



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411  
312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | ncahlc.org

April 18, 2012

Dr. Glenn D. Mroz  
President  
Michigan Technological University  
1400 Townsend Dr. Houghton, MI 49931-1295

Dear President Mroz:

Attached is the report of the team that conducted Michigan Technological University's Quality Checkup site visit. In addition to communicating the team's evaluation of your compliance with the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and the Commission's Federal Compliance Program, the report captures the team's assessment of your use of the feedback from your last Systems Appraisal and your overall commitment to continuous improvement.

I hope you will read and study the report carefully, because the team invested heavily in preparing for and conducting this visit, and its perceptions and advice are valuable to your institution. Please consider distributing it widely throughout your institution, since its positive feedback can be helpful in strengthening and broadening involvement in your quality improvement efforts.

A copy of the report will be read and analyzed by the AQIP Panel that reviews institutions for Reaffirmation of Accreditation at the time your review is scheduled. Prior to that review, we will send you a listing of the materials the Panel will consider, and give you an opportunity to update or supplement them if you so desire.

To comply with federal requirements, we need you, as CEO of your institution, to formally acknowledge receipt of this report within the next two weeks, and to provide us with any comments you wish to make about it. Your response will become a part of the institution's permanent record.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stephen D. Spanghel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial 'S'.

Stephen D. Spanghel  
Vice President for Accreditation Relations

# QUALITY CHECKUP REPORT

Michigan Technological University

Houghton, Michigan March  
14-16, 2012

## Quality Checkup team members:

**Dr. Katie DeBoer**

Director of Institutional Research

Minneapolis Community and Technical College at  
Pembroke

**Dr. Charles Harrington**

Professor of Management

The Higher Learning Commission

30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400 Chicago, Illinois 60602-2504

800-621-7440 • [www.ncahlc.org](http://www.ncahlc.org)

Academic  Quality Improvement Program

**Background on Quality Checkups conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement Program** The Higher Learning Commission's Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) conducts Quality Checkup site visits to each institution during the fifth or sixth year in every seven-year cycle of AQIP participation. These visits are conducted by trained, experienced AQIP Reviewers to determine whether the institution continues to meet The Higher Learning Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*, and whether it is using quality management principles and building a culture of continuous improvement as participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) requires. The goals of an AQIP Quality Checkup are to:

1. Affirm the accuracy of the organization's online Systems Portfolio and verify information included in the portfolio that the last Systems Appraisal has identified as needing clarification or verification (System Portfolio Clarification and Verification);
2. Review with organizational leaders actions taken to capitalize on the strategic issues and opportunities for improvement identified by the last Systems Appraisal (Systems Appraisal Follow Up);
3. Alert the organization to areas that need its attention prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation, and reassure it concerning areas that have been covered adequately (Accreditation Issues Follow Up);
4. Verify federal compliance issues such as default rates, complaints, USDE interactions and program reviews, etc. (Federal Compliance Review); and
5. Assure continuing organizational quality improvement commitment through presentations, meetings, or sessions that clarify AQIP and Commission accreditation work (Organizational Quality Commitment).

The AQIP peer reviewer(s) trained for this role prepare for the visit by reviewing relevant organizational and AQIP file materials, particularly the organization's last *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* and the Commission's internal *Organizational Profile*, which summarizes information reported by the institution in its *Annual Institutional Data Update*. The report provided to AQIP by the institution is also shared with the evaluator(s). Copies of the Quality Checkup report are provided to the institution's CEO and AQIP liaison. A copy is retained by the Commission for the institution's permanent file, and will be part of the materials reviewed by the AQIP Review Panel during Reaffirmation of Accreditation.



### **Clarification and verification of contents of the institution's *Systems Portfolio***

The team, in partnership with Michigan Technological University (MTU) leadership, established a framework for the visit that included engagement in dialogue, reflection, exploration and learning for campus constituents and stakeholders. The framework set the tone for meetings with students, faculty, administrators, Board of Control members, staff and others who are playing a part in the development and implementation MTU's quality initiatives.

Prior to the visit, MTU provided specific tools for team members to review including a Quality Program Summary, Federal Compliance Report, and copious web-based institutional data and information resources.

The University's Quality Program Summary included:

- Organized opportunities (O's and OO's) into key categories; data/information management, targets, student support, governance, assessment, and planning
- Included feedback and progress comments
- Identified resources and actions taken for O and OO
- Related directly to strategic issues identified in the feedback report, to Action Projects and to other initiatives undertaken by MTU to meet its mission.

The institution demonstrated that the electronic filing of its systems portfolio included relevant links to policies that described processes overlooked in the feedback provided to the school. The institution also did attempt to answer every inquiry prompted by questions posed in the nine categories reviewed—a requirement no longer expected. Although these factors appear to have led to a reporting of more opportunities for action by the review team, the institution did find the total feedback helpful in focusing attention on the need to further imbed a culture of continuous improvement into their operations.

On the whole, MTU felt the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report was clear and presented an accurate reflection of the institution at the time it was written. The University intends to explore how it might further use its Systems Portfolio to enhance the development, implementation and understanding of the institution's strategic direction, the University's approach to quality, and how projects across the institution link systemically, and facilitate a more deliberate and encompassing approach to communication across the institution relative to quality improvement;; a theme that emerged during the visit.

In the team's judgment, Michigan Technological University presented ample evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.

**Review of specific accreditation issues identified by the institution's last Systems Appraisal**

No accreditation issues were identified in the last Systems Appraisal Feedback Report. All five Criteria for Accreditation are being met.

In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.

**Review of the institution's approach to capitalizing on recommendations identified by its last Systems Appraisal in the *Strategic Issues Analysis*.**

The Systems Appraisal Team identified the following strategic issues to assist Michigan Technological University in prioritizing and taking action on the important broad challenges and opportunities it faces:

1. The institution will be strengthened by identifying how degree programs contribute to identified institutional learning outcomes. Alignment between program outcomes and institutional outcomes will enhance the institution's ability to understand how the core curriculum and the degree programs provide an integrated learning experience. As the university's "schools" contribute comparative data, it will demonstrate all the university's program strengths.
2. Michigan Tech appears to operate more at a departmental or unit level rather than at a collegewide level when it comes to defining, planning, and implementing processes. It's unclear whether there is any sharing of best practices among departments/units or whether any college wide processes that impact upon all departments/units are in place. The institution has an opportunity to build systemic processes, using the most effective components of existing departmental/unit processes, to develop commonly understood and consistently implemented processes. As new college-wide processes are developed, data collection and analysis and use of data to determine appropriate improvements can be incorporated as necessary components of continuous process improvement.

3. Since Michigan Tech is currently revisiting and updating its strategic plan, the institution has an opportunity to more closely connect annual planning, Dashboard metrics, and its strategic plan so that each component is integrated into a comprehensive continuous improvement process.

In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met or is in the process of meeting this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.

### **Review of organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement**

There was evidence of the University's continuing commitment to systematic improvement:

- Broad participation in the Quality Checkup visit from multiple constituents, most of whom were clearly aware of the institutional commitment to continuous improvement and familiar with its concepts and tools,
- Meetings with the President and Provost, and the commitment and leadership of the Executive Team indicated a both a broad understanding and strong organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement,
- While there is ample evidence of organizational commitment to continuous quality improvement, including quality improvement initiatives that were not identified as institutional AQIP Action Projects, the institution has initiated training activities, planning activities, day-to-day operational activities, and performance reviews which collectively will reinforce and strengthen the development of an AQIP culture within the institution.

In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.

### **Other AQIP issues**

Discussion with internal stakeholders reveals that quality improvement initiatives would benefit significantly from more deliberate and inclusive communication across institutional units. It was felt by

campus constituents that the institutions is reasonably effective in top down communication regarding quality and various quality improvement initiatives, however communication across units is sparse and often incomplete. Of particular utility would be communication with addresses the closure and impact of completed quality projects and Kaizen events and anticipated future quality initiatives. The team also suggests that the institution find creative and novel ways to communicate and celebrate the successful completion and impact of quality initiatives.

The team believes the level of institutional performance relative to decision driven operational and strategic planning may be improved by re-structuring and aligning the University's institutional research and planning functions to better leverage the institution's quality system and processes. Focusing institutional resources on institutional effectiveness would provide the proactive research tools necessary to engage in environmental boundary scanning, policy analysis, trend analysis, and the standardization of data and information used for planning and decision making across campus.

The institution's ability to make timely and informed decisions supported by requisite institutional and environmental data is predicated on the availability, validity, and reliability of measures. Conversations with campus faculty, academic administrators, and University staff indicate varying levels of frustration with matters related to access, availability, usability, and reliability of institutional data. The Team suggests that the University should give thoughtful consideration to decentralizing data access by providing use-friendly data query and manipulation tools that would provide timeliness and flexibility to end users of institutional data. Furthermore, it was evident to team members that additional institutional attention should be directed to standardizing data definitions across campus functional databases and to establish data entry standards and protocols that might limit data entry errors and the resulting necessary effort to scrub and correct data before it use in analysis and reporting.

### **Appendix A Worksheet for The Evaluation Team on Federal Compliance Requirements**

*Instructions: The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. 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 appropriate sections of this AQIP Quality Checkup Report. This Worksheet must be completed for all Quality Checkup visits after January 1, 2012.*

### **Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team:**

MTU Student Handbook

MTU School of Business and Economics Degree Audit  
MTU *Academic Integrity* Policy  
MTU Student Code of Conduct  
MTU University Senate *Policy 14-03*  
MTU *International Student Transfer Credit* Policy  
MTU *Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources* Policy  
MTU Audited Fiscal Year Financial Statements, 2011-2007  
MTU A-13 Reports, 2011 – 2007  
MTU *Annual Security and Safety Report*  
MTU *Notice of Required Student Disclosures* Statement  
MTU *Satisfactory Academic Progress* Policy  
MTU *Classroom Attendance* Policy

### **Evaluation of Federal Compliance Program Components**

**1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition:** *The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). New for 2012: The Commission has a new policy on the Credit Hour. Complete the Worksheet in Appendix A and then complete the following responses. Attach the Worksheet to this form.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

  ✓✓   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

       The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Credits. Rules governing assignment of course credit hours are set by the *U.S. Department of Education*, and the *Michigan Department of Management and Budget*. For lecture and recitation courses, the rules are precise. One class meeting of 50 minutes per week is assigned one course credit. Universities are allowed considerable latitude for laboratory and field courses. General practice is that one credit may be assigned to laboratory sections ranging from 50 to 170 minutes (one to three "hours"), two credits for sections ranging from 170 to 230 minutes (three to four "hours"), and three credits for those ranging from 170 to 290 minutes (three to five "hours"). The variation in time-to-credit ratio is intended to reflect both the intensity of the laboratory experience and the time required out of class to develop reports. Field classes typically carry the same or fewer credits per class hour compared to laboratory classes since time is often spent in transit and in other relatively low intensity learning activities.

Degree Program Length. The number of credits for the bachelor's degree averages about 128 credits. Total credits required for each degree program is listed on the degree audit for the program for the appropriate year. The graduate school sets minimum degree requirements for all graduate programs, which are 30 credits beyond the bachelor's degree for the masters, and 30 credits beyond the masters for the doctorate. Individual programs may have additional requirements.

Tuition. Tuition is consistent across undergraduate programs, but non-Michigan residents are assessed at a significantly higher rate than Michigan residents. Tuition is consistent across graduate degree programs regardless of residency. Additional surcharges and fees apply for certain programs, including engineering and computer science, due to the higher delivery cost of delivery for these programs. The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**2. Student Complaints:** *The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints for the three years prior to the visit.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

✓✓ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Students have multiple avenues for registering varying types of complaints at Michigan Tech. The Student Commission, a campus-wide standing committee chaired by the Vice President for Student Affairs, meets regularly to address issues of concern to students. The Offices of the Dean of Students, Conduct Services, and Disability Services see students for a variety of concerns. Together, they assist students and categorize office visits into seven major areas: academic, financial, judicial, absence, disability, grievance and other. Total visits are compiled annually by category, type of visit, and year of student.

Michigan Tech's policy regarding academic grievances is stated in the Student Handbook. The Graduate School has a separate policy for handling graduate student grievances. Students are encouraged to seek informal resolution of their complaint by consulting with the University Ombuds Office. The Ombuds Office keeps no formal records of complaints. Academic departments deal with students grievances in their units; beginning in 2012, the Office of the Provost will review student grievances annually.

Other avenues for student complaints include:

- If a complaint concerns academic integrity, students are instructed to follow procedures in the Academic Integrity Policy,
- If a complaint concerns privacy issues (FERPA), students are instructed by the Student Handbook to file a complaint regarding privacy with the USDE,
- If a complaint concerns sexual discrimination, harassment or other affirmative action issues, students are advised to contact the Affirmative Programs Office. This office maintains a log of student complaints. Complaints of sexual assault are referred immediately to the Office of Public Safety.
- If a complaint concerns scientific misconduct, students are advised to contact the Office of Compliance, Integrity, and Safety,
- If a complaint concerns violation of Michigan Tech's Code of Community Conduct, students are advised to contact the Office of Student Conduct Services.

In addition to complaints, students have many opportunities to voice their concerns, as discussed in the University's *Systems Portfolio (3P1)*.

*The needs of current students are communicated by student advisory boards and focus groups in a number of areas including: academic units, the Career Center, the JR Van Pelt/Opie Library, Student Affairs, the Student Development Complex, the Student Commission, residence hall councils, Michigan Tech Student Foundation, Undergraduate Student Government, Graduate Student Council, Student Entertainment Board, and the Memorial Union Board. Through regular presentations by their representatives, or individual questions during the public comment part of the proceedings, students directly voice their needs to the Board of Control. They can also address counseling services, judicial affairs, and various other units through direct contact with Board members, staff, and faculty. Student employees also communicate the needs of the greater student body directly to their on-campus employers.*

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**3. Transfer Policies:** *The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

✓✓ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

       The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Michigan Technological University is committed to accepting the maximum allowable amount of credit transfer to facilitate the transfer of students to Michigan Tech. The university maintains a full-time Transfer Services Office for students intending to transfer credit.

Transfer credit evaluation is governed by University Senate Policy 14-03. Collegiate and non-collegiate sources of credit are evaluated as transfer credit when it has been determined that they meet accreditation standards, and that the student has demonstrated an acceptable level of performance. Transfer credit is granted for courses taken in which a grade of “C” (2.0) or better has been earned and where the courses are judged equivalent in content, length and prerequisites to Michigan Tech courses. Transfer credit from non-accredited post-secondary institutions must be authorized by the dean of the college or school. There is no limit to the number of credits transferred, but students must adhere to the residency credit requirement for graduation. All transfer credit awarded is recorded on the student’s transcript.

Policies and procedures for transferring credits from international institutions are described by International Programs and Services. The Graduate School allows a limited number of graduate credits to be transferred from other institutions; a limited number of courses taken as an undergraduate at Michigan Tech can be applied to a graduate degree.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**4. Verification of Student Identity:** *The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and has appropriate protocols to disclose additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM’S CONCLUSIONS:

  ✓✓   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends follow-up.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends follow-up.

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

Comments:

Online course content is only available to students enrolled in the specific online course, and accessed through the learning management system with their unique ISO (Initial Sign-on) login user ID and password. Students are expected to adhere to Michigan Tech's Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources, which includes a prohibition against disclosing passwords to others. The Student Handbook identifies computer use policies which outline the ethical expectations of MTU students as well as the consequences for violating these expectations.

Portions of the distance learning program integrate corporate (employer) partners who verify the student (employee) identity. Some examinations are proctored in a test center; a proctor agreement is signed by the student and proctor to verify the identity of the student. For student essays, faculty have access to anti-plagiarism software (Turnitin) to verify originality of written work.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**5. Title IV Program and Related Responsibilities:** *The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.*

- **General Program Requirements:** *The institution has provided the Commission 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 raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements:** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Two 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 the Commission with information about three years of default rates. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures:** *The institution has provided the Commission 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.** *The institution has provided the Commission 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 One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*

- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about 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.*
  
- **Contractual Relationships:** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (The institution should review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's Web site for more information. If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not completed the appropriate Commission Contractual Change Application the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible.)*
  
- **Consortial Relationships:** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships (The institution should review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's Web site for more information. If the team learns that the institution has such a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not completed the appropriate Commission Consortial Change Application the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible.)*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

  ✓✓   The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

       The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Financial composite ratios were submitted to HLC in March 2011 and were included as an appendix to the University's *Federal Compliance* report. No comments or concerns were raised by the Commission.

Michigan Tech received an unqualified opinion in response to the financial audit for fiscal year 2011. Audited Fiscal Year Financial Statements for fiscal year 2011 and prior years are available at <http://www.admin.mtu.edu/acct/reports/audited.php>.

The A-133 Report for 2011 and previous years is available at <http://www.admin.mtu.edu/acct/reports/a133.htm>. The auditors did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that they consider to be material weaknesses.

Michigan Technological University's cohort default rates are significantly below national average for public universities (FY2009 7.2%, FY2008 6.0%) as well as private universities (FY 2009 4.6%, FY2008 4.0%).

All Required Student Disclosures are reported on Michigan Tech's website at <http://www.mtu.edu/student-affairs/interests/student-disclosure/>. In compliance with the Clery Act, the university publishes an Annual Security & Fire Safety Report that contains three years of campus crime statistics.

All information required by Title IV, such as graduation rates by gender, ethnicity, Pell Grants, etc., are reported on Michigan Tech's website at <http://www.mtu.edu/student-affairs/interests/student-disclosure/>.

Michigan Tech clearly states its policies for Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance on its website. Undergraduate Academic Progress and Standards are also discussed in the student handbook and undergraduate catalog..

Michigan Tech has no contractual relationships with third-party entities to deliver its academic programs.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**6. Institutional Disclosures and Advertising and Recruitment Materials:** *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 the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S  
CONCLUSIONS:

✓✓ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up. \_\_\_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

Michigan Technological University discloses its accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission on its webpage devoted to accreditation.

**7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with State Regulatory Boards:** *The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence. Note that if the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is currently under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor in the past five years, the team must explain the action in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S  
CONCLUSIONS:

✓✓ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

In addition to Higher Learning Commission accreditation, Michigan Technological University discloses professional accreditation by ABET (engineering and science), AACSB International (business), and the Society of American Foresters (forestry) on the provost's webpage as well as the web pages of the units which are professionally accredited. The institution is in candidacy status for accreditation by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council for its teacher education programs; the Michigan Department of Education has approved 10 Michigan Tech teaching preparation programs for teacher certification. MTU's chemistry degree programs are approved by the American Chemical Society.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

**8. Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment:** *The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment 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.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

✓✓ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.

\_\_\_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

In anticipation of the Team visit, the University placed the following notification on the university website, as well as in the alumni newsletter, well the student newspaper (*The Lode*), and the local newspaper (*The Daily Mining Gazette*):

*"Michigan Technological University is accredited by the The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) under the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). As part of its reaccreditation process, commission representatives will be on campus for a Quality Check-up Visit on March 14-16, 2012. Michigan Tech invites public comment about the university, which should be sent directly to the Commission using the following link or mailed to:*

*Public Comment on Michigan Technological University  
The Higher Learning Commission  
230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 Chicago, IL  
60604-1411"*

Communication from HLC dated March 5, 2012 indicated that the Commission had not received any public comments regarding Michigan Technological University.

Additional Monitoring, if any:

## Appendix B Credits and Program Length

*Instructions: The team reviews the "Protocol for Peer Reviewers Reviewing Credit Hours Under the Commission's New Policies" before completing this Worksheet. This Worksheet must be completed for all Quality Checkup visits after January 1, 2012.*

### A: Answer the Following Questions

#### *Institutional Policies on Credit Hours*

- 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:

- 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?

Yes                      No

Comments:

- 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 timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes                      No

Comments:

- Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission 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:

### *Application of Policies*

- 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 the Commission 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:

- 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:

- If the institution offers any alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, were 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:

- 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 reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

Yes                      No

Comments:

- 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:

**B: Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team. For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.**

**C: Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate**

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

Yes                       No

Rationale:

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

**D: Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour Appendix C Clock Hour Worksheet**

*Instructions: Teams complete the following worksheet only if the institution offers any programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Such programs typically include those that must be identified in clock hours for state licensure of the program or where completing clock hours is a requirement for graduates to apply for licensure or authorization to practice the occupation. Such programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.*

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 include at least 20 semester hours.

**A: Answer the Following Questions**

- Does the institution's credit to clock hour formula match the federal formula?

Yes                      No

Comments:

- 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?

- Did the team determine in reviewing the institution's credit hour policies that they reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education?

Yes                      No

Comments:

- 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

(Note that the team may approve a lower conversion rate than the federal rate as noted above provided the team found no issues with the institution's policies or practices related to the credit hour and there is sufficient student work outside of class as noted in the instructions.)

**C: Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate**

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

Yes                       No

Rationale:

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