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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

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

Reviews by fiscal year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 – 2005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 – 2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2007</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 – 2008</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 YEARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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