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K. Arnold:

• Program coordinator, assistant professor
• Participated in initial accreditation and re-accreditation
• Wrote the Program Analysis Report for both visits

Program:

• 4-year Bachelor of Science Degree
• Housed in College of Engineering, Applied Science & Technology, Department of Professional Sales
• 125 majors
• Initial CIDA accreditation: 2009
• Re-accreditation: 2015
• 1 full-time tenure-track faculty
• 1 – ¾ time faculty; 1 – ½ time faculty; 1 adjunct
The 6-year period between initial CIDA accreditation and re-accreditation, saw 2 changes in CIDA standards.

Because the process was an **ongoing study**, the ability to tailor curriculum to meet standards and objectives through the 6-year period was beneficial.
Faculty reviewed CIDA standards during departmental meetings and faculty retreats as a group as well as individually as curriculum was assessed and changed.
This ongoing process also provided opportunity for faculty collaboration to devise various ways to supplement the course structure with other program curriculum opportunities that produced outcomes that met and often combined CIDA standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdisciplinary Charrette</th>
<th>Charitable Chair</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIDA Standards met</strong></td>
<td><strong>CIDA Standards met</strong></td>
<td><strong>CIDA Standards met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>4a, b, c</td>
<td>2g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a, b, c</td>
<td>7 c, d, f</td>
<td>5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a, b, c, d</td>
<td>8 d, e</td>
<td>6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>8a, b, c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a, c, g</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 8 months prior to reaccreditation, faculty openly discussed and determined which course was most applicable to be labeled as a ‘primary’ or ‘secondary’ indicator on the CIDA matrix.

In-depth discussion was held in regards to interpretation of the standard and clarification of evidence.

This also provided opportunity for faculty to confirm the appropriate courses for which evidence would be accountable.
The faculty completed the matrix together over several working meetings by viewing the matrix on a projector and completing the matrix as a group.

Note: Pay attention to the instructions provided by CIDA in regards to the ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ indicators. Keep to the minimum --- don’t feel like you have to have the maximum number of each.

The matrix was then saved to Google Drive so that it would continue to be a working document that everyone had access to. Anytime a change was made (such as during the PAR draft) notification was provided to all faculty members.
OWNERSHIP & ACCOUNTABILITY
Faculty members individually assessed those courses that were indicators and identified and recorded assignments, projects, tests, etc. that they considered strong evidence of meeting the standard.

A spreadsheet for each course and each standard was created and faculty provided that information to aid in the preparation of the Program Analysis Report (PAR).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDT 3025</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Reference Number:</strong></td>
<td>2e, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>The interior design program provides: exposure to a variety of business and organizational structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How it is satisfied:</strong></td>
<td>Chapter 18 of Pitrowski’s book covers Business Formations. The students are required to read this section. Lectures are given to increase understanding. Quizzes are given. Students are required to select the appropriate business entity for their own business plan and for a group project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spreadsheets from each faculty member were then provided to the program coordinator who compiled them by instructor. By cross-referencing the completed CIDA matrix and the completed spreadsheets, the program coordinator was able to draft the PAR citing specific assignments that met the standard.
During the drafting of the PAR, when questions arose in regards to faculty-submitted spreadsheets, the program coordinator provided a checklist of questions for the faculty member to clarify in writing so that the draft could continue.
Laminated reference cards were then made from the final matrix for each course bin to easily identify the standards for each course and the assignment/project that clearly represents each for the site visitors.
Faculty could then highlight those specific assignments indicated on the matrix in the site visit display for each course.
SELF-STUDY PROCESS TO COMPLETION OF PAR

(AS EARY AS POSSIBLE)
FACULTY REVIEW OF
STANDARDS INDIVIDUALLY

FACULTY REVIEW OF STANDARDS IN DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS, RETREATS

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

(6-12 MONTHS PRIOR TO ACCREDITATION)
DETERMINE PRIMARY & SECONDARY INDICATORS TOGETHER, COMPLETE MATRIX

FACULTY INDIVIDUALLY DETERMINES ASSIGNMENTS & PROJECTS THAT MEET STANDARDS

EACH FACULTY MEMBER COMPILE SPREADSHEETS FOR THEIR COURSES AND SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY HOW WORK MEETS STDS.

COMPLETION OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS REPORT
BENEFITS OF SELF-STUDY PROCESS

- Collaboration
- Innovation
- Ownership
- Confidence
- Identification of faculty expectations

BENEFITS OF ACCREDITATION PROCESS

- Validates program
- Provide resources
- Acknowledgement
- Accountability
thank you