This session relates to core components of the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation, using evidence for improvement, enhancing student achievement, and learning outcomes. Specifically:

**SACSCOC 7.1**

The institution engages in ongoing, comprehensive, and integrated research-based planning and evaluation processes that (a) focus on institutional quality and effectiveness and (b) incorporate a systematic review of institutional goals and outcomes consistent with its mission.

An institutional planning and effectiveness process involves all programs, services, and constituencies; is linked to the decision-making process at all levels; and provides a sound basis for budgetary decisions and resource allocations.

What evidence exists that the institution-wide planning and evaluation processes result in continuing improvements in institutional quality?

Are appropriate internal and external constituents and stakeholders involved in the planning and evaluation process?

**SACSCOC 8.2.a, b, c**

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results for...

a. Student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs. (Student outcomes: educational programs)

b. Student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs. (Student outcomes: general education)

c. Academic and student services that support student success. (Student outcomes: academic and student services)

Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution’s success at achieving its mission and can be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions.

What is the role of faculty, chairs, deans, oversight committees and others in the process?

How does the institution seek improvements in educational programs after conducting these analyses?

How has the institution’s use of assessment results improved educational programs?

Specific examples where the findings from analysis of results have led to efforts to make program improvements.

How (and by whom) are the findings analyzed in order to take possible action on the findings?

If weaknesses are found, what process is there to seek improvements in the delivery of general education learning experiences?

Details on the assessment and analysis of results from these assessments.

Specific examples where the findings from analysis of results have led to efforts to improve the general education component of undergraduate degree programs.

Excellence in Assessment Designation

http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/eiadesignationoverview.html

Figure 1. EIA Evaluation Rubric: Use of Campus-level Evidence of Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of campus-level results with measures used at other levels to guide campus decision-making</td>
<td>Campus-level assessment results have been considered in combination with assessment results at other levels of the institution to guide decision-making related to changes in policies/practices that may lead to improved student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of use of assessment results from all levels of campus provided to stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholders from both inside and outside the institution are regularly provided with evidence that institutional decision-making is appropriately guided by assessment results from multiple levels of campus assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of changes made as a result of assessment evidence from all levels of campus</td>
<td>Changes made as a result of assessment are communicated to both internal &amp; external campus audiences, including students. Communications include information on evidence supporting need for change. (weighted for both internal &amp; external communication, that changes made are communicated to both, &amp; if communications include information on evidence supporting need for change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of outcomes from changes made as a result of assessment evidence from all levels of campus</td>
<td>Changes made as a result of assessment are monitored and evaluated. Outcomes from changes are communicated to both internal and external campus audiences, including students. Communications include information on evidence used to evaluate the change. (weighted if evidence is provided that changes made as a result of assessment results are monitored and evaluated, and more if outcomes from changes are monitored and results are communicated with both internal &amp; external audiences)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:** To what extent does the application provide evidence of meeting the exemplary definition provided?
5 = clear evidence provided that meets the exemplary definition; 3 = evidence provided, but either evidence is unclear or practice falls short of exemplary definition; 1 = evidence is alluded to but not provided directly or practice needs significant improvement to meet exemplary definition; 0 = no evidence provided or evidence provided does not address practice at all.

**Reflection Exercise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Challenge Reflection</th>
<th>EIA Standard of Excellence</th>
<th>Effective Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What challenges are there for your institution’s demonstration of SACSCOC Principles for using evidence, or for EIA “Use of Campus-level Evidence of Student Learning?”</td>
<td>What dimension/s outlined in the EIA rubric is/are particularly difficult and why?</td>
<td>What approach might you take to improve use of evidence, especially in the most challenging dimension/s?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>