The institution introduces a benchmark of a 5-year student growth in full-time students for goal … However, institutional growth does not indicate the student population."

The inclusion of an Official Graduation Rate metric specific to the success of low-income students, provides a more valid measure of student achievement. There is a shortage of highly qualified teachers and nurses in the [State region]."

The third goal is that at least 80% of [Institution] students have been enrolled on a part-time basis. Thus, identifying a standardized measure of program completion that includes all students, not just full-time students, provides a more valid measure of student achievement.
"The institution...does not indicate how it...evaluates these metrics...as indicators of student achievement...[No rationale was offered for how each indicator is appropriate and aligned with the college’s mission, the students it serves, or the kinds of programs it offers."

"[The] Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find thresholds of acceptability for the student achievement criteria...” (emphasis added)

"The institution described in their Compliance Certification the threshold[s] for graduation and retention rates but not for the other achievement [measures].” (emphasis added)

"The institution does not state how...thresholds are defined and how they are appropriate for the mission.” (emphasis added)

"[T]he Federal Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress standard of a minimum of 67% completion of all courses attempted within one year of graduation...

"The state sets the threshold of accountability for all indicators.

"For the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX-RN) for nursing graduates, the state of *** requires a first-time pass rate of 8%, which provides the minimum threshold of acceptability in this case.

"The minimal target, or threshold for accountability, for Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) examination pass rates is the state requirement (%).

"Based on three years of data for each measure, baseline levels are set two standard deviations below the system mean..."
A sub-task for the establishment of appropriate institutional goals was presented to the SACSCOC Annual Meeting.

Reference to Internal Processes of Threshold Setting

- “It identifies goals (targets) for retention and graduation rates (% and #, respectively) and State Licensure Passing Rates in Nursing (# as required by the [State]) Board of Nursing), but not for State Licensure Passing Rates in Education.”
- “The general goal is to improve upon the placement rate obtained in the previous year.”
- “The College has set a target of the previous year’s total of degrees and certificates obtained by [Institution] students.”
- “[Institution] Career and Technical Education (CTE) technical skill attainment rate will exceed the threshold percentage (%).”
- “Reference to external processes of threshold setting.”

Reference to Own Trend Data / Baseline, Threshold, Goal Values

- “The institution provided five years of IPEDS data showing an increase in graduation rate from ~12% to ~32%, while the institution’s graduation rate is improving, it is unclear what the institution’s goal is for student achievement in the area of graduation rates.”
- “The goal established for the graduation rate was a 10% increase over five years. Achieving this goal would place the University’s graduation rate in line with the national average.”
- “The goal set by the [Institution’s Law School], the school sets a goal that the average bar passage rate for its graduates of each institution will be working or enrolled within one year of graduation.”
- “The aspirational goal is for the percentage pass rate for first-time takers of the [licensure] exam to be no lower than two standard deviations below the average obtained by all first-time examination candidates.”
- “The college seeks to score above the 3-yr. average of [system] peer median scores as calculated by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) tool.”
- “We have also set a goal to meet or exceed the median first-time to fall full-time retention rate of a comparison set of institutions selected using the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.”
- “Reference to peers / National Data.”

Reference to External Accountability Standards

- “In addition to accountability thresholds, the College identifies goals/targets for each metric. Generally, institution-level targets align with the statewide/system goals and objectives.”
- “The general [Institution] Career and Technical Education (CTE) technical skill attainment rate will exceed the State threshold percentage (%).”
- “Reference to External Accountability Standards.”

Reference to Student Populations

- “[Given the selectivity and rigor of [Institution’s Law School], the school sets a goal that the average bar passage rate for [... graduates] is 8% (+15 percentage points to ABA threshold] or higher.”
- “The criteria for the establishment of the threshold of accreditation and the goals to achieve are set by past history (as illustrated in the charts) and by the admissions procedures of the university that provide an opportunity for a wide range of students, some who, while still not permit beyond a year or two. Thus the expectations are realistic and provide a reasonable “goal” to lead to increased success on the part of the university and the individual student.”
- “Reference to Student Populations.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Compliance Components</th>
<th>Sample Feedback from Peer Evaluators (Illustrative excerpts from Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee report)</th>
<th>Sample Institutional Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Student Achievement Outcomes for Selected Measures</td>
<td>&quot;The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could find no evidence of the institution ... evaluating the data (outcomes).&quot; (emphasis added)</td>
<td>• &quot;[T]he goal for the retention rate is not fully articulated but appears to be somewhere between the national average for open enrollment institutions (8%) and the national average for private institutions (8%), but no rationale for this goal is provided.&quot; (emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reference to Internal Process of Goal Setting | "The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could find no evidence of the institution ... evaluating the data (outcomes)." (emphasis added) | • "The goal set by the [State System] is that 4% of the graduates of each institution will be working or enrolled within one year of graduation. [Institution] has exceeded that goal in the past three years.

"[O]ver the past three years, the course completion rates have been maintained above the target level of 8%. One of the strategies that the College is putting in place is a ___ Program, which will conduct outreach to students at risk for failing or dropping classes.

"Students in ENG 101 have met the benchmark in all but one of the six semesters for which data has been analyzed. Students in ENG 102 have met the benchmark in all six semesters.

"Students in MTH 120 and 130 have failed to meet the benchmark approximately 8% of the time.

"Data for [Institution's] 2016 cohort show all students and Hispanic students missing the achievement goals for both First-to-Second Year (4%) and First-to-Third Year (4%) retention rates by roughly ten or more percentage points. However, the threshold of acceptability was met.

"The percentage of the College's AA graduates who transfer to a four-year institution (see Figure #) has declined over the past two years; in fact, the College did not meet the minimum goal in 2016. As the decline in 2016 was not large, this may represent an aberrant year and not a consistent trend. With the economy continuing to improve, it is also possible that these students chose to enter the workforce rather than continue their education. As the decline between 2015 and 2016 was not precipitous, College leadership is monitoring this metric for the time being and will take action if 2017 data indicates a continued downward trend.

"[Institution] failed to surpass the minimum acceptable threshold for the 2015 graduating class. Because of this, the [Director of Assessment] worked with staff in [Career Services] to develop more focused interventions for graduates who were not immediately employed or seeking to further their education after graduating from [Institution]. This resulted in a large (+8%) gain in this metric for the 2016 graduating class. While the percent of 2017 graduates enrolled or employed within one year dipped to 8%, it remains above the minimum acceptable threshold of 8%." |
| Discussion of Performance in Reference to Pre-Set Reference Points/Contexts (Thresholds and/or Goals) | "While a depth and breadth of results of student achievement are published on the institution’s website, the Committee could not find evidence that the institution actually evaluates (e.g., establishes benchmarks and targets or provides evidence of internal trend analysis) the level of student achievement on the identified measures." (emphasis added) | • "[Institution] set the [State System] is that 4% of the graduates of each institution will be working or enrolled within one year of graduation. [Institution] has exceeded that goal in the past three years.

"[O]ver the past three years, the course completion rates have been maintained above the target level of 8%. One of the strategies that the College is putting in place is a ___ Program, which will conduct outreach to students at risk for failing or dropping classes.

"Students in ENG 101 have met the benchmark in all but one of the six semesters for which data has been analyzed. Students in ENG 102 have met the benchmark in all six semesters.

"Students in MTH 120 and 130 have failed to meet the benchmark approximately 8% of the time.

"Data for [Institution's] 2016 cohort show all students and Hispanic students missing the achievement goals for both First-to-Second Year (4%) and First-to-Third Year (4%) retention rates by roughly ten or more percentage points. However, the threshold of acceptability was met.

"The percentage of the College's AA graduates who transfer to a four-year institution (see Figure #) has declined over the past two years; in fact, the College did not meet the minimum goal in 2016. As the decline in 2016 was not large, this may represent an aberrant year and not a consistent trend. With the economy continuing to improve, it is also possible that these students chose to enter the workforce rather than continue their education. As the decline between 2015 and 2016 was not precipitous, College leadership is monitoring this metric for the time being and will take action if 2017 data indicates a continued downward trend.

"[Institution] failed to surpass the minimum acceptable threshold for the 2015 graduating class. Because of this, the [Director of Assessment] worked with staff in [Career Services] to develop more focused interventions for graduates who were not immediately employed or seeking to further their education after graduating from [Institution]. This resulted in a large (+8%) gain in this metric for the 2016 graduating class. While the percent of 2017 graduates enrolled or employed within one year dipped to 8%, it remains above the minimum acceptable threshold of 8%." |

Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional CCR Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional CCR Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • "The Office of the Executive Vice President of Enrollment Management and Student Success in consultation with student services personnel across the College ... and, as a result of a series of retreats, planning workshops, and student success meetings...Sources include the following: [date]

Retreat Agenda, Planning Workshops, and Student Success Meetings..."[date]

"A cross-section of faculty and staff worked together to produce [Institution's] initial performance targets...[Institution's] President and Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPA) collected and analyzed data from several prior academic years to develop several targets based on historic trend data and align with [Institution's] institutional mission. The administrators took into consideration contextual issues specific to [Institution] such as implementation of admission standards and declining regional high school graduate numbers. Both the [State System] and [Governing Body] have recently reviewed the submitted information and accepted the rationale and approved these targets based on the appropriateness to [Institution’s] mission, students, and programs." |

**DRAFT/Work-in-Progress**
"While the university supplied data for several indicators, the university did not provide sufficient evaluation of its goals and outcomes for student achievement." (emphases added)

Reference to External Benchmarks / Peer Performance
- "[The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find information regarding graduation, and job placement rates, but is on par with the overall average for public institutions in [State].]"
- "In fiscal year 2015 (the most recent year available) the national student loan cohort default rate was 10.8 percent, and the cohort default rate for [State] was 8.6 percent. In this same year, the [Institution] cohort default rate was 3.8 percent, less than half the national average. The university’s low cohort default rate further evinces mission achievement as [Institution] graduates are financially capable of repaying federal loans secured to finance their educational endeavors."
- "Peer group comparison validates the College’s effectiveness. 4% of graduates were working or enrolled within a year of graduation, which is more than 5 percentage points above the peer group average."
- "[Peer School 1] is only the two-year college that (like [Institution]) serves the [Metro] area and is [Institution’s] lead competitor. Presently, their graduation rate is 18% versus [Institution’s] 10%. [Peer School 2] is the second closest school to [Metro area], and it holds at 6% graduate rate versus [Institution’s] 4%. However other larger community colleges have better graduation rates to include [Peer School 3] at 8% and [Peer School 4] at 8% and [Peer School 5] (which is the largest community college in the state) at 4%.”

Reference to Internal Review Process
- "The curriculum committee reviews the data of the most recent report and compares it to previous years to monitor for changes. The curriculum committee presents the results to the faculty during the annual retreat to determine the appropriate action plan."
- "Course completion rates in each program are reviewed annually by program faculty and academic administrators. Administrators use final grades to monitor students’ academic progress and evaluate instructional practices while instructors use the data and student learning outcomes data to make instructional decisions to improve their ability to meet students’ learning needs. These processes are also utilized to evaluate programs for program viability and student achievement, and to develop plans for continuous improvement across the institution via the institutional effectiveness plans (IEPs)."

Illustrative Excerpts† from Institutional CCR Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Compliance Components</th>
<th>Sample Feedback from Peer Evaluators</th>
<th>Sample Institutional Approaches</th>
<th>PUBLICATION of Goals and Outcomes for Selected Measures of Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find information regarding how the institution publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement such that it is accessible to the public.]&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td>&quot;For retention and graduation rates, outcomes (results) are published by the institution on its Consumer Information webpage, not just the goals themselves. These appear in the strategic plan document, which appears to be an internal document.&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td>&quot;The College publishes the goals and outcomes for student achievement on a Success webpage, per SACSCOC’s Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure policy statement.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The institution included [Data Summaries], which contain achievement data and benchmarks, it was not clear to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee that these are published anywhere. The institution’s annual reports include academic highlights for retention, graduation, and job placement rates, but no goal / benchmark information.&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td>&quot;The college has a [Peer School 1] rate of 11.5% versus [Institution’s] 17%, a [Peer School 2] rate of 8% versus [Institution’s] 12%, and a [Peer School 3] rate of 9% versus [Institution’s] 10%.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Page / Location on the Institutional Website</td>
<td>Dedicated Page / Location on the Institutional Website</td>
<td>&quot;The goals and outcomes for the institution are outlined below and are published in the Student Success Report. This report is published on [Institution’s] website under the Student Outcomes section on the Consumer Disclosures page.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Fact Book / Other Institutional Media</td>
<td>Institutional Fact Book / Other Institutional Media</td>
<td>&quot;Full-time retention data are published on the Student Achievement Disclosure Information page of the [Institution] website.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to External Websites</td>
<td>Link to External Websites</td>
<td>&quot;Data for student achievement are published on the University website’s Accreditation page (URL) under the category of Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure. For each category of data, both the goal and minimum acceptable level are published, as well as the data obtained for the past five years.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Student Achievement data is publicly available on the [Institution] website. Student Achievement data is appropriately published by being three ‘clicks’ away from the [Institution] main page, appears in the search bar when you search for ‘Student Achievement,’ and follows the SACSCOC Policy for Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Illustrative excerpts from Institutional CCR Narratives

‡Peer School 1

8.1

From [Data Source] (which is the largest community college in the state) at [State]."

The College’s Annual Student Achievement Report is [also] available to our students, campus community, and the public on . the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges Membership Directory under additional information for [Institution]."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Compliance Components</th>
<th>Sample Feedback from Peer Evaluators (Illustrative excerpts from Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reports)</th>
<th>Sample Institutional Approaches</th>
<th>Illustrative Excerpts(^1) from Institutional CCR Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Student Completion Indicator (KSCI)</td>
<td>&quot;The institution has selected the National Student Clearinghouse Total 6-Year Completion Rate as its SACSCOC student completion metric. Though the institution referred to &quot;Curriculum Student Completion&quot;, it was unclear to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee if this is the same metric.&quot;</td>
<td>Identification of the Selected KSCI and Discussion of Institutional Performance on the KSCI Over Time (change from baseline values)</td>
<td>- &quot;[Institution] selected the IPEDS Outcome Measure as its student completion indicator for SACSCOC. This was selected due to its inclusion of transfer-in and part-time students.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Although the institution identified several measures that they utilize to measure student achievement, they did not explicitly identify a specific student completion metric (e.g., IPEDS Graduation Rate, IPEDS Outcome Measure, or National Student Clearinghouse Completion Rate) for benchmarking purposes as first requested by SACSCOC in July 2018.&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- &quot;To track completion rates, [Institution] has selected the modified IPEDS outcome measure for its key student completion indicator as it is most reflective of the university's largely first-generation and working student population and its current strategic focus on Transfer student recruitment and support. While completion rates remain below target, they have improved over the last several years.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find any discussion of the baseline graduation data calculated using the IPEDS Graduation Rate (150% standard time), as submitted to SACSCOC in fall 2018, which established a baseline of 28.0% as reported in IPEDS 2016 and subsequent performance of 32.0% in IPEDS 2017.&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td>Data Disaggregation (and rationale)</td>
<td>- &quot;The President's Cabinet and the Office of Institutional, Assessment, Planning and Effectiveness collectively reviewed the available options and considered what would most accurately reflect our completion rates. After this research and discussion we informed SACSCOC that we would prefer to be reviewed based on our IPEDS [Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems] 6-year graduation rate, which is the &quot;traditional&quot; Overall Graduation Rate (150% standard time). Using this traditional 6-year graduation rate most accurately reflect those students that began at [Institution] and have completed their degrees in 6-years from our University. We are also able to review our graduation rates with peer institutions in a comprehensive manner to note our status among like institutions. These peer institution comparisons will be detailed in the next section.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Please note that the institution should include an analysis of the institution’s progress from the baseline completion (level on the KSCI)&quot; (emphases added)</td>
<td>Improvement Actions (if appropriate)</td>
<td>- &quot;The external measures include the key student completion metric selected by the College in response to SACSCOC's efforts to monitor and support student completion: IPEDS graduation rate. The College's 2017 institutional resume provides institution and peer group averages for graduation rates of first-time, full-time, credential-seeking students after three, four, and six years. The College shows graduation rate gains since 2010 for all cohorts at three, four, and six years. While the most recent four and six-year cohort graduation rates sit slightly below, the most recent three-year cohort graduation rate equals the peer group average of 8%.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- &quot;The Key Student Completion Indicator for *** University has been identified as the IPEDS Outcomes Measure eight-year graduation rate. This measure was chosen because it includes part-time students and students who transfer into the University. In our nursing program, a large percentage of the students are transfers from other schools after completing their core set of classes and prerequisites for the nursing program. ... In the three cohorts reported, we have seen an increase each year from 8% for the 2008-2009 cohort, to 9% for the 2009-2010 cohort, and to 8% for the 2010-2011 cohort, meeting not only the minimum threshold of 8%, but achieving the goal of 8% with the 2010-2011 cohort. This increase is promising and should continue as the focus on retention from our Quality Enhancement Plan enables students to persist to degree completion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The "excerpts" are provided to assist the reader in identifying typical (and often interrelated) approaches to support an institution’s assertion of compliance with components embedded in CR 8.1. Extracted from Compliance Certification Report narratives, these excerpts are components of some institution’s articulation of overall compliance with CR 8.1.