STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS

The Commission recognizes its dual responsibilities of quality assurance (the public role) and quality improvement (the private role) must be kept in balance. Nowhere is this dual role more in play than in the area commonly summarized by the term 'student assessment.' The Commission's *Standards for Accreditation* speak to assessment for improving the academic program and services for students (in many places, but especially in 4.48-4.54). At the same time, the Standards speak to the Commission's public responsibility for ensuring an appropriate level of student success and in making the results used and known – part of its responsibility as being recognized by the federal government as a reliable authority on the quality of education (many places, but especially: 2.7, 4.5, 4.34, 4.50, 4.54, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 10.10 and 10.12).

To fulfill these responsibilities and provide a framework for institutions and useful information for teams and the Commission, the Commission has developed two sets of data forms as discussed below. This is the third version of the forms; revisions to earlier versions are based on review and feedback from institutions. The Commission anticipates the forms will continue to evolve and welcomes comments from institutions.

The Commission approaches the goal for institutions to become increasingly explicit in the area of student achievement and success with the following assumptions:

- Given the diversity of institutions, there is no single way to achieve the goal; the system is best served when institutions can choose the method that best fits their approach;
- Greater regularity in how institutions report how they assess student learning and what they are finding out will be useful to institutions, visiting teams, and the Commission;
- It will be useful for all for the Commission to offer clear choices to institutions, with the understanding that the choices presented are subject to alternatives proposed by the institution and changes over time by the Commission, based on its experience;
- The Commission's approach should not only provide a framework to record how institutions are assessing student learning but also stimulate greater coherence in institutional approaches and greater sharing among institutions.

Institutions are asked to complete two sets of data forms:

Part I: Making Assessment More Explicit (The E-series) asks institutions to select and declare their basic approach to assessment and to summarize their findings. Four possible alternatives are listed below; if institutions wish to propose another alternative, they are invited to contact Commission staff. The four approaches are:

1. An inventory of program assessment and specialized accreditation
2. The Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) plus program review
3. Statement of claims for student achievement with supporting evidence
4. Comparison to peers on measures of student achievement and success

Part II: Documenting Student Success (The S-series) provides a format for institutions to present data on retention and graduation rates and other measures of student success appropriate to the institution's mission.

These two sets of data forms are further explained and presented, below.

PART I: MAKING ASSESSMENT MORE EXPLICIT (THE E SERIES)

Here institutions are asked to declare their approach to providing "systematic and broad-based assessment of what and how students are learning" (4.48), and summarize how the information is used for improvement. Four possible alternatives are listed below; if institutions wish to propose another alternative, they are invited to contact Commission staff.   In all cases, the Commission expects that the alternative selected will provide the institution with the ability to present its assessment at the program and institutional level. The four <u>alternatives</u> are:

- **E1: Inventory**:   In this alternative, the institution completes: <u>Part A</u>, an inventory of how programs assess student learning and use the results, and, as appropriate, <u>Part B</u>, an inventory of specialized accreditation. This alternative is based on a system used by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

- **E2: VSA**:   Here, the institution commits to the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) plus program review. This alternative builds on the system developed by APLU and AASCU; because the VSA uses institutional level data, it is augmented for Commission purposes by information on program review. While the system was developed by and for public institutions, for the Commission's purposes, it may be selected by any institution.

- **E3: Institutional Claims**:   Some institutions may elect a framework in which they state claims for the success or achievement of their students and provide evidence to validate the claim. This audit approach provides the institution great flexibility in stating the claims it makes to the public about student learning and student achievement, and developing credible evidence to support the claims.

- **E4: Peer Comparison**:   Many institutions already have complex systems to compare themselves with peer institutions, most often on matters of resources and processes; this alternative provides the opportunity to extend those comparisons to outcomes for student learning and success. Here the institution identifies key measures of student success (e.g., transfer or acceptance to graduate school) and compares its level of performance with that of its peers.

Selecting the method: In the periodic reviews, institutions are asked to declare which of the above four methods they wish to use. Alternatively, institutions may propose a fifth system or combination of the above. Such proposals should be forwarded to the Director of the Commission early in the report-preparation process. The Commission staff will review the proposal and confer with the institution.

Using the information in the forms and integrating information into the self-study: Institutions are encouraged to select their approach and complete the forms early in the report-preparation process so that they can use the information. The <u>Appraisal</u> section of the report provides a useful opportunity for institutions to reflect both on the success and achievement of their students and on their own progress in understanding what and how students are learning. Similarly, the <u>Projection</u> section affords institutions an opportunity to state their commitment for improvement in the area of assessment.

OPTION E1: PART A. INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

CATEGORY	(1) Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	(2) Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	(3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	(5) What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	(6) Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
At the institutional level:						
For general education if an undergraduate institution:						
List each degree program: 1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						
6.						

Institutions selecting E1a should also include E1b.

OPTION E1: PART B. INVENTORY OF SPECIALIZED AND PROGRAM ACCREDITATION

(1) Professional, specialized, State, or programmatic accreditations currently held by the institution (by agency or program name).	(2) Date of most recent accreditation action by each listed agency.	(3) List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	(4) Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board, or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.). *	(6) Date and nature of next scheduled review.
.				

*Record results of key performance indicators in form S3.

Institutions selecting E1b should also include E1a.

OPTION E2. VOLUNTARY SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTABILITY PLUS PROGRAM REVIEW

I.   Institutions selecting this option should include copies of the most recent College Portrait institutional template under VSA and up to two prior templates. The templates will be available from APLU and AASCU.

II.   Complete the information on program review, below.

CATEGORY	(1) What is the date of the most recent program review?	(2) How is an "external perspective" incorporated into the review?	(3) How are the results of the program review considered?	(4) What major changes have been made as a result of the most recent program review?	(5) What is the date of the next program review?
List each degree program: 1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					

OPTION E3. INSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, WITH VALIDATING INFORMATION

CATEGORY	(1) What are the claims for student achievement or student success?	(2) Where are the claims published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	(3) Other than course completion and grades, what outcomes evidence is used to support the claims?	(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. by the curriculum committee)	(5) What changes have been made in the program, the claims or the evidence?
At the institutional level:					
For general education if an undergraduate institution:					
List each degree program: 1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					

OPTION E4. MEASURES OF STUDENT SUCCESS: COMPARISON WITH PEERS

CATEGORY	(1) What is the measure of student achievement or student success?	(2) What is the institution's score or rate?	(3) What is the peer comparison group?	(4) What is the peer score or rate on this measure?	(5) What changes have been made as a result of the comparison?
At the institutional level:					
For general education if an undergraduate institution:					
List each degree program: 1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					

PART II: DOCUMENTING STUDENT SUCCESS (THE S-SERIES)

The S-series of forms has been devised for institutions to present data on retention and graduation rates and other measures of student success appropriate to the institution's mission. (*Standards for Accreditation*: 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 10.10 and 10.12) Clearly, not every measure listed here is appropriate for every institution. At the same time, some institutions may have multiple instances of a single item (e.g., licensure pass rates). In developing these forms, the Commission recognizes the value of trends in data, and the importance of the institution's own goals for success. Each form provides space for institutions to indicate definitions and the methodology used to calculate measures of student success.

By listing several ways to measure student success and achievement, the Commission encourages institutions to reflect on how they are using data to understand student success. The far right column within each form provides institutions the opportunity to identify their goal for each measure of student success, and the date by which the goal is expected to be attained. As always, the Commission expects that the institution's mission will provide helpful guidance in thinking about which measures of student success are most important and most useful. In brief, the forms are:

S1. Retention and Graduation Rates. Here institutions are asked to provide information on their IPEDS-defined retention and graduation rates, along with their goals for these indicators. Institutions can also provide additional retention and graduation indices, depending on their mission, program mix, student population, locations, and method of program delivery. For example, some baccalaureate institutions may also track 4- and 5-year graduation rates; some community colleges may find 4- and 5-year rates to complete an associate's degree to be helpful in evaluating their success with their student population. Institutions can also track the success of part-time students, transfer students, or students studying at off-campus locations or in programs offered on-line.

S2. Other Measures of Student Achievement and Success. The measures recorded here are likely to be mission-related. For example, some institutions may track the success of students gaining admission into certain graduate- or first-professional degree programs. Community colleges may track the success of their students entering baccalaureate programs. For some institutions, the number of students who enter programs such as Teach for America, the Peace Corps, or public service law may also represent indicators of institutional effectiveness with respect to their mission.

S3. Licensure Passage and Job Placement Rates. Institutions that prepare students for specific careers will find it appropriate to record the success of their students in passing licensure examinations. Also included in this form is the provision to record the success of students – perhaps by their academic major – in finding employment in the field for which they were prepared.

S4. Completion and Placement Rates for Short-Term Vocational Programs. Institutions with such programs in which students are eligible for Title IV federal financial aid should use these forms.

Using the forms: By completing these forms early in the self-study process, institutions will have time to collect and analyze all available information. The Appraisal section of the self-study provides a useful opportunity for institutions to reflect both on the findings recorded in the forms and the extent to which they have developed the systems to collect and use the most important data on student success. Similarly, the Projection section affords institutions an opportunity to state their commitment for improvement in the area of assessment.

Form S1. RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES					
Student Success Measures/ Prior Performance and Goals	3 Years Prior	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year (201_)	Goal for 201_
IPEDS Retention Data					
Associate degree students					
Bachelors degree students					
IPEDS Graduation Data					
Associate degree students					
Bachelors degree students					
Other Undergraduate Retention Rates (1)					
a					
b					
c					
Other Undergraduate Graduation Rates (2)					
a					
b					
c					
Graduate programs *					
Retention rates first-to-second year (3)					
Graduation rates @ 150% time (4)					
Distance Education					
Course completion rates (5)					
Retention rates (6)					
Graduation rates (7)					
Branch Campus and Instructional Locations					
Course completion rate (8)					
Retention rates (9)					
Graduation rates (10)					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
* An institution offering graduate degrees must complete this portion.					

Form S2. OTHER MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS					
Measures of Student Achievement and Success/ Institutional Performance and Goals	3 Years Prior	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year (201_)	Goal for 201_
Success of Students Pursuing Higher Degree					
1					
2					
3					
4					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					
Rates at Which Graduates Pursue Mission-Related Paths (e.g., Peace Corps, Public Service Law)					
1					
2					
3					
4					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					
Rates at Which Students Are Successful in Fields for Which They Were Not Explicitly Prepared					
1					
2					
3					
4					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					
Documented Success of Graduates Achieving Other Mission-Explicit Achievement (e.g., Leadership, Spiritual Formation)					
1					
2					
3					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					
Other (Specify Below)					
1					
2					
Definition and Methodology Explanations					

		3 Years Prior	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year (201_)	Goal for 201_
Form S3. LICENSURE PASSAGE AND JOB PLACEMENT RATES						
State Licensure Passage Rates *						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
National Licensure Passage Rates *						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
Job Placement Rates **						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						

* For each licensure exam, give the name of the exam above along with the number of students for whom scores are available and the total number of students eligible to take the examination (e.g. National Podiatric Examination, 12/14). In following columns, report the passage rates for students for whom scores are available, along with the institution's goals for succeeding years.

** For each major for which the institution tracks job placement rates, list the degree and major, and the time period following graduation for which the institution is reporting placement success (e.g., Mechanical Engineer, B.S., six months). In the following columns, report the percent of graduates who have jobs in their fields within the specified time.

Institutional Notes of Explanation

a	
b	
c	
d	
e	
f	

July 2011

	3 Years Prior	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year (201_)	Goal for 201_

Form S4. COMPLETION AND PLACEMENT RATES FOR SHORT-TERM VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR WHICH STUDENTS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID

	3 Years Prior	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year (201_)	Goal for 201_
Completion Rates *					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
Placement Rates **					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					

* List each short-term vocational training program separately. In the following columns indicate the annual weighted average completion rate for the most recent and two prior years. In the final two columns, list institutional goals for the next two years.

** List each short-term vocational training program separately. In the following columns indicate the annual weighted job placement rate for the most recent and two prior years. In the final two columns, list the institutional goals for the next two years.