSoft, prevents students from enrolling in a course without the prerequisite. Faculty have the authority to override a prerequisite. In addition, the catalog outlines degree requirements for graduate and undergraduate programs and outlines courses that meet the general education learning goals and graduate student learning goals.

The institution has a policy to govern faculty credentials which includes faculty teaching dual credit courses. Dual credit faculty must be approved by UW-Superior department faculty. UW-Superior assigns the dual credit faculty member an appropriate department supervisor. While the team was able to review the documents showing the approval process of individual dual credit faculty, there was no evidence provided for the assurance of student achievement, common student learning outcomes, or the supervisory relationship between the faculty members. The team suggests great care be taken in the future to include dual credit courses in the assessment of the general education outcomes and ensure that assessment data for the dual credit courses be provided to institutional faculty annually.

UW-Superior maintains external accreditation for music, social work, education, small business association, and music.

The institution evaluates the success of its graduates and has set goals toward graduate success within the strategic plan. The state legislature requires that UW institutions track the information and coordinate with a UW system office. The institution utilizes an alumni survey and maintains an impressive return rate. The alumni survey recently added questions based on student learning outcomes. The addition of learning outcomes has only recently been implemented with the graduate programs. These data will be interesting to review in the next assurance review.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*

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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior has established learning goals for its graduate and undergraduate programs, and those learning goals are posted on the program web pages. In addition, the general education program (University Studies Program) has student learning outcomes, and there are Graduate Student Learning Outcomes. The Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes have been mapped to the general education (University Studies) courses, and the first cycle of assessment for the outcomes has been completed. The cycle for program level assessment is referenced in the assurance argument and was affirmed in discussions with the Assessment Committee. Evidence of examples of how review of outcome data has helped programs close the feedback loop were also discussed.

The academic programs at UW-Superior are assessed via an annual assessment process on a three year cycle: a plan is submitted in the fall, the capstone course is assessed, data are reviewed in the summer and early fall of the following year, and the results are submitted. Once results are submitted, the Assessment Committee reviews the reports to provide feedback to the programs to improve assessment methodology. While this feedback loop is present, there is not yet a process in place to follow-up on suggested improvements resulting from assessment efforts. The committee expressed that it is their intention to complete the follow-up process, but they have only completed a single year in their 3 year cycle.

Though only one year has been completed it was clear to the team that the UW-Superior faculty have moved significantly in their assessment efforts in the last four years. The assessment of co-curricular learning has also shown significant progress in the last few years. The student services team have developed student learning outcomes based upon the institutional learning goals and there is a work week before each semester where assessment data are shared and successes celebrated. It was suggested to the Assessment Director that the assessment results for student services be shared more broadly with faculty to highlight how learning is taking place outside the classroom.

The current assessment process is integrated, and the general education learning outcomes have been
modified and mapped within general education courses. It is also apparent, based on discussions with the General Education Committee and the Assessment Committee, that a culture shift is beginning which is laudable. Though the institution has not completed mapping of high impact practices within all programs, and has not yet developed a process to track and follow-up with suggestions for improvement based on assessment results, the team expects, based on the momentum expressed in the meetings, that these will be completed before the reaffirmation visit.

While there is not an overwhelming list of academic program improvements based on assessment data currently available due to the single year of assessment results, the institution provided numerous examples of how assessment data are being used to drive decisions in other areas. The use of DFW data in a chemistry gateway course changed pedagogy and resulted in lower DFW rates. The supplemental instruction program has been successful and additional courses are set to be added. In addition, academic advising and other student services programs are being modified based on assessment results.

Finally, there is evidence that the assessment of student learning in retention areas are tied to the strategic plan and budgeting process. The tie of academic program assessment to the budgeting process is not readily apparent. The team suggests that a process be put in place to ensure that faculty can request budget dollars which are tied to improvement initiatives. The team also suggests that there be thought given to mechanisms which can be used to reward faculty for progress in meeting assessment goals (for example professional development, release time to help peers).

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
4.C - Core Component 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.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

The university has defined goals for persistence and completion that have been incorporated into the strategic plan. In addition, the institution has outlined (through a collaborative committee process) 12 retention initiatives to move the university forward with its retention goals. Discussions with the committee and other campus constituents reveal that faculty and staff are excited to finally be moving forward with many initiatives that were identified several years before. In addition, data have been gathered and analyzed on several of the initiatives (for example, DFW rates and Supplemental Instruction).

Retention, outcomes, and completion data have also been used to improve other initiatives across campus. Data associated with first and second year retention rates and NSSE data were used to inform the decision to create the Center for Community Engaged Learning. Analysis of DFW rates in Chemistry were used to modify the gateway course and course delivery. Supplemental instruction was used along with increased tutoring and the addition of extra student learning material placed in the learning management system to significantly reduce the DFW rate for the course. Administration intend to review credits to degree to help department evaluate academic programs as they have recognized that a few programs have higher than expected credit requirements. Administration is also analyzing course schedule times due to advising data as it was recognized that students had scheduling conflicts that resulted in students not carrying full loads which is a retention issue.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)
No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

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.

Evidence

UW-Superior has made significant progress in the assessment of student learning in the last four years. The institution has revised its general education outcomes as required, assessed the first of the gen ed outcomes in their cycle, and mapped the gen ed outcomes to the general education courses. They have also begun to systematize the programmatic assessment process and have completed a year in the three year program assessment cycle. The co-curricular assessment process is also moving forward and having a meaningful impact on student learning in these areas.

The team was very impressed, not just with the progress that has been made in areas charged by the HLC team 4 years ago, but also with the momentum toward a positive culture shift. Though progress has been significant, the institution should not slow momentum as there are still activities required to achieve a higher level of assessment success.
5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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.

5.A - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW- Superior has been faced with a number of fiscal challenges in the last four years related to the shrinking system budget and declining funding to the institution as a part of the allocation process and the mandated tuition freeze at the state level. In order to address the issues around resource needs and effective resource planning, the Chancellor and the senior leadership team have used a number of strategies to make the most efficient use of all of the resources available to the campus. These strategies have included program prioritization, outsourcing of the bookstore which has taken the campus from an annual deficit of approximately $290,000 to surplus revenue of about $100,000, outsourcing of janitorial and grounds crew services, retirement buyout packages, and efforts to recruit and retain additional students through improved enrollment retention efforts and a focus on meeting student needs.

Although one of the ongoing concerns at UWS is the budget impact in the State of Wisconsin from ongoing mandated tuition freezes and declining resource allocations to the UW system that have resulted in decreased resources to the campuses, dedicated faculty and staff and a student centric mission assure programs are delivered as verified in interviews with faculty, staff and students.

This is the second year of an Integrated Budget Planning Process that is tied to the institutional
strategic planning priorities and UWS is working hard to improve both its methodology and to fund initiatives that will help it achieve strategic goals. One of the areas of consultation requested was how to improve the methodology so that not only does the process recognize budget growth opportunities but also allows the institution to stay on top of areas for program prioritization if program enrollments decline or programs become obsolete in the current educational environment. Suggestions were made to the budget group to include enrollment, retention and graduation metrics in the budget request information data to help inform decisions and make referrals to other campus committees if indicated.

Conversations with leadership staff validated the qualifications of key personnel. Questions about the use of interim leadership and mid-level administrative personnel were addressed and reflected financial decisions not to hold full external searches during times of limited budgets. The processes of appointments were explained and reflected fit with institutional needs and priorities. Permanent hires were made only after an approved and open advertised search.

The UWS Director of Budget provides well developed budget reports to key stakeholders on a regular basis. These reports allow careful tracking of the institution's financial position. In addition the Director of Budget sits on the system committee that is selecting a system wide software package for tracking budget.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
5.B - Core Component 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 governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

2. 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.

3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior is a part of the University of Superior System and as such is governed by both the policies and procedures of the system and through the power delegated to the Chancellor through the system President and Board of Regents. This process was affirmed during an interview with the President of the UW System and the Regent assigned primary oversight for UW-Superior. The President explained in great detail the role of the system in helping the institutions in navigating through the state budget crisis and how system level reserves have been used to even the playing field for smaller campuses with fewer resources. For example during the 2016 spring floods, the system provided resources to cover the losses to library and infrastructure that were not covered by insurance and to forgive significant campus debt. These actions when combined with the hard work of the campus validated both top down and bottom up processes involved in governance actions at the institution.

The system administration also reflected on the fact that the President and Board set broad policy and expect that the implementation of policy will vary based on the unique attributes of each campus. The BOR and President have full confidence in the UW-Superior Chancellor and she has demonstrated her ability to work collaboratively with her campus to engage internal stakeholders and the community in the institution's strategic planning process and with a variety of campus stakeholders including faculty, staff, students, and administrators in planning for both the Wisconsin fiscal realities of the 2010-2016 budget periods and the resultant challenges for the campus including program prioritization, restructuring, and some outsourcing in order to achieve the shared strategic goals of a student centric campus.

The President and Chancellor also recounted how the system was able to help the campus after the floods of spring 2012 by forgiving the debt for the infrastructure repairs and some of the other accumulated debt for capital improvements in 2016. This systems campus infusion allowed for a focus on the restructuring of operational costs without having to factor in old outstanding campus
During interviews with campus constituents they described the ways in which faculty, academic support staff, administrators, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort. For example, the Assessment Committee described the process by which units set the program learning outcomes and identified appropriate courses in which general education learning outcomes could be assessed. These processes and results are described in great detail in Criterion Four. However, the way in which a variety of stakeholders are engaged in both setting the parameters and closing the feedback loop with the data, shows diverse campus involvement in data-driven decision making.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
5.C - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

UW-Superior embarked on a formal process linking budget to its strategic planning priorities three years ago and is now entering the third year cycle using this process. Members of the institution's planning and budget committee have refined their process over each of the past cycles to try and make the links to strategic priorities as clear as possible without the onerous process of zero-based budgeting at a time when resources are as restricted as they have been and the campus has also been engaged in converging processes of program prioritization, outsourcing of some services, and a number of other activities to preserve core focus on serving students. As one of the committee members articulated, the budgeting to priorities has merely been moving small sums of funds around the edges rather than an ability to invest significantly in priorities.

Despite the perception that the budgeting process linked to strategic priorities has only been able to provide limited funds to test new initiatives, the results of these test strategies as presented to the team have been amazing and have helped the campus figure out what is working and what is not working particularly as the programs use assessment data to drive program improvement. For example, one of the programs used a study of its DFW data and proposed Supplemental Instruction to improve student persistence. A pilot project was funded and appears to have yielded positive results. Additional funds are being included to grow the program because the retained student tuition is significant and the program meets the core mission of the University. On the other hand the group provided examples of unsuccessful projects that were not continued.

It was very apparent in all meetings on the UW-Superior campus that all stakeholders have worked very hard together to get past the fiscal upheavals of the past four to six years. All groups that the Team interacted with during the visit talked about the challenges of the environment, but ironically the blame was not placed on campus administrators but rather on the lack of legislators who really understood higher education in the state and particularly the challenges of a campus trying to meet the
needs of largely first in their families to attend college. Faculty and staff alike were willing to work hard, even for the low salaries they felt they earned relative to some other states and bigger campuses, because of the real commitment to their students. Conversely, the students celebrated their faculty. The one challenge faculty did see was the ability to recruit and retain junior faculty, particularly if the financial challenges continued. The Chair of the Faculty Senate indicated that the biggest faculty losses had been from not yet tenured faculty and those who just didn't have time to do their research. On the other hand one of the junior faculty in a discipline of one said he enjoyed the ability to be academically creative because he was a discipline of one. These somewhat conflicting data points reflect the perceived strength and unification of the campus after a lot of hard work. Most are still asking questions like "how can we do this better and more effectively" not questions like "can we stop doing this?" In fact, the Team did not hear a single voiced complaint about the work that had been done to ready the campus for the visit.

As previously described in the report, external constituency needs are considered and there is real evidence of connection between the campus and its communities that has now been formalized in the Center for Community Engaged Learning. This Center is a campus source of pride.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
5.D - Core Component 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.

Rating

Met

Evidence

As documents in the Addendum clearly reflect, UW Superior has made very significant progress in its journey to improve its overall institutional effectiveness in the last four years. The Team saw evidence of a fully integrated Strategic Planning process that engaged the entire campus and external stakeholders. There was evidence presented in almost every interview and group meeting that validated the collection of robust sets of data, the analysis of that data by a variety of stakeholders, and the use of the data to inform campus decision-making about operations, budgets, program prioritization, and strategies to achieve institutional goals.

The four main initiatives in the strategic plan are summarized as student experience, thriving partnerships, achieving excellence, and resource management. Monthly email updates help the entire campus to track progress on its initiatives reflecting the transparency that was witnessed firsthand onsite.

Although the campus does not yet have all of the necessary metrics in place to monitor and measure everything it sees as a key indicator of performance, it is clear that the campus is actively engaged in the process of transformation and is capable of continuing the journey without continuous oversight. The Team would expect to see a mature process in place at the time of the reaffirmation visit.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

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.

Evidence

UW Superior has made a significant transformation in the past four years and has become a forward-looking institution. It uses its human resources effectively to create structures that allow the institution to design processes that are collegial, collaborative and data-drive. The processes that are in place and those that are being refined to reflect results of data allow UW Superior to improve the quality of its educational programs, respond to future opportunities and challenges, and probably most importantly to come together as a campus to create a shared vision for the future of the institution under the leadership of its Chancellor.
## Review Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.A</td>
<td>Core Component 1.A</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B</td>
<td>Core Component 1.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.D</td>
<td>Core Component 1.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.S</td>
<td>Criterion 1 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.B</td>
<td>Core Component 2.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.C</td>
<td>Core Component 2.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.D</td>
<td>Core Component 2.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.E</td>
<td>Core Component 2.E</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.S</td>
<td>Criterion 2 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.A</td>
<td>Core Component 3.A</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.C</td>
<td>Core Component 3.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.D</td>
<td>Core Component 3.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.E</td>
<td>Core Component 3.E</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.S</td>
<td>Criterion 3 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.S</td>
<td>Criterion 4 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Core Component 5.A</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.B</td>
<td>Core Component 5.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.C</td>
<td>Core Component 5.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.D</td>
<td>Core Component 5.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.S</td>
<td>Criterion 5 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Summary

Conclusion

UW Superior demonstrated significant progress since its last interaction with HLC. There is clear evidence that the campus and its constituents have embraced a culture of assessment, incorporated assessment of general education with integration of the analysis of data, and closing the loop with the first cycle of results and improvements, and has moved to an integrated planning and budgeting model where budgeting is based on strategic priorities. The team was impressed with the improvements noted and the overall campus culture encountered. In light of these findings the team believes that UW Superior is able to progress without HLC monitoring until its next Comprehensive Visit.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation
Met

Sanctions Recommendation
No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation
Not Applicable to This Review

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

**Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components**

The team reviews each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution’s ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

This worksheet is to be completed by the peer review team or a Federal Compliance reviewer in relation to the federal requirements. The team should refer to the *Federal Compliance Overview* for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation.

The worksheet becomes an appendix in the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

Institution under review: University of Wisconsin-Superior

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

- [ ] Evaluation team
- [ ] Federal Compliance reviewer

**To be completed by the Evaluation Team Chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:**

Name: Linda F. Samson

☑️ I confirm that the Evaluation Team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.
Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition
(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*. Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
   - Identify the institution’s principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution’s Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
     - Associate’s degrees = 60 hours
     - Bachelor’s degrees = 120 hours
     - Master’s or other degrees beyond the bachelor’s = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor’s degree
   - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
   - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
   - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.

2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

UW-Superior’s Academic Policy 1127 matches best practice and federal definitions. The courses and programs are aligned with credit given to similar courses at other institutions. Most course syllabi, overall, lack consistency in format, presentation of course descriptions across different sections, and/or articulation of goals/objectives/outcomes. The syllabi reviewed by the Federal Compliance Reviewer lacked sufficient detail to provide evidence that individual courses are consistently in compliance with campus policy.

However, by the time the team arrived on the campus there was already evidence of attention to this issue. Therefore the suggested interim report on consistency of expectation of syllabi to contain measurable learning outcomes that are similar across different instructors and modalities, learning outcomes that scaffold to program learning outcomes to ensure program alignment, and sufficient detail of expected student learning engagement to support the assignment of credit hour and course level will communicate expected student learning and engagement, and document course and program learning alignment has already been addressed and will be completed by the campus before the start of the fall 2017 term. Given UW-Superior’s attention to all of the issues...
previously outlined in HLC guidance and the dedication with which the campus and its administration has tackled each issue, the team was convinced that additional external monitoring is not required and the campus can be trusted to make the necessary changes.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints
(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

   - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
   - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
   - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
   - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
   - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   - [x] The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - [ ] The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

UW-Superior publicizes the procedures for student complaints through its website (https://www.uwsuper.edu/provost/universitywide/uw-complaint-process.cfm), its catalog, and its student handbook (https://www.uwsuper.edu/studentconduct/policies/index.cfm). The process to manage complaints appears to allow for due consideration by the person closest
to the issue, with appeal beyond that level if the student felt that their complaint was not addressed appropriately. The policies provide a timeline for the initial complaint for course grade appeals, but are silent on the time the petitioner or the responder can utilize to proceed to the next level or provide a response. Clarification of the expected timeline might benefit both the student and the institution when discerning “next steps” in an appealing process.

A review of the provided complaint summary reveals a larger number of student grade appeals in the Spring 2016 semester and a trend toward increased complaints regarding Title IX. Tracking of complaints is occurring, although the presented information lacks details related to the level of resolution that was achieved.

The documentation also lacks details of the use of complaints in improvement process. Specific examples should be provided of how the review of complaints has resulted in improvement of processes or procedures, policy communication or clarity of expectations. There is a semi-annual review process at the level of senior administration that has just been implemented so there is an expectation that more formalized review processes and documentation of how the review of complaints allows the institution to improve institutional effectiveness will occur after the next series of reviews have taken place. Data available onsite validated that there has been ongoing process improvement over the past 18 months and that information is being shared across units. Redacted letters replying to students filing complaints were reviewed onsite and were both timely and appropriate to the issues cited in the grievance.

Additional monitoring, if any:

**Publication of Transfer Policies**
(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
   - Review the institution’s transfer policies.
   - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.
   - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
   - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreements.
agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.

- Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The UW-Superior website easily navigates to appropriate information for undergraduate students considering transferring courses or programs into the institution. Links within will take students to specific institutional agreements, the UW transfer site, the transfer policy, as well as providing information regarding credit for work experience and for military learning. The transfer policies are presented in the course catalog and on the institution’s website. The publically-presented information aligns with institutional policy AP 1204, as provided in Appendix D.

A review of the graduate transfer policy reveals less information available for the student through the website. FAQS provides the general policy of accepting 9 hours of relevant credit toward the program of study, but no other details were to be easily found within the graduate website. The information aligns with AP1115G (presented in Appendix D). Using the website search feature I could find the petition form for transferring graduate credit. The institution may want to make this information more readily available to graduate students.

Additional monitoring, if any:

**Practices for Verification of Student Identity**
(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students’ privacy.
• Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution’s approach respects student privacy.

• Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

UW-Superior provides students with unique usernames and requires secure passwords. The institutional and System policies expect the student to abide by academic integrity policies that would ensure secure use of these identifiers. Five distant courses require proctored exams; this information is communicated to students prior to enrollment.

Although the institution meets the current requirements for ensuring student identity in online courses, UW-Superior may be advised to keep abreast of advancing technological processes to provide additional mechanisms of ensuring student identity; some of the technology is relatively cost-efficient and adds an additional level of ensured-integrity in online programs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities
(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.

• The team should verify that the following requirements are met:

  o General Program Requirements. The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities.
• **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department’s review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)

• **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.

• **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.

• **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

• **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

• **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC’s website for more information.)
Consortial Relationships. The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC’s website for more information.)

- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution’s compliance or whether the institution’s auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution’s compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
- If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
- If issues have been raised concerning the institution’s compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution’s ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (Core Components 2.A and 2.B).

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

The last presented audit for federal financial aid compliance was in 2011. Several items were identified, focusing on internal controls over student payroll processing and compliance with FWS regulation, return of financial assistance funds, Perkins Loans collections, reconciliation procedures, etc. The institution agreed with most of the findings and implemented appropriate changes, and provided rationale for the one area in which they disagreed. Several areas of separation of duty were identified, and UW-Superior noted that an additional position in financial aid “had been requested and was being considered.” No recent areas of concern are presented. The additional position in financial aid was approved and has been filled. A date for the next audit has not yet been set.
The loan default rates for year 2 (2012) are higher than the 4-year public default rates (UW-Superior is 8.1%; 4-year public is 7.6%) but their Year three rate and Year 1 rates are below the peer average. The institution is encouraged to continue to provide loan counseling and reach-out to those borrowers with delinquent status.

The Cleary Safety and Fire Safety report is thorough and well done. Finding this information on the website might be a challenge for prospective students and their parents. One needed to click Campus Life – Services – Safety – Annual Report – Annual Report (again, on a different page) - then either click on the report or the statistics link.

Information regarding student right to know is present in different places on the campus website. Fast Facts within the About Us section has some of the information, other information is presented within the Fact Book, which is not readily found on the website (see Publication of Student Outcome Data below). Processes for withdrawing are found within the college catalog. Financial Aid policies and Tuition/fees disclosures are easily reached through Admissions – Financial Aid links from the main webpage. Academic programs and faculty can be found through the institution’s website. A search of the website revealed a Disabilities Services site with appropriate information; a click through Academics – Academic Support – Educational Success Center – Disability Support Services also took me to the appropriate page. A web search for Study Away led to the appropriate site with information regarding resources, financing, etc., but I was unable to find this through clicking on front page links. The Federal Compliance Reviewer could not find on the institution’s website disclosure of athletic participation/equity, graduation and completion rates.

Satisfactory academic progress policy is available through admissions – policies – satisfactory academic progress policy clicks from the institution’s main page.

UW-Superior presents the information that should be conveyed to the public, but a search of the website does not readily bring that information into access. Overall, navigating through the website for prospective student application, tuition and fees, and programs is easy. Finding appropriate disclosure information for success rates, default rates, athletic equity and completion, etc. is difficult and should be addressed. This issue should have a simple resolution that can be quickly remedied.

In fact by the time the team arrived on site, the Interim Provost had already written a memo indicating how this issue was to be resolved and by whom with a due date for completion. In light of the campus attention to the issue, the Team does not believe that interim monitoring is required.

**Additional monitoring, if any:**

---

**Required Information for Students and the Public**
(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Academic programs; institutional, program, and course fees; and policies regarding admissions, enrollment, satisfactory progress, etc. are readily attainable through UW-Superior’s website, course catalog, and student handbook.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information
(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

   • Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.

   • Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.

   • Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.

   • Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Institutional and specialized accreditation information is provided in the UW-Superior website and in the college catalog under the respective programs. UW-Superior assigns responsibility for ensuring accuracy for advertising and recruiting materials through the University Marketing and Communications division, in association with admissions, the registrar’s office, the bursar, financial aid, and office of institutional effectiveness. A review of the website, catalog, and provided recruiting materials indicates a consistency of information.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.

   • Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.

   • Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:
UW-Superior collects data and states that this data is analyzed by various programs and departments on campus, including the academic programs, offices with specific student population focus, and financial aid, etc. Numerous examples were provided onsite of how this information has driven improvements within academic programs, planning, assessment, institutional effectiveness, etc. The data the institution states that it collects has been shown to provide meaningful information for decision-making. The Visit Team verified that the data has driven decisions and produced results for the campus. It is very clear that the campus has institutionalized its assessment processes.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Publication of Student Outcome Data**  
(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
   - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution’s website—for instance, linked to from the institution’s home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
   - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - ☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - □ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - □ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - □ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

**Rationale:**

Entering UW-Superior’s website through the front page, the Federal Compliance Reviewer could not find student outcome data within three clicks for the graduate or the undergraduate programs. "A ‘Superior Facts’ link under ‘About UW-Superior’ leads to a summary of some institutional effectiveness data." Web searches for “Fact Book” and “Retention” yield links to the appropriate information, but the information does not seem to be readily accessible to incoming students or their parents unless they know the terms to use. The data found appears to focus on the undergraduate programs; The Federal Compliance Reviewer did not
find graduate program data. The institution states that it does have this and other data….adding appropriate links on the front page, or within the undergraduate or graduate launching pages, should be relatively simple fix for this concern. After discussions with the ALO, a memo was received and is included in the Addendum indicating how this information will be corrected and the responsible party. Given the attention the campus has shown to correcting identified problems, the Team feels certain that the corrections to the web site will be made without additional monitoring required particularly since the information is present just not currently well organized.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies
(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
- Verify that the institution’s standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
- Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution’s capacity to meet HLC’s Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

UW-Superior has institutional accreditation through HLC, which is appropriately documented on its website and in its catalog. Specialized accreditation occurs for programs in social work, music, teacher education, and small business development centers. These accreditations are appropriately indicated on the institution’s website (both in the accreditation page and in respective department pages, as appropriate) and in the college catalog.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment
(FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

   Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team’s review of the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the assurance section of the team report.

   • Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution’s notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

   • Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ✓ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

   □ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   □ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   □ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:
UW-Superior published print and electronic notifications regarding the HLC visit and opportunity for public comment, as appropriate.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement  
(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)
   - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
   - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.
   - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students’ mastery of tasks to assure competency.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - [ ] The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - [ ] The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Not applicable

Additional monitoring, if any:
Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

- Provided materials in Appendices, including College Undergraduate Catalog and the 2015-2016 Course Schedule.

- Requested course syllabi
  - ACCT 201 (3 offerings - different instructors, modalities, and terms)
  - BIOL 100 (4 offerings – different instructors, modalities, and terms)
  - BIOL 130 (1 offering)
  - BIOL 305 (1 offering)
  - BIOL 440 (1 offering)
  - BIOL 491 (Policy for Student Research/Independent Study)
  - BUS 211 (2 offerings – different terms)
  - COUN 752 (1 offering)
  - COUN 756 (1 offering)
  - EDAD 741 (1 offering)
  - EDAD 820 (1 offering)
  - GEOL 110 (2 offerings – different instructors and terms; one a 3-week summer term)
  - GEOG 100 (1 offering)
  - HHP 102 (5 offerings - different terms, modalities)
  - HTH 469 (2 offerings – different modalities, terms)
  - HIST 212 (1 offering)
  - MATH 095 (2 offerings - different terms)
  - TED 279 (2 offerings - different terms)
  - SPED 481 A (1 offering)
  - WRIT 102 (9 offerings – different instructors, modalities, and terms)

- University of Wisconsin-Superior Website materials, including:
  1) student handbook,
  2) college graduate catalogs,
  3) Student complaint process,
  4) transfer credits and articulations,
  5) graduate programs,
  6) Accreditation page,
  7) Teacher Education page (for specialized accreditation information for teacher education program).
  8) 2017-2018 Course Offerings
Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: University of Wisconsin - Superior

Review the Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions
Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses
A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution’s calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

UW-Superior has a Fall and Spring academic term each of 15 weeks, summer college with various-length session, and a J-Term in January of three weeks.

The summer session schedule of courses reveal that courses are offered over a period of 3-, 4-, 8-, and 12-week sessions.

The J-term of 2018 offers 11 courses within the general studies program, through face-to-face (Art 101 and ART 203), online (BIOL 100, COMM 110, MATH 095, MATH 112, MUSI 161, PHIL 151, POLS 230, and WRIT 209), or what appears to be a blended format for PSYC 101.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate
Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s calendar and term length practices?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions
Review Sections 2–4 of the Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team’s review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded. Review the Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses (Supplement A1 to the Worksheet for Institutions) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.

2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to Worksheet for Institutions, as applicable).

   • At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.

   • Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)

   • Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.
• Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to Worksheet for Institutions). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.

4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.

• For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

• At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.

• For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.

• Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.

5. Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs. Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.

6. Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation. With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to Worksheet for Institutions, consider the following questions:

• Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?

• Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?

• For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended
learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?

- Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution’s assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?

- Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?

7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:

- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.

- If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.

- If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

**Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours**

A. **Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team**

**COURSES:**

- ACCT 201 (3 offerings - different instructors, modalities, and terms)
- BIOL 100 (4 offerings – different instructors, modalities, and terms)
- BIOL 130 (1 offering)
- BIOL 305 (1 offering)
- BIOL 440 (1 offering)
- BIOL 491 (Policy for Student Research/Independent Study)
• BUS 211 (2 offerings – different terms)
• COUN 752 (1 offering)
• COUN 756 (1 offering)
• EDAD 741 (1 offering)
• EDAD 820 (1 offering)
• GEOL 110 (2 offerings – different instructors and terms; one a 3-week summer term)
• GEG 100 (1 offering)
• HHP 102 (5 offerings - different terms, modalities)
• HLTH 469 (2 offerings – different modalities, terms)
• HIST 212 (1 offering)
• MAT 095 (2 offerings - different terms)
• TED 279 (2 offerings - different terms)
• SPED 481 A (1 offering)
• WRIT 102 (9 offerings – different instructors, modalities, and terms)

PROGRAMS:
• Biology BA/BS (syllabi and catalog descriptions)
• Health & Wellness Management (catalog descriptions)
• Guidance & Counseling MSE (syllabi and catalog descriptions)
• Educational Administration Ed.S (syllabus and catalog descriptions – used online 2016-2017 graduate catalog)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

a. Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

The undergraduate and graduate catalogs provide a credit definition for credit load that identifies both face-to-face and online, as well as laboratory learning, studio credit, music ensemble, internship, and individualized study. This aligns with the AP1127 Policy on Credit Hour Definition accessed through UW-Superior’s website.

b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution’s policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

☒ Yes ☐ No
Comments:

UW-Superior’s Policy AP1127 articulates expected student engagement for credits earned, across multiple modalities of courses and learning experiences.

c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

Academic Policy 1127 relates credit earned across alternative formats and time frames.

d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

AP1127 aligns with the federal definition for credit hour assignment and aligns with higher education good practice.

2. Application of Policies

a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☐ Yes ☒ No

Comments:

The course topics within the academic programs are appropriate, and are within the appropriate credit offered at other institutions for these courses. Course syllabi were inconsistent in format and information provided. Many syllabi lacked sufficiently-detailed information regarding student assignments, topics to be covered, etc. to discern the amount of student engagement that would be expected within the course.

b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution’s policy on the award of credit?

☐ Yes ☒ No
Comments:

A review of syllabi from different sections, terms, and/or modalities reveals inconsistency in course descriptions and in articulation of goals and objectives. A few syllabi have sufficient learning objectives to ascertain that the students should be appropriately engaged for the level of the course and the credits assigned to the course. Most syllabi, however, lack learning objectives, content, and assessment methodologies to provide sufficient evidence that courses are taught at the appropriate credit level.

c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Comments:

Syllabi from a single course offered in different terms or modalities, or offered in sessions with different lengths, are generally similar. The general nature of the syllabi, without specific discussion of assignments or unit topics in some cases, provides minimal evidence to evaluate or support the assigned credit for the specific courses. The titles of the courses are appropriate for the credit assigned by UW-Superior when compared with similar courses taught by other institutions.

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Comments:

Many reviewed syllabi lack identified and measurable course outcomes or consistent course objectives, providing minimal evidence for specific comparison of course learning outcomes and student engagement expectations across different modalities or session timeframes. Several of the syllabi do have sufficiently detailed objectives, which provide some evidence that the assignment of credit is appropriate for those courses. However, the inconsistency across most courses does not provide evidence to support UW-Superior’s expectation for student learning outcome, for the credit awarded in that course.

e. Is the institution’s actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Comments:
The assigned credit hours for UW-Superior’s courses align with similar courses taught at other institutions. The class time for 3-week summer offerings provides sufficient learning time for the credits assigned to be met. The programs are appropriate in credit size, and the communication of expectation for student engagement are in the catalogs.

C. **Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate**

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded “no” to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

**Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s credit hour policies and practices?**

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No

**Rationale:**

Articulation of learning outcomes across different offering modalities and instructors will provide coherence and consistency in learning expectations for all students. Alignment of learning outcomes to scaffold toward the program learning outcomes will ensure degree coherence and will facilitate in assessing program effectiveness.

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

**Interim report on consistency of expectation of syllabi to contain measurable learning outcomes that are similar across different instructors and modalities, learning outcomes that scaffold to program learning outcomes to ensure program alignment, and sufficient detail of expected student learning engagement to support the assignment of credit hour and course level will communicate expected student learning and engagement, and document course and program learning alignment.**  DUE  May 31, 2019

D. **Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour**

**Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?**

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

**Identify the findings:**

UW-Superior’s policy matches best practice and federal definitions for credit assignment. Courses and programs at UW-Superior are similar to equivalent courses offered by other institutions, in student level, credit offerings, and course descriptions. Although many course syllabi lack sufficient detail to provide evidence supporting that individual courses are consistently in compliance with campus policy, the inconsistent evidence does not support systemic noncompliance but rather suggests a lack of attention to this core detail.

**Rationale:**
Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions
Review Section 5 of Worksheet for Institutions, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):

1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours
A. Answer the Following Questions

1. Does the institution’s credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

☐ Yes ☐ No
Comments:

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

Comments:

3. Did the team determine that the institution’s credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers “No” to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

   □ Yes  □ No  

   Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

   □ Yes  □ No  

   Comments:

   B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution’s credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

      □ Yes  □ No  

   C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

      Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s clock hour policies and practices?

      □ Yes  □ No  

      Rationale:

      Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:
**INSTITUTION and STATE:** University of Wisconsin-Superior, WI  
**TYPE OF REVIEW:** Standard Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation  
**DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:** Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation. Will include an interim report on learning outcomes assessment to be embedded in the Assurance Filing. The report should provide specific evidence to demonstrate the following: 1) That the University's assessment protocol is being employed systematically across the institution for both General Education and academic programs; 2) That assessment data is being systematically collected, reviewed and analyzed; and 3) That data derived from learning outcomes assessment is being systematically employed to generate appropriate change in curricula or programs. Comprehensive Evaluation to include a Federal Compliance Reviewer.  
**DATES OF REVIEW:** 4/24/2017 - 4/25/2017  

- [x] No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

**Accreditation Status**

**Nature of Institution**

- **Control:** Public  
  **Recommended Change:**

**Degrees Awarded:** Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Specialist  

**Recommended Change:**

- **Reaffirmation of Accreditation:**
  - **Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation:** 2012 - 2013  
  - **Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation:** 2022 - 2023  

**Recommended Change:**

**Accreditation Stipulations**

**General:**  
Prior Commission approval is required for substantive change as stated in Commission policy.  

**Recommended Change:**
Additional Location:
Prior HLC approval required.

**Recommended Change:**

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:
Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

**Recommended Change:**

**Accreditation Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Pathway</th>
<th>Standard Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommended Change:**

**Upcoming Events**

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2022 - 2023

**Recommended Change:**

**Monitoring**

Upcoming Events
None

**Recommended Change:**

**Institutional Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degrees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses
None

Recommended Change:

Additional Locations
None

Recommended Change:

Distance Delivery

09.0101 - Speech Communication and Rhetoric, Bachelor, BS in Communicating Arts
13.0401 - Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Master, MS in Education-Educational Administration
13.1001 - Special Education and Teaching, General, Master, MS in Education-Special Education
13.1202 - Elementary Education and Teaching, Bachelor, Bachelor's Degree, Elementary Education
13.1299 - Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Levels and Methods, Other, Master, MS in Education-Instruction
13.1315 - Reading Teacher Education, Master, MS in Education-Reading
24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Bachelor, Bachelor’s Degree, Individually Designed
24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Bachelor, Interdisciplinary Studies
24.0199 - Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities, Other, Associate, Associate Degree
30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Bachelor, BS in Sustainable Management
30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Certificate, Sustainable Enterprise Management Certificate
30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Certificate, Sustainable Management Science Certificate
30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Master, MS in Sustainable Management
31.0505 - Kinesiology and Exercise Science, Bachelor, BS in Physical Education, Exercise Science Concentration
51.0001 - Health and Wellness, General, Bachelor, BS in Health and Wellness Management

Recommended Change:

Correspondence Education
None

Recommended Change:
Internal Procedure

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Contractual Arrangements
None

Recommended Change:

Consortial Arrangements

30.3001 - Computational Science - Master - Collaborative Online Master of Science in Data Science (MSDS) - Collaborative Online Master of Science in Data Science (MSDS)

30.3301 - Sustainability Studies - Master - Master - 30.3301 Sustainability Studies (Master of Science in Sustainable Management) - UW-Green Bay, UW-Oshkosh, UW-Parkside, UW-Stout

30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other - Bachelor - Bachelor - 30.9999 Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other (BS in Sustainable Management) - Wisconsin Consortia Sustainable

51.0001 - Health and Wellness, General - Master - Collaborative Online Master of Science Degree in Health and Wellness Management (MS-HWM)

51.0001 - Health and Wellness, General - Bachelor - Bachelor - 51.0001 Health and Wellness, General (Bachelor of Science in Health and Wellness Management) - Wisconsin Consortia Health

Recommended Change: