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Objectives for Today’s Session

• Answer why this topic is important
  – Standard 8.1 is a Core Requirement
  – Noncompliance leads to sanction (warning or probation)
  – Public Disclosure
• Examine differences between 2012 and 2018 Principles of Accreditation (POA)
• Understand what is required in 2018 POA
• Give examples and an outline for organizing the response to Standard 8.1

How many of you

• Are new to accreditation?
• Are an off-site reviewer?
• Are an on-site reviewer?
• Have a
  – Fifth-Year Interim Report due shortly?
  – Tenth-Year Reaffirmation Site Visit shortly?
Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation
2012 – FR 4.1 Student Achievement

The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission.

Criteria may include enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.

Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation

“The institution publishes statements of its goals for student achievement and the success of students in achieving those goals.

Information on student success may include reliable information in retention, graduation, course completion, licensure examinations, and job placement rates and other measures of student success appropriate to institutional mission.”

Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation
2018 – 8.1 Student Achievement

The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered.

The institution uses multiple measures to document student success.
### Standard Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FR 4.1</th>
<th>CR 8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates success wrt student achievement</td>
<td>Evaluates student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with mission (with examples given)</td>
<td>Goal and outcomes consistent with mission, students served, or programs offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria with examples (from Policy)</td>
<td>Criteria (measures decided by the institution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published (from Policy)</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rationale & Notes Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FR 4.1</th>
<th>CR 8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria with examples</td>
<td>Criteria – rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of acceptability</td>
<td>Outcomes for the criteria specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thresholds of acceptability (minimum target defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal (obtainable targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data presented &amp; evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data source identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of 8.1 (must be published)

- **Criteria** (measures) based on institutional mission, goals, or strategic goals
- **Measurable Outcomes** (with rationale for each criteria)
- **Threshold of Acceptability** (minimum targets) with rationale
  - **Goal** (realistic targets) with rationale
  - **Evaluation of Data** with source
- Closing the loop is not necessary for Standard 8.1
Note on Standard 8.1 from POA

- From page 190 – "An institution is not required to report separate student achievement data by location or by mode of instruction. However, it should be clear from narratives how these sites and modes are incorporated into broader institutional statistics and into outcomes assessment measures.
- Institutions with multiple sites or with a broad array of distance learning programs may find it helpful to consider location or mode of delivery as a key variable in developing ways to use assessment results for program improvement."

Additional Note on Standard 8.1 (Item C from Dr. Wheelan’s email of 8-15-18)

- “…discussion of student success dynamics on the selected key completion indicator in the Compliance Certification and in the Fifth-Year Interim Report as a part of their response to Core Requirement (CR) 8.1 (Student achievement)...Evaluation committees will use this information as contextual reference points to inform their reviews of institutional cases for compliance with CR 8.1.”

Coming in Spring 2020 (Item III from Dr. Wheelan’s email of 9-12-19)

- “…pay close attention to the success of ALL students by disaggregating data by socioeconomic levels, ethnicity, etc., when responding to Standard 8.1 (Student Achievement)...during both the decennial review and fifth-year report. Beginning in the spring of 2020, peer review committees will begin to ask for this information, so please...include it in both your Compliance Certification and Fifth-Year Interim Report.”
SACSCOC Fifth-Year and Reaffirmation Committees will Examine and Analyze

- Documentation demonstrating success with respect to student achievement
- Appropriateness
  - Criteria
  - Thresholds of acceptability
- Whether the information is appropriately published

Random Sample Survey of SACSCOC Institutions

- Total number of members: 793 (Accredited and Candidate List as of June, 2018)
- Total number of public members: 479
- Number in survey: 91 (11.5% of membership and 19.0% of the public members)

Results:

- Accessed 60 (65.9%) of the 91 public members’ student achievement sites through SACSCOC Membership Database
- The remaining 31 (34.1%) of the 91 public members surveyed might not be compliant.
- Criteria (measures) used
  - Graduation rates = 88%
  - Retention = 75%
  - Licensures = 62%
  - Job placement rates = 53%
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Results (continued)

• Student achievement criteria based on:
  – 32% Mission
  – 13% Institutional goals
  – 22% Strategic plan or goals
  – 33% Not specified – Possible non-compliance
• Format:
  – 50% web based
  – 35% PDF
  – 15% mixed

SACSCOC - 2018


Mean number of student achievement measures = 5.9
  – Credential completion rates
  – Retention and persistence rates
  – Job placement, post-graduation employment, or graduate school acceptance rates
  – Licensure or certification exam pass rates
  – Course completion (pass/success rates)

SACSCOC 2018

Student Achievement - emerging non-compliance issues:
  – No rationale for the criteria (measures)
  – No rationale for the thresholds of acceptability or thresholds did not exist
  – Evaluation of measures not apparent
  – No discussion on the Key Student Completion Indicator
**LSU Eunice’s Approach**

- LSU Eunice is a Level 1, two-year, open admissions community college.
- Mission is typical for a two-year institution
- Strategic goals – To serve the citizens of Louisiana and position the University strategically, LSU Eunice seeks to
  1. Increase access
  2. Increase success
  3. Increase partnerships
  4. Demonstrate a culture of continuous improvement

---

**LSU Eunice – Criteria**

Available at [www.lsue.edu/sacscoc](http://www.lsue.edu/sacscoc)

- National Student Clearinghouse total 6-year Completion Rate (Key Student Completion Indicator)
- Enrollment
- Retention
- Statewide graduation rate
- Employment six months after graduation
- Degrees conferred
- Licensures

---

**Example – Retention (see page 9)**

- Criteria – Retention of students at LSU Eunice
- Outcome – LSU Eunice will increase new first-time full-time degree seeking student retention from fall 2017 to fall 2018
- Brief rationale for criteria and outcome
- Threshold of acceptability (minimum) = 49.56%
- Goal (realistic target) = 50.96%
- Brief rationale for threshold and goal
- Evaluation – Retention = 53.92%, since 53.92% > 50.96%, objective met.
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Example – Placement (see page 10)

- Criteria – Placement of Radiological Technology students
- Outcome – Students completing the RADT program will be employed within one year of graduation
- Brief rationale for criteria and outcome
- Threshold of acceptability (minimum) = 75%
- Goal (realistic target) = 95%
- Brief rationale for threshold & goal
- Evaluation – Placement = 100%, since 100% > 95%, objective met.

Strategy on Writing CR 8.1

- Published (link to “live” website and a PDF of the website)
- Rationale for criteria related to mission and strategic and institutional goals
- List criteria with outcomes, thresholds (with rationale), goals (with rationale), data, and evaluation
- Discussion of the Key Student Completion Indicator (KCSI)

In Summary…

- Criteria (measures) should be derived from institution’s mission, goals, or strategic goals, or students served
- Outcomes for each criteria stating criteria in measurable terms
- Rationale for criteria and outcomes
- Thresholds of acceptability (with rationale)
- Goals (realistic targets that are sought with rationale)
- Present and evaluate data (with source)
- Include a discussion of the selected key completion indicator
- Use multiple measures
- Publish
Example: Retention of new first-time full-time degree seeking students at LSU Eunice

Note: Differences exist between what is published on the web and what is written for the Standard.

Example: Retention

1. Criteria: Retention of students at LSU Eunice

2. Outcome for 2018-2019 Planning: LSU Eunice will increase new first-time full-time degree seeking student retention from fall 2017 to fall 2018.

   Rationale: Institutional priority based on LSU Eunice’s strategic goal one. Included in statewide workforce and completion priorities.

   For writing the Standard:
   Add details to the rationale: Why use retention?
   Provide institutional and state documents as evidence.

3. Threshold of acceptability (a data point – minimum): 49.56%
   Rationale: Institutional leaders do not wish to fall below 49.56% and the 49.56% is the median for the previous seven years of retention data.

   For writing the Standard:
   Answer why leaders do not wish to fall below 49.56%.
   Is the 49.56% threshold the result of historical data? If so, provide evidence.
   Are there other reasons? If so, provide as required.

4. AY 2018-2019 Goal (a data point – realistic and achievable target): 50.96%
   Rationale: The 50.96% was set as the goal because it is the mean of the previous six years of data.

   For writing the Standard
   Provide additional rationale for goal.
   Provide historical data as evidence, if necessary.

5. Evaluation: May include a graph here with trending data. Current AY 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 retention based on institutional data = 53.92%. Since the observed retention rate = 53.92% > the established goal = 50.96%, this objective is met.

   For writing the Standard
   Might want to elaborate on how data was collected?
   If additional statistics are involved, state methodology.
   Summarize the context of the data with respect to past years and the goal.
   If the data seems to be unusual, state that fact and why.
   Not Required: Plan for improvement if the outcome is not met.

Note: Data may run a year or two behind the current reporting year.
Example: Job Placement of Radiological Technology (RADT) Students

Note: Differences exist between what is published on the web and what is written for the Standard.

1. **Criteria:** Placement of graduating RADT Students

2. **Outcome for 2018-2019 Planning:** Students completing the RADT program will be employed within one year of graduation.

   **Rationale:** Institutional priority based on LSU Eunice’s strategic goal two. Included in statewide strategic workforce priority.

   For writing the Standard:
   - Add details to the rationale: Why use placement?
   - Provide institutional and state documents as evidence.

3. **Threshold of acceptability** (a data point – minimum): 75%

   **Rationale:** This is the minimum five-year average specified by Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) Standards.

   For writing the Standard:
   - Is this self-explanatory? If so, no other explanation is needed. Provide evidence.
   - Might want to state which average (mean, median, or mode).
   - Are there other reasons? If so, add to the rationale.

4. **AY 2018-2019 Goal** (a data point – realistic and achievable target): 95%

   **Rationale:** The 95% goal is historical over five years.

   For writing the Standard
   - Provide additional rationale for goal, if necessary.
   - Provide historical data, if necessary.

5. **Evaluation:** Students placed as a Radiologic Technologist = 100%. Since the observed placement = 100% > the established goal = 95%, this objective is met.

   For writing the Standard
   - May want to elaborate on how data was collected and in what time frame.
   - If additional statistics are involved, state methodology.
   - Summarize the context of the data in respect to past years and goal.
   - If the data seems to be unusual, state that fact and why.
   - **Not Required:** Plan for improvement if outcome is not met.

Note: Data may run a year or two behind the current reporting year