Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions

Effective September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017

This document outlines the information institutions should provide in a separate federal compliance section of their Assurance Argument or Comprehensive Quality Review. Institutions should answer the questions below and provide supporting documentation where necessary. A list of required and optional appendixes is provided at the end of the document.

The information requested in this document should be uploaded in the Assurance System in a separate federal compliance document **before** the visit unless otherwise noted. The institution should refer to the *Federal Compliance Overview: Information for Institutions and Peer Reviewers* in completing this template. This guide identifies applicable HLC policies and provides an explanation of each requirement.

Note that some federal requirements are related to the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices. This document identifies those related Criteria and Assumed Practices so that the institution may cross-reference any material it prepares to address them. The document also provides cross-references to the Code of Federal Regulations; while these cross-references will provide context for HLC's requirements, it is important that institutions write to HLC's requirements and not to the federal regulations cited.

Institution name: University of Wisconsin -Green Bay

Main contact in the financial aid office: James Rohan

Number of staff members in the financial aid office: 7 positions, 6 staff members (1 open position)

Identify when the last U.S. Department of Education training for the staff of the financial aid office occurred: Professional development opportunities utilized by the financial aid office and provided by the US Department of Education predominantly include webinars and sessions downloaded from the Federal Student Aid (FSA) conference. In addition, various staff attend state financial aid conferences which include presentations by US Department of Education training officers.

The FSA conference is held annually and the physical location does vary. Periodically staff will attend the conferences in person. However, the taped and released broadcasts of the training and informational sessions allow staff to view them on campus and as frequently as needed. This past year, for example, there was great attention to the transition to "Prior – Prior Year" or "PPY". Financial Aid staff members joined together to listen and learn about the implementation of that significant change to processing. In addition, we annually watch federal update sessions from the Department as well as presentations on application processing changes and verification updates. The taped sessions are generally made available late December or early January each year.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: February 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 1

Our state conferences are held in the fall and in the spring and at least one staff member is asked to attend each of the conferences. We are fortunate that our state organization continues to include a federal training officer at each of our conferences. Sessions provided by the training officer typically involve an update of changes that may be upcoming or have recently taken place. The fall 2016 conference included a live feed with Jeff Baker from the Department of Education discussing critical issues as well.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

1. Complete the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*. Submit the worksheet and the attachments listed in it as **Appendix A**.

2. What is the length in semester or quarter hours or other applicable units of each of the institution's degree programs? Institutions offering programs at a single degree level may be able to identify a specific number of semester or quarter hours to which all their programs conform; institutions with programs at different degree levels may need to expand their answer, and if so should include a list in Part A, Section 1 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* (Appendix A).

   Undergraduate degrees are 120 credit hours.

   MS- Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning is 30 credit hours

   MS - Science in Environmental Science and Policy is 34 credit hours

   MS - Science in Management is 30 credit hours

   MS in Nursing Leadership and Management in Health Systems is 30 credit hours

   MS in Sustainable Management is 34 credits

   Master of Social Work is 60 credits

3. Are there any differences in tuition for specific programs?

   ☒ Yes

   ☐ No

   If so, please identify the programs and explain the rationale for the difference in tuition.

   Engineering Technology includes a per term $700 differential tuition fee for declared majors to help support the additional costs of labs and equipment necessary for instruction in the major.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §602.16(a)(1)(viii), 34 CFR §602.24(f), 34 CFR §600.2, and 34 CFR §668.8(k) and (l).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 3.A and Assumed Practice B.1.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

4. What is the institution's process for handling student complaints?

   UWGB has struggled to implement a comprehensive and systematic procedure for reviewing student complaints, which has undergone numerous changes in the past few years. Approximately five years ago (2012), the University began tracking student complaint records but only in a very limited way: the two colleges that existed then - the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional Studies - were asked to track only the number of student complaints they received. Due to significant administrative turnover in the Provost's office, including the Associate Provost, who acts as the

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 2

Accreditaiton Liaison Officer and so was in charge of developing the Student Complaint Process, student complaints were not effectively recorded for the next several years, and the process was not improved. Two years ago (2015), the Associate Provost revised the procedure to be more systematic and to incorporate all of the required data. This process was instituted in 2016.

The current process requires each institutional area (Student Affairs, Business & Finance, Advancement, Athletics), Academic Colleges and Schools, and non-instructional and co-curricular divisions within Academic Affairs (Enrollment Services, Continuing Education and Community Engagement, Instructional Technology, Library) to maintain a Student Complaint Record and submit a report by June each year. The Associate Provost is responsible for collecting and reviewing these reports. This process has been in place for one year only, and it has proven difficult for areas and divisions to comply with the requirement in a timely manner, which has in turn delayed proper review of the reports as a whole.

At the time the current policy was adopted, it was our understanding that each division was required to track student complaints and submit its own report on the complaints it received. Recently, we learned that this is not a requirement, and we are currently revising and updating our complaint process. Beginning in the 2017-2018 academic year, student complaints will be centralized in the Student Affairs Division, utilizing the Maxient software. Each area and division will designate an individual for maintaining and updating the area or division's student complaint records, but having a centralized resource for maintaining these records will significantly improve the institution's management of records as well as our ability to review, assess, and act upon them. The Associate Provost is working in concert with the Assistant Dean of Students and the Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Business & Finace/Risk Management Officer to ensure that the new policy is developed and implemented.

The Student Affairs Division has done a better job at tracking student complaints and has had a systematic system in place since 2006. Since 2009, Student Affairs has been utilizing Maxient to track student complaints. The Dean of Students publishes a concise but thorough set of definitions of compalints and grievances on its website and includes a link to an electronic form that anyone may utilize to submit an incident report. These reports are reviewed on a regular basis by a committee specifically tasked to make sure that complaints are addressed. Title IX cases are reviewed monthly and as needed by SART (Sexual Assault Response Team).

Finally, as UWGB is a member of NC-SARA, we are required to publish our student complaint and grievance policy on a separate website. This website follows the definitions and procedures outlined on the Dean of Students' website as well as including information about UW System complaint processes and NC-SARA complaint processes.

5. Provide the institution's complaint policy and procedure and the web address where the public can find this information:

   See Appendix B.
   Appendix B.1. Dean of Students Complaint and Grievance Policy.
   Appendix B.2. Current University Student Complaint Policy and Procedure.
   Appendix B.3. Draft University Student Complaint Policy and Procedure.
   Appendix B.4. NC-SARAProgram Integrity Complaint Procedures.   or attach as **Appendix B**.

6. Provide an aggregated report of the number and type of complaints received since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC and explain their resolutions. Attach as **Appendix C**.

7. How does the institution integrate what it has learned from the complaint process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning?

   UWGB needs to develop a more comprehensive review process for student complaints. The Student Affairs Division has successfully developed a systematic review process that employs a standing committee that meets bi-weekly to review complaint and grievance reports, both to deliberate appropriate actions to take in specific cases but also to consider appropriate improvements in processes

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 3

and services across campus. One example of this is the recent implementation of a Bias Incident or Hate Crime Reporting Form (see Appendix B.1.c. Bias Incident or Hate Crime Report). This report is accessible from the Dean of Student's website, the American Intercultural Center (AIC), the Inclusive Excellence website, Human Resources, and Public Safety. Reports are routed to the Dean of Students, Counseling & Health, Director for Inclusive Excellence, and AIC Director. The vicitm in the incident is invited to discuss his or her situation with appropriate staff such as counselors, and the case is reviewed by a Student Review Team. The University noticed a siginficant increase in reporting after this process was introduced: 3 reports were submitted in 2015-2016; 16 reports were submitted in 2016-2017. This suggests that more students are using the sytem to report incidents that previously went unreported.

The recommendations of the report submitted by the Assistant Dean of Students at the end of the 2016-2017 academic year are to expand the Response Team beyond the Dean of Students office and to define a clear Human Resource process.

Parallel to the process outlined above, which focuses on specific bias incident reports, the University will need to develop a similar process to review student complaints in a comprehensive and systematic way. The Associate Provost, the Assistant Dean of Students, and the Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Business & Finace/Risk Management Officer will work to develop and implement that process during the 2017-2018 academic year.

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §602.16(a)(1)(ix).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 2.A and Assumed Practice A.3, A.4.

Publication of Transfer Policies

8.   Where are the institution's transfer policies published?

Undergraduate Catalog: http://catalog.uwgb.edu/undergraduate/general-information/admissions/transfer-students/

Graduate Catalog: http://catalog.uwgb.edu/undergraduate/general-information/admissions/transfer-students/

UW-Green Bay course equivalencies, transfer guides, articulation agreements, and information on transferability of credit is accessible through the UW System Wisconsin Transfer pages (https://www.wisconsin.edu/transfer/) and the Transfer Information System (TIS) (https://www.wisconsin.edu/transfer/wizards/) utilized by all Wisconsin colleges and universities that are a part of the UW System, as well as, UW-Green Bay's Admission's Transfer site specifically targeted to transfer students: http://www.uwgb.edu/admissions/apply/transfer/.

Provide copies of the published transfer policies (such as those included in the institution's catalog, on the website or in other appropriate publications) as **Appendix D**.

9.   How does the institution disclose articulation agreements, at both the institutional level and the program level, to current and prospective students? (Ensure that the disclosures clearly identify whether the institution 1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) through the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) through the articulation agreement; 3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and 4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement [e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.].)

Transfer Guides and Articulation Agreements are published on the Office of Admissions Transfer website: http://www.uwgb.edu/admissions/apply/transfer/. These include policies and guides for transfer from University of Wisconisn two-year institutions, the Wisconsin Technical College System, as well as other community and technical colleges in Wisconsin. Transfer guides for specific majors:

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 4

http://www.uwgb.edu/advising/transfer/guides.asp. These guides which courses are accepted at UWGB and what courses equivalencies or program requirements they meet. Completion of general education requirements are included in the policy statements and transfer guides as well. Articulation Agreements likewise state what the program requirements are, how specific courses taken at the partner institution meet those requirements, and what remaining requirements students may expect to meet at UWGB.

Provide a list of articulation agreements as **Appendix E** and the web address where the public can access this list. Note that you do not need to provide the full articulation agreements, only the list of agreements that you make public.

10. What is the process implemented by the institution to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions?

In aligning transfer policy to transfer decisions, UW-Green Bay incorporates a credit transfer evaluation review process that enlists faculty review of subject matter and course to course equivalence along with the expertise of the Registrar and/or Transfer Services Coordinator. After faculty review, the Registrar and/or Transfer Services Coordinator work in the development and implementation of both articulation agreements and transfer guides.

In collaboration with the Advising office, the Registrar and/or Transfer Services Coordinator review articulation agreements for alignment with institutional policy and practice. Along with enforcing policy, both areas verify that the recommended practice of a 75% equivalency standard is utilized during the faculty credit transfer evaluation review process; this ensures consistent alignment to the criteria and procedure used in transfer policy when transfer decisions are made.

Case-by-case credit transfer evaluation is handled in a similar manner where the Transfer Coordinator ensures consistent alignment to the criteria and procedure used in transfer policy when transfer decisions are made.

Provide evidence (e.g., charts, data, etc.) that institutional decisions regarding transfer of academic credit align with the policy:

See Appendix F or attach as **Appendix F**.

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §668.43(a)(11).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 2.A and Assumed Practice A.5.D.

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

11. Does the institution have students enrolled in distance or correspondence courses, as defined in federal definitions?

☒ Yes

☐ No

12. How does the institution verify the identity of students enrolled in these courses?

When students enroll at UW- Green Bay, they are assigned a unique username, plus a default password they must change in order to log into the D2L content management system. After that initial password change, students can log into D2L to access the courses they are enrolled in and complete assignments and exams. While not required, Turnitin software is used in some courses when students are submitting written assignments to guard against plagiarism.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 5

UW-Green Bay has a proctoring policy for online courses, although its use is not required. Some courses require that students physically sit for exams. The policy determines suitable proctors, the proctoring process including tests sent directly to approved proctors, and timeline for proctoring.

13. Are there any additional costs (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) charged directly to the student because of this method?

☒ Yes

☐ No

14. What are these additional costs?

The University charges a $25 per credit distance education fee for all online classes.

15. How are the additional costs disclosed to students prior to enrollment in a distance or correspondence course?

The costs are communicated on the Bursar's web page and disclosed in various print pieces for potential students of online degree programs.

Provide copies of the disclosures and the web address where the public can access such information as **Appendix G**.

16. How does the method of verification make reasonable efforts to protect student privacy?

Students set up their own unique passwords for their Student IDs. All information connected to their accounts match the same student privacy policies as residential students. Any staff who require access (advisors, registrar staff) must obtain prior approval through the appropriate channel. This includes submission appropriate paperwork, inlcuding a Request for Database Access to Personally Identifiable Information. Please see Apepndix G.1 for this form.

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §602.17(g).

Related HLC Requirement: Core Component 2.A.

Title IV Program Responsibilities

This requirement has several components the institution must address. The institution staff compiling this information should work with the financial aid office and the chief financial officer or comptroller. For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §602.16(a)(1)(x).

17. General Program Responsibilities

a. What is the current status of the institution's Title IV program (e.g., recertified on date x, provisionally certified on date x, etc.)?

UWGB received confirmation of recertification in March, 2015 with approval until September 30, 2020. The Eligibility and Certification Approval Report (ECAR) and Program Participation Agreement (PPA) have been included in Appendix I.

b. When was the institution's most recent Title IV program review?

UWGB underwent a program review related to compliance with the Clery Act in May, 2009. Based on the initial notification, the University was "selected from a sample of institutions" and "not the result of any specific complaint or allegation of non-compliance." A Final Program Review Determination (FPRD) was issued in March, 2011.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 6

That report, included as Appendix H.1, indicated that UWGB had misclassified four incidents and failed to accurately publish some arrest reports in 2007. It required UWGB to reclassify the incidents and to review its policies.

c. Has the institution been audited or inspected by the Office of the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Education since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC?

☐ Yes
☒ No

d. Attach the most recent Title IV program review, or other inspection or audit reports since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC, as **Appendix H**.

e. List any limitation, suspension or termination actions imposed on the institution by the U.S. Department of Education (hereafter referred to as "the Department") since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC and the reason for such actions.

None

f. List any fines, letters of credit or heightened monitoring imposed on the institution by the Department since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC and the reason for such actions.

None

g. What response and corrective actions has the institution taken in regard to these Department actions?

n/a

h. What are the consequences of these challenges for the institution's short- and long-term financial health?

n/a

i. What are the findings from the OMB Circular A-133 portion of the institution's three most recent audited financial statements, which identifies material weaknesses in the processing of financial aid?
No weaknesses found.

j. In which of the following Title IV federal financial aid programs does the institution participate? Select all that apply:

☒ Pell Grant
☐ Federal Family Education Loan
☒ Federal Direct Stafford Loan
☒ Direct PLUS Loan
☒ Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant
☒ Federal Work Study
☒ Perkins Loans
☐ Academic Competitiveness Grant

Provide all correspondence with the Department and other documents that explain the above responses as **Appendix I.**

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §668.16.

18. Financial Responsibility Requirements

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 7

a. What were the outcomes of the three most recent Department reviews of the institution's composite ratios and financial audits?
2016 = 4.38
2015 = 4.22
2014 = 4.29

b. Have there been any fines, penalties, letters of credit or other requirements imposed by the Department as a result of these reviews?
No

Note: HLC also annually analyzes each institution's financial ratios to determine whether there might be financial concerns. The peer review team checks with the institution and the HLC staff to determine whether HLC or the Department has previously raised concerns about the institution's finances based on these ratios.

c. What actions has the institution taken or does it plan to take in response to any concerns raised by HLC or the Department? (*Related HLC Requirements: Core Components 5.A, 2.B; Assumed Practice D.1.)*
n/a

Provide all correspondence with the Department and other documents that explain the above actions as **Appendix J**.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR 668.15, 34 CFR 668.23, 34 CFR 668.171, 34 CFR 668.173, and 34 CFR 668.174.

Related HLC Requirements: Criterion 5, Core Components A (resources) and B (administrative capacity).

19. Default Rates. The institution should take steps to avoid excessive loan default rates.

Institutions and teams should use the three-year default rate to complete this section.

a. What are the student loan default rates as provided by the Department for the three years leading up to the visit? (Institutions with evaluations after September must include the most recent cohort default rate in the Federal Compliance Filing or ensure that the most recent rate is provided to the team on-site if the rate was not available when the Federal Compliance Filing was submitted.)

Year 1: 2013 4.8%

Year 2: 2012 3.5%

Year 3: 2011 4.2%

b. If the institution's default rates are higher than those of its peer institutions, if the institution's rates are rising, or if the rates have exceeded Departmental thresholds or triggered a Department review, what actions has the institution taken in response?

Our default rates do not exceed any Department of Education thresholds nor have they triggered any review. Default rates will vary from year to year and, as they do, UW Green Bay's place among our peers will fluctuate. Concern over default rates is a concern at all levels – institution, state and national. Recently enacted state legislation mandates an annual disclosure of information to students regarding their student loans and accumulated debt as well as other information to assist with financial literacy. That requirement takes effect for the 2017-18 academic year and is hoped to present a greater awareness of student borrowing and levels of indebtedness.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 8

Below is a summary of other 3 year cohort default rates from a national, state and UWS perspective.

Fiscal Year	UWGB default rate			National Rate	National Public 4 year	WI - total	UW
institutions							
FY 2013	4.8%	11.3%	7.3	9.6	Not compiled		
FY 2012	3.5%	11.8%	7.6	9.2	4.6		
FY 2011	4.2%	13.7%	8.9	9.9	5.2		

In comparison with the national and Public 4 year institutional CDR's, UWGB fares well. In addition, our students have performed well in repayment relative to those at other institutions in the state. Our default rate among other UW institutions has, over the 3 fiscal years, been comparable. However, the 2013 fiscal year did see a rise in the default rate which has dropped us from 5th of the 14 UW institutions (in FY 2012) to 10th.

Provide any correspondence with the Department related to default rates and any default rate management plan required by the Department as **Appendix K**.

c. Does the institution participate in private loan programs or any loan services that it provides to students directly or that a related corporation provides to its students?
☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, provide a list of companies that provide loan services to the institution's students and explain the relationship of these companies to the institution.
Students are informed of the availability of private educational loans. We do not have or distribute any preferred lender information to student or parent borrowers. We do have a working relationship with lenders which is appropriate and necessary in the event of problem resolution. Lender representatives do communicate with office personnel periodically regarding their products.

In 2015-16, private loans were received by 350 students for a total of $2,591,108. Those loans were processed by 18 different lenders.

The University does not have any agreements with lenders and follows Regent Policy Document 13-4 pertaining to relationships with educational loan lenders. This is included in Appendix L along with a list of companies that processed private loans for 2015-16.

Provide samples of the loan agreements and disclosure information as **Appendix L**.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §668.201, §668.204, and §668.217.

Related HLC Requirements: HLC Criterion 2, Core Component A (integrity); Criterion 5, Core Components A (resources) and B (administrative capacity); Assumed Practices D.1–5.

20. Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures. Title IV responsibilities include the legal obligation to disclose information to students and to the public about campus crime, athletic participation and financial aid.

a. What administrator or office on campus is responsible for ensuring that these disclosures are regularly compiled and published and that the data are accurate?
The Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance oversees the following disclosures:
34 CFR §668.40–conviction for possession or sale of illegal drugs

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 9

34 CFR §668.44–availability of employees to disseminate info
34 CFR §668.46–security and crime
34 CFR §668.49-crime & fire statistics

The Director of Financial Aid oversees the following disclosures:
34 CFR §668.42–financial assistance info – publish and make available
34 CFR §668.43–cost of attendance, etc.

The Associate Athletic Director for Compliance
34 CFR §668.41–athletically related student aid and other disclosures

b. Has the institution been the subject of any federal investigation related to any of the required disclosures listed in question 20?
☐ Yes

☒ No

c. Does the institution have any findings from the Department regarding these disclosures?
☐ Yes

☒ No

Explain any findings related to any of the required disclosures listed in question 20 and corrective action plans the institution may have put together to remedy the findings.
n/a

d. Provide copies of the information disclosed to students and provide the web address where this information is made available to the public as **Appendix M**.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §668.40, 668.41, 668.42, 668.43, 668.44, 668.46, and 668.49.

21. Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics. Title IV responsibilities require that institutions provide to students and the public graduation/completion rates for the student body by gender, ethnicity, receipt of Pell grants and other data as well as information about the process for withdrawing as a student, cost of attendance, policies on refund and return of Title IV financial aid, current academic programs and faculty, names of applicable accrediting agencies, description of facilities for disabled students, and the institution's policy on enrollment in study abroad. In addition, certain institutions need to disclose their transfer-out rate. Also, institutions with athletic programs are required to disclose athletic participation rates and financial support data.

a. What administrator or office on campus is responsible for ensuring that these disclosures are regularly compiled and published and that the data are accurate?
Associate Athletic Director for Compliance

b. Has the institution been the subject of any federal investigation related to any of the required disclosures listed in question 21?
☐ Yes

☒ No

c. Does the institution have any findings from the Department regarding these disclosures?
☐ Yes

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 10

☒ No

    d. Explain any findings related to any of the required disclosures listed in question 21 and corrective action plans the institution may have put together to remedy the findings.
n/a

    e. Attach copies of the information disclosed to students and provide the web address where this information is made available to the public as **Appendix N**.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §668.41, 668.45, 668.48, and 668.8.

Related HLC Requirement: Assumed Practice A.6.

22. Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies. The institution is required to have a Satisfactory Academic Progress policy and an attendance policy as part of the Title IV program.

    a. Are these policies readily available to students?
☒ Yes

☐ No

    b. Do they satisfy state or federal requirements?
☒ Yes

☐ No

    c. Does the institution have any findings from the Department regarding these disclosures?
☐ Yes

☒ No

Explain any findings related to any of the required disclosures listed in question 22 and corrective actions that may have been required by the Department related to these findings.
n/a

    d. Attach copies of the information disclosed to students and provide the web address where this information is made available to the public as **Appendix O**.

    e. Are the policies being appropriately applied by the institution in individual student situations?

Note: 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 provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

☒ Yes

☐ No

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §668.34.

Related HLC Requirements: Criterion 3, Core Component A; Assumed Practice A.5.

23. Contractual Relationships. List any contracts related to academic programs with third-party entities not accredited by a federally recognized accrediting agency. Attach as **Appendix P**. Include the

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 11

name of the provider, the name of the relevant academic program, what the provider does, the dates when the relationship starts and ends, and the date it was approved by HLC if required.

(The institution should have previously disclosed to HLC all existing contracts and received approval for those contracts as required by HLC policy. Institutions can see the list of HLC-approved contractual arrangements on its *Institutional Status and Requirements (ISR) Report.* HLC's substantive change policy requires that the institution notify HLC of any new contracts for up to 25 percent of an academic program, that the institution obtain prior HLC approval before initiating any contract for 25 to 50 percent of a program, and that HLC approve contracts for more than 50 percent of a program only in exceptional circumstances under strict scrutiny.)

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §668.5 and 602.22(a)(2)(vii).

Related HLC Requirements: Assumed Practices A.10–11.

24. Consortial Relationships. List any consortial relationships with other entities accredited by a federally recognized accrediting agency. Attach as **Appendix Q.** Include the name of the provider, the name of the relevant academic program, what the provider does, the dates when the relationship starts and ends, and the date it was approved by HLC if required.

(The institution should have previously disclosed to HLC all existing consortiums and received approval for those consortial arrangements as required by HLC policy. Institutions can see the list of HLC-approved consortial arrangements on its *Institutional Status and Requirements (ISR) Report.* HLC's substantive change policy requires that the institution notify HLC of any new consortiums for up to 25 percent of an academic program, that the institution obtain prior HLC approval before initiating any consortiums for 25 to 50 percent of a program, and that HLC approve consortiums for more than 50 percent of a program only in exceptional circumstances under strict scrutiny.)

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §668.5.

Related HLC Requirements: Assumed Practices A.10–11.

Required Information for Students and the Public

25. Provide course catalogs and student handbooks. Attach as **Appendix R.**

26. Which sections of the institution's website include required disclosure information? Provide the webpage name and link for each.
Privacy policy (http://www.uwgb.edu/policies/privacy.asp)
HLC Accreditation (http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/accreditation/)
Campus Security (http://www.uwgb.edu/publicsafety/clery/)

On an annual basis all campus security policies and the annual security report is distributed via email to all staff and students. Major admission publications includes links to the Annual Security Report. Additionally, the Privacy Policy, HLC Accreditation, and the Campus Security (CLERY) report are included in the footer of every UWGB webpage.

27. What policies and processes does the institution have in place to ensure required information for current and prospective students about institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information is accurate, timely and appropriate? Attach copies of these policies and procedures as **Appendix S**.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 12

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR §602.16(a)(1)(vii).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 2.A, 2.B; Assumed Practice A.5.

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

28. Do the institution's advertisements and recruiting materials provide accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students, and is information about the institution's accreditation status with HLC and other accrediting agencies clear and accurate? If the institution has been placed on a sanction or its programmatic accreditation has been withdrawn, do the disclosures accurately explain this information?

    ☒ Yes

    ☐ No

    Provide copies of these advertising and recruiting materials as **Appendix T**.

29. Which sections of the institution's website include advertising and recruiting information? Provide the webpage name and link for each.

UW-Green Bay annually revises its admissions marketing material to provide the most timely and accurate information possible to prospective students and family members. The university provides a listing of all of its accreditations in on its homepage and linked in the footer of every top level webpage (including: Admissions, Academics, Faculty & Staff, Majors & Minor and Students) to a page hosted on the Office the of Provost website.

Admissions: www.uwgb.edu/admissions and all the corresponding links

UW-Green Bay Home Page: www.uwgb.edu

Majors and Minors: www.uwgb.edu/majors-minors

The UW-Green Bay Home Page and all pages include links to Visit (www.uwgb.edu/admissions/visit) and Apply (www.uwgb.edu/admissions/apply).

Academics: www.uwgb.edu/academics/ and all corresponding links

30. What policies and processes does the institution have in place to ensure advertising and recruiting information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies is accurate, timely and appropriate? Provide copies of these policies and procedures as **Appendix U.**

31. What webpage displays the Mark of Affiliation on the institution's website? Provide a link.

http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/accreditation/ linked on the footer of our website

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §602.16(a)(1)(vii) and 602.23(d).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 2.B; Assumed Practices A.5, A.7.

Review of Student Outcome Data

Institutions in their program review and institutional improvement processes are required to consider student outcome or performance data on the full range of their offerings where such data are available. Data can be at the institutional or the program level. Student achievement data typically include retention

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 13

rates, graduation rates, licensure exam pass rates, employment rates, acceptance to further study or other similar information.

32. How does the institution gather or receive information about student outcomes from academic programs across the institution?

UW-Green Bay has four linked processes related to assessing student outcomes in academic programs. First, UW-Green Bay rolled out a new General Education Program in 2014 and its implementation included an assessment plan. Learning outcomes are assessed on a staggered, rotating schedule, and course sections are selected randomly. Faculty are advised to use a course assignment or test to assess their students. The Associate Dean of the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment co-manage the process and prepare summary reports, which are provided to the General Education Council to determine if learning outcomes are being met and to deliberate how the program can be improved.

Second, each academic major has an assessment plan which requires an on-going cycle of collecting information, deliberating over the results, and publishing the outcomes. Each assessment plan includes the definition of intended student learning outcomes, an explanation of the direct and indirect methods the faculty plan to use to assess those outcomes, a timeline for the implementation of the methods, and information about who will coordinate the data collection. Required updates and status reports include any findings and actions taken based on those findings. Programs publish both their assessment plans and annual updates online each year, and the seven-year program review highlights major assessment findings and connects those findings to conclusions being drawn in the self-study about overall program quality and plans for the future.

Third, the university supports a set of surveys which include student self-reported assessment of relevant outcomes. These include the Graduating Senior Survey, the Graduate Student Graduation Survey, the Graduate Follow-up Survey for undergraduates (a "first-destination survey" which meets most NACE requirements), and the Alumni Survey for both undergraduate and graduate students. The results are shared with university administration and chairpersons on a yearly basis and are published online. Program-level results from the Graduating Senior and Alumni Surveys are prepared once every seven years for each major, during the year that it conducts its program review (or upon request). Program-level results from the Career Center's Graduate Follow-up Survey are published online each year, and include employment rates, salary information and graduate school plans.
Finally, every third year the university participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which includes self-reported assessments of a set of learning outcomes. Although only the very largest majors typically secure an adequate sample to use NSSE data for program-level assessment, NSSE data have guided the institution's decisions regarding the development and implementation of a new general education program and the development and implementation of special programming for at-risk students.

In 2016-17, the Office of Institutional Research began providing major-level information for student persistence within the major, college, and university from one term to the next. Previously, graduation and retention rate data were only used to inform university-level decisions and did not focus on program-level outcomes. As a new data resource, this information is not yet considered within the context of regular program review.

33. List the types of student outcome data available to the institution:

a. Graduation and Retention rates; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/factbook/#Outcomes_&_Assessment_
b. Term Persistence Rates by Major and College; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/Persistence/index.asp
c. General Education benchmark assessment results; http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/gened/

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 14

d.   Assessment in the Academic Programs; http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/academics/
e.   Graduating Senior, Alumni Survey, and Graduate Student Graduation Survey results, in "Student Perspectives" series; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/assessment/perspectives/
f.   Graduate Follow-up "First Destination" Survey; http://www.uwgb.edu/careers/connections/graduate-follow-up-survey.asp
g.   NSSE results; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/reports/ or attach as **Appendix V**.

34. Explain how information about student outcomes informs planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness, and other topics.

Formally, the data gathered about student outcomes informs planning primarily through the work of appropriate Governance and Appointive Committees. The Academic Affairs Council receives the program review self-study reports and deliberates with the majors about the implications of those reports' results, and sends their own assessment of each major's health to the appropriate dean. The General Education Council similarly works with annual reports of the outcomes from the General Education Assessment Program, and guides on-going changes to both the assessment of the program and the structure of the program. The Graduate Academic Affairs Council will begin receiving annual reports of the outcomes of the Graduate Student Graduation survey for deliberation and to support the guidance they provide to the Director of Graduate Studies. The University Accreditation and Assessment Council reviews the assessment-related work of the committees and makes recommendations to the administration about how to improve the overall climate and effectiveness of assessment efforts.

Informally, the data gathered about student outcomes informs planning in a very organic and pervasive manner because virtually all of the primary data sources are publically available online, and have been for many years. Individual faculty and staff have the freedom to request special data analyses about particular issues their department is facing using the institutional and national (NSSE) survey data; they are encouraged to do so during faculty orientation and the staff who manage those survey results are encouraged to be as responsive and supportive as possible to these special requests. Deans, department chairs and individual faculty regularly ask the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for ad-hoc special analyses whose focus is student learning and those requests are not expected to funnel through any bureaucratic process. The data exist for the faculty to use to improve the education provided here, and the university has always encouraged the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to give the members of the faculty as much access as possible.

35. The federal government is increasingly concerned that institutions and accreditors are taking into account federal metrics in the review of student outcome data. These metrics are best found in the College Scorecard.

Explain how information from the Scorecard is incorporated in the institution's review of its student outcome data. Please note the loan repayment rate identified on the Scorecard and explain how the institution uses this metric in its review of its own data.

Each fall, when the U.S. Department of Education updates Scorecard information, UW-Green Bay's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment reviews the information with the senior administration. That review includes an assessment of any negative or positive changes in any of the items and a high-level comparison of values reported for UW-Green Bay to values reported at each of the other schools in the UW and private universities in the northeast Wisconsin region. The University Assessment Committee reviews and discusses scorecard results in the spring. The scorecard contains two items that measure long-term success. In the Scorecards released so far, the average salary of students six years after attending UW-Green Bay has been slightly above the national comparison figure. Most recently, UW-Green Bay students earned $39,600 compared to the national average of $34,300. The second measure of long-term success is the percent of students with federal loans who have begun to pay off that debt within three years of leaving school or graduating. The loan repayment rate of former UW-Green Bay students is 90%, which is much higher than the national rate of 66%.

The high loan repayment rate for UW-Green Bay students reported in the Scorecard has not been a surprise to campus leadership. For many years, the administration has been aware of the federally calculated Three-year Cohort Default Rates. UW-Green Bay's 4.8% default rate for the 2013 cohort is well below the national rate of 11.3%, and well below the rate for all schools in Wisconsin of 9.6%.

For more information see Federal Requirement 34 CFR 602.16(a)(1)(i).

Related HLC Requirements: Core Components 4.A–C; Assumed Practice C.6, C.7.

Publication of Student Outcome Data

Student outcome data should be made available to the public through 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 should be clearly labeled as such. Any technical terms in the data should be defined, and any necessary information on the method used to compile the data should be included. Data may be provided at the institutional or department level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.

36. Are student outcome data published on the institution's website following the specifications above?

☒ Yes

☐ No

37. How does the institution ensure that the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution?

Program-level assessment reports are required of all majors and master's degrees. The Associate Provost monitors the submission of annual updates and works with programs that have not met the requirement until they are able to submit the required plans and updates. Similarly, all majors and all master's programs are included in the schedule of seven-year program reviews.

The University has not yet fully included its six stand-alone minors in the seven-year program reviews or learning outcome assessment processes. These programs are in dance, geography, global studies, international business, sociology and women's and gender studies. All combined, these six minors enrolled over 130 students in Fall 2016.

38. Provide a link to the webpage(s) that contains the student outcome data.

a. Graduation and Retention rates; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/factbook/#Outcomes_&_Assessment_
b. General Education benchmark assessment results; http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/gened/
c. Assessment in the Academic Programs; http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/academics/
d. Graduating Senior, Alumni Survey, and Graduate Student Graduation Survey results, in "Student Perspectives" series; http://www.uwgb.edu/oira/assessment/perspectives/
e. Graduate Follow-up "First Destination" Survey; http://www.uwgb.edu/careers/connections/graduate-follow-up-survey.asp

Related HLC Requirement: Assumed Practice A.6.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 16

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

39. List any relationships the institution has with a specialized, professional or institutional accreditor or with any governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution has a presence. Note whether the institution or any of its programs is on a sanction, is provisionally approved or has lost status with any state agency or accrediting body.

    National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
    American Chemical Society (ACS)
    Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI)
    Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND)
    National Association of Schools of Music (NASAM)
    Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
    Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education (CAHIIM)
    Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)
    Wisconsin Board of Nursing

    The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is an approved institution through the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements since November 16, 2016. The authorization is granted through the Distance Learning Authorization Board (DLAB) of the State of Wisconsin, created under Wisconsin Act 208 to represent and authorize Wisconsin higher education institutions within NC-SARA. The DLAB has entered into the regional higher education compacts (Midwestern Higher Education Compact or MHEC). Under this compact, participating states will recognize the regulations of the home state of postsecondary institutions offering distance learning.

    Provide the most recent comprehensive evaluation report and action letter from each institutional or specialized accrediting agency as well as any interim monitoring prepared for that agency. Attach as **Appendix W**.

40. Explain how the institution makes its standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies available to students. Provide samples of those disclosures as **Appendix X** and indicate the web address where students and the public can find these disclosures.

For more information see Federal Requirements 34 CFR §602.28, 34 CFR 668.41, and 668.43.

Related HLC Requirements: Core Component 2.B; Assumed Practices A.7, C.4.

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

Local newspapers, institutional websites and alumni magazines are appropriate choices of media in which to solicit public comments. Notices of the opportunity to comment should reach all constituencies but should not unduly burden the institution. Notices of the visit should be published following the format prescribed in the *Procedure on Third-Party Comments*.

Notices should include:

- The purpose and dates of the visit.
- The institution's accreditation status with HLC.
- An invitation to send written, signed comments directly to HLC.
- Contact information for HLC.

Notices should specify that comments must be sent to HLC no later than four weeks before the start of the visit.

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 17

In cases where comments are of a sensitive nature, HLC ensures that the commenter is aware that comments are typically forwarded to the institution and the evaluation team with identifying information intact. In some cases, HLC may redact the identifying information of the commenter or summarize the comment.

41. Submit a list of constituencies that have received the notice of opportunity to comment. (These groups may include students, parents, alumni, taxpayers, donors, community groups and local businesses.)

    Students, Parents, Alumni, Taxpayers/General Public, Faculty/Staff, UWGB Board of Trustees, Foundation Board, Alumni Board, Donors, Community Members.
    Please see Appendix Y for details, including size of constituency reached.

42. What media did the institution use to solicit comments?

    E-mail, Facebook (various groups), Newspaper Notification Ads (Green Bay Press-Gazette), Alumni Newsletter, Twitter, Inside Magazine, UWGB Accreditation Website, UWGB LOG News E-Mail, HR Connect E-mail, Video Message.
    Please see Appendix Y for details, including size of constituency reached.

43. Copies of the institution's notices must be sent in PDF format to HLC (legalaffairs@hlcommission.org) at least one month before the comprehensive evaluation visit. The comments and notices are compiled by HLC staff members and sent to the evaluation team and the institution three weeks prior to the visit. As third-party comments are an important part of the comprehensive evaluation, HLC also reviews and forwards comments received after the deadline lapses and even during the visit. Attach a copy of the notices as **Appendix Y**.

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs / Faculty-Student Engagement

44. Does the institution offer any direct assessment programs, as defined in 34 CFR §668.10?
    ☐ Yes

    ☒ No

    Note: HLC policy and federal regulations require that direct assessment programs be reviewed and approved by the accrediting agency before they are initiated. Contact your HLC liaison if the institution offers direct assessment programs that have not been approved by HLC.

45. Does the institution offer any competency-based programs?
    ☐ Yes

    ☒ No

    Note: The definition of competency-based and direct assessment programs (as taken from 34 CFR §668.10) can be found on the substantive change application for new competency-based or direct assessment programs.

46. Provide a list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
    n/a

47. How does the institution ensure that faculty in these programs regularly engage with students? Please respond to the following questions:

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 18

a. Do the faculty members initiate communication on some regular basis with the students in the course(s)? If yes, provide examples of how and when this occurs in each program.

n/a

b. Do the students have a responsibility to initiate communication with the faculty members on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom? If yes, provide examples of how and when this occurs.

n/a

c. Describe the manner in which faculty respond to questions from students about the academic content of the program. Describe the interaction between faculty and students about demonstrating competencies in the program material.

n/a

d. Demonstrate that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, written and oral communication abilities, etc., in the context of the course(s) in question with appropriate guidance by faculty.

n/a

e. Demonstrate that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc., in the context of the course(s) in question with appropriate guidance by faculty.

n/a

List of Appendixes

Please read each section of this document carefully for instructions on the information and material to be included in these appendixes. Appendixes displayed in italics are optional; the institution may provide the required information either by entering it into this form or by attaching it as an appendix.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition
Appendix A.......... Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institutional Records of Student Complaints
Appendix B.......... Institutional complaint policy and procedure, and web address
Appendix C.......... Complaints received since last comprehensive evaluation and their resolutions

Publication of Transfer Policies
Appendix D.......... Published transfer policies
Appendix E.......... List of articulation agreements, and web address
Appendix F.......... Evidence that decisions regarding transfer align with disclosed policy

Practices for Verification of Student Identity
Appendix G .... Disclosures of additional costs related to verification, and web address

Title IV Program Responsibilities
Appendix H.......... Most recent program review or other inspection or audit reports since last comprehensive evaluation
Appendix I .... Correspondence with the Department and other documents explaining the institution's general program responsibilities

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 19

Required Information for Students and the Public

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

Review of Student Outcome Data

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

Audience: Institutions
Form
Published: March 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Filing
Contact: 800-621-7440
Page 20