

Institutional Accreditation Programs & Values Congruence



**What MIT has
Learned and
Implemented to
Care for our
Community**



Presenters



Steve Baker

MIT Class of 1984, Theta Xi, AILG Chair 2006 - 2009



Marlena Martinez

Assistant Director, Fraternities, Sororities, Independent Living Groups



Kaya Miller

Assistant Dean & Director, Fraternities, Sororities, Independent Living Groups



Lauren Davis Wojtkun

Assistant Director, Fraternities, Sororities, Independent Living Groups



Presentation Outline

- Learning Outcomes
 - Highlight the collaborative model of chapter accreditation that MIT has developed to ensure the highest standards of organizational and facility health, safety, and viability
 - Tips for how to implement elements of the program institutionally or organizationally.
- Main Topics: Stakeholders, Parameters, History, Logistics, Outcomes, Assessment, Transferability

Accreditation Program Overview

- Peer-Review system modeled after academic visiting committee structure.

- Main Players:
 - Association of Independent Living Groups, Inc. (AILG)
 - AILG Accreditation Committee
 - AILG Accreditation Coordinator
 - Alumni Review Team Volunteers
 - Division of Student Life - Fraternity, Sorority, & Independent Living Group (FSILG) Office
 - Chapter Volunteers & Undergraduate Leadership

Accreditation Program Stakeholders

Association of Independent
Living Groups (AILG)

- Accreditation Committee
- Accreditation Coordinator

MIT Division of Student Life
& Fraternities, Sororities
and Living Groups (FSILG)
Office

MIT FSILG
Accreditation

Alumni Review Team
Volunteers

Alumni Volunteers &
Undergraduate Leadership

Accreditation Program Parameters

- MIT community characteristics & demographics
- Program Objectives:
 - Provide MIT administration and the AILG with a multi-dimensional evaluation of the health of each FSILG chapter
 - Create a forum for alumni, staff, & students to share best practices and exchange ideas on improving the FSILG community
 - Proactively identify and address issues of concern before they become serious

Accreditation Program Timeline

June 2004	Formal “self accreditation” proposal presented to AILG
November 2004	AILG vote to attempt pilot; Dean charters to proceed
March / April 2005	Pilot of two organizations * LESSON: process does not scale; logistics unworkable
December 2005	Simplified Basic Data Form (BDF), Beta Test of three organizations
2006 - 2007	Process refinements: volunteer skills established * LESSON: sorority review must be led by sorority women
June 2007	First review cycle completed & budget requested from Dean * LESSON: part-time, paid coordinator & more oversight needed
2007 - 2008	Process coordination improved with Coordinator role * LESSON: findings must be submitted in a timely manner
April 2008	First “Not Recommended for Accreditation” finding * LESSON: follow-up intervention process needed
2008 - 2009	Process maturation, documentation on web, large volunteer pool

Accreditation Program History

➤ Reviews by fiscal year

2004 – 2005	2	
2005 – 2006	7	
2006 – 2007	24	
2007 – 2008	15	
2008 – 2009	33	
<hr/>		
5 YEARS	81	REVIEWS

Accreditation Program Logistics

- AILG Coordinator schedules review; recruits alumni volunteer review team; appoints team chair
- Chapter and alumni officers complete Basic Data Form (BDF, or Accreditation Questionnaire)
 - BDF sample form
 - BDF data kept confidential by review team & coordinator
- Review team reads BDF prepared by chapter
 - Chair consults with FSILG staff
- Review occurs
- Organization comment period
- AILG Board reviews & approves adverse reports
- Report submitted to MIT

Accreditation Program Outcomes

- Recommended for Accreditation
 - Congratulatory note to alumni and undergraduate leadership.
 - Next review scheduled in two years.

- Recommended for Accreditation with Reservations
 - Staff-led consultation to address minor/moderate deficiencies noted.
 - Follow-up review scheduled in 6 months.

- Not Recommended for Accreditation
 - Staff-led full-scale intervention launched to address major deficiencies noted.
 - Next review scheduled in 6 months or when advised by staff.

Interventions

- Letter from Residential Life detailing deficiencies noted / shortcomings
- Each deficiency is addressed with action items and deadlines for completion and / or documentation
- Collaboration among staff, students, chapter volunteers and AILG volunteers is paramount

Accreditation Program Assessment

- Feedback loops
 - Review Team to Organization
 - Organization to Review Team & AILG
 - AILG to MIT
- What We Have Learned
- Critical Success Factors

Implementing this Model

- Transferability to other Institutions
 - Attention to Outcome
 - Attention to Process
 - Budget implications / options
 - Staffing / volunteer needs

Questions / Comments / Contact Us

www.mitailg.org/programs/accreditation/accreditation.html



Steve Baker, AILG Board
sbaker@alum.mit.edu

Marlena Martinez, Assistant Director,
FSILG Office
marlenam@mit.edu

Kaya Miller, Assistant Dean & Director,
FSILG Office
kmiller@mit.edu

Lauren Davis Wojtkun, Assistant Director,
FSILG Office
laurenw@mit.edu