

Addressing Potential Non-Compliance Factors in CR 8.1: Illustrative Examples of Institutional Approaches – *Work-in-Progress* (Fall 2022) (best printed on 11x17 paper)

This document presents a summary of selected findings from *ongoing* content analyses of:

- a) judgments of non-compliance on CR 8.1 articulated by Off-Site Reaffirmation Committees from reviews conducted in 2019- 2022** – Sample illustrative excerpts from primarily Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee report narratives are provided to assist the reader in identifying typical (and often interrelated) factors leading peer evaluators to judgments of non-compliance on CR 8.1. Note that these excerpts are *components* of some committee’s articulation of *overall* judgment on institution’s compliance with CR 8.1.
- b) institutional Compliance Certification Report narratives on Core Requirement (CR) 8.1 submitted in 2019-2021** -- Sample illustrative excerpts from Compliance Certification Report narratives are provided to assist the reader in identifying typical (and often interrelated) approaches institutions take to support their assertion of compliance with elements embedded in CR 8.1. Note that these excerpts are *components* of some institution’s articulation of *overall* compliance with CR 8.1.

This descriptive summary is neither exhaustive nor evaluative and is intended to provide a current snapshot of some common ways institutions and peer evaluation committees have been interpreting and applying selected compliance components of CR 8.1. For more information regarding the interpretation of this standard, please refer to the following: [Principles of Accreditation](#) (p.20), [Resource Manual](#) (pp. 64-65), and [Interpretation of Core Requirement 8.1](#). For institution-specific questions about compliance components embedded in CR 8.1, please contact your assigned SACSCOC Vice President.

I. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p>I. MEASURES (CRITERIA) Indicators or metrics selected by the institution itself to document multiple dimensions of student achievement in the context of its mission, student populations, programs, and strategic priorities. In other words, these are items to be measured - items for which (i) thresholds of acceptability and goals are pre-set by the institution and (ii) outcomes are reported.</p>	<p>- Not discussing appropriateness of selected measures of student achievement</p>	<p>- “The institution did not justify ... the criteria it utilizes ... Therefore, the Committee could not determine the appropriateness of criteria ... used to [document] student achievement.”</p>	<p>- Reference to institutional mission</p>	<p>- “As a workforce education institution with a mission focused on in-demand technical occupations and economic development..., the College measures institutional success first and foremost by student wages and job placement, tracking graduate wages and student job placement to monitor the applicability and relevance of the college’s course and program offerings.” - “[E]specially for the MD and PhD programs, eventual job placement (practice sites and type of practice for physicians) and final job placement (in academia, industry, or government) is an important metric linked to our mission with respect to meeting the healthcare needs of the underserved and diversifying the health professions and research workforce.” - “The third goal is that at least #% of graduates will have one or more experiences in applied learning, defined as capstone projects & courses, community-based leadership projects, cross-cultural experiences, internships ... & practicums, student research & scholarship. This is a goal...consistent with our mission to [develop] ‘A student body of committed learners, actively involved in the programs of the college and in service to the greater community’.” - “The College’s Mission and Values Statement highlights the College’s commitment to Collaboration and building alliances with...regional post-secondary institutions to support transfer...The inclusion of the Transfer Rate metric supports the College’s ability to monitor the extent to which it is achieving its Mission to develop transfer alliances and pathways.” - “Sitting alongside the goal of academic excellence is [Institution’s] commitment to engage students with Christ’s message of love and salvation and to equip them for a life of service in the world...The University employs two primary assessments, ..., to measure how students are growing in their faith and its impacts on their personal habits and behaviors.”</p>
		<p>- “The Committee was unable to identify a rationale or evidence demonstrating that the identified metrics are ‘appropriate to the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered’ as this was not addressed by the institution.”</p>	<p>- Reference to institutional strategic plan</p>	<p>- “Persistence, retention, and completion have been institutional objectives and success measures in the last two strategic plans, 2015-2020 and 2020-2025.” - “The College’s institutional-level student achievement metrics were selected for the purpose of measuring the effectiveness of the Strategic Directions associated with each of the four institutional commitments in Strategic Plan 2020.” - “In fall 2019, [Institution] developed a 2020-2022 Strategic Plan along with a series of strategic goals/objectives. From this plan, the [strategic planning committee] and executive leadership decided on a set of student achievement indicators, with specific goals and outcomes, as measures of student success.” - “The institution’s rationale for choice of this metric is that retention is a core institutional priority based on [Institution’s] 2016-2022 Strategic Plan...” - “Improvement of graduation rates is central to [Institution’s] Strategic Plan for 2018-2022. Strategic Goal #1 is to ‘increase retention, progress, and graduation rates through creating a campus culture focused on individual student success’.” - “[Institution] also has a student achievement goal to increase the number of transfer students from neighboring community colleges. This goal is aligned to the institution’s goal: ‘To recruit the best students from across the university and abroad, who demonstrate a higher capacity to excel in dynamic and challenging academic environments.’ The goal is also aligned with University Priority #, Objective #: Increase the number of transfer students from neighboring community colleges from #% to #% by 2020.” - “Licensure and certification pass rates are another key indicator of student achievement. There is a shortage of highly qualified teachers and nurses in the [State region].”</p>
		<p>- “The institution...does not indicate how it ... evaluates these metrics as indicators of student achievement... [N]o 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.”</p>	<p>- Reference to external accountability requirements</p>	<p>- “Each [student achievement] measure is defined by state statute...” - “The state strategic plan metrics are the primary measures of student success for [Institution’s] strategic plan.” - “These measures are included in the performance-based funding model for [State System] and are used in determining allocations to the # colleges.” - “[State system strategic] goals focus on increasing the number of graduates who are working or enrolled within one year after their award. To align with these goals, [Institution] has adopted graduate first and fifth year earnings as lagging indicators of student success...” - “Seven student achievement/success measures are used by all # community colleges within the [State] Community College System. These measures are called the [State System] Performance Measures of Student Success and are commonly referred to as the Performance Measures.... Having the ability to compare [Institution’s] s performance to like institutions provides the college with relatable benchmark data and, additionally, highlights other institutions that could serve as a resource in the event advice is needed to improve a local Performance Measure.” - “The fourth student achievement indicator for Goal 1 is the average semester credit hours (SCH) attempted when completing an associate degree. [State] Administrative Code Rule # states that all academic associate degree programs must consist of 60 SCH unless an exemption has been granted by the [State] Higher Education Coordinating Board. Ensuring that students do not attempt an excess amount of semester credit hours when completing a 60 SCH associate degree directly supports the College’s mission.” - “Student achievement [indicators] have been identified through mandates of [programmatic] accrediting bodies...”</p>

I. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
	<p>- Not identifying student achievement measures for significant and relevant segments of student populations</p>	<p>- [Institution selected enrollment growth as one of its student achievement measures] “[I]nstitutional growth does not indicate the level of student achievement during their time at the institution—such institutional enrollment goals do not appear to relate to the topic of student achievement which is the focus of this standard.”</p> <p>- “It is not apparent that the measures of student achievement are appropriate for the kinds of programs offered...”</p>	<p>- Reference to student progression patterns</p> <p>- Reference to student sub-populations</p>	<p>- “Success in college level English and math classes are critical in demonstrating how community college students, who often start with academic deficiencies, are progressing academically at [Institution].”</p> <p>- “Course success is a fundamental measure of student achievement and how well [Institution] is accomplishing its mission of effective teaching and learning. Additionally, course success is an essential component of progressing through an academic program to earn a degree, and many of [Institution’s] four-year transfer partners require students to maintain grades of ‘C’ or higher to transfer credits. As such, course success is an appropriate student achievement criterion for the College.”</p> <p>- “Over half of [Institution] students indicate plans to transfer to a 2-year specialized program or 4-year college or university to complete degree requirements. Therefore, the College monitors the transfer-out rate of students...”</p> <p>- “Freshman retention rate is an indicator of student engagement in and commitment to the educational process being the path to fulfilling one’s dreams. Retention between freshman and sophomore years is most critical and most difficult, but also most beneficial, as it is a significant indicator the student may persist in the educational process.”</p> <p>- “Average time to degree is an important and specific metric for the programs. Timely completion assures that students are making good use of resources and that support of the students is sufficient for them to achieve the learning competencies in an appropriate time frame.”</p> <p>- “Degrees Awarded without Excess Credits - This metric measures the percent of bachelor’s degrees awarded without excess credit. Credits are considered in excess when the number of credits a student earns exceeds 110 percent of degree credit required. [Institution] focuses on having students declare majors during their freshman year, providing milestones in ‘major maps’ to aid students in efficiently completing degree requirements.”</p> <p>- “While completion of a degree or certificate remains the touchstone for student achievement, its status as a lagging measure can present challenges when attempting to monitor the impact of initiatives on student achievement. By the time students graduate it is too late to intervene with efforts that could enhance the ability to meet the goal of completion of an associate degree within three or four years. Thus, the number of hours students complete during a semester of a year becomes a useful measure of momentum toward degree completion.”</p> <p>- “Because [Institution] is a majority–minority institution ..., [Institution] monitors the success of minority students as a distinct performance indicator.”</p> <p>- “[P]ercentage of academically unprepared students who complete a college-level course in the subject area they entered not ready within two years. ... Of the College’s # first-time freshman students enrolled in coursework in the Fall 2018 semester, #% were identified as requiring developmental courses in one or more subjects. It is critical to the College mission that academically unprepared students both meet [Institution] requirements and complete college-level coursework within a reasonable timeframe.”</p> <p>- “Pass rate for each developmental course sequence - Within its mission, the college provides educational opportunities to high school graduates seeking a higher education. As an open admissions institution, this results in a large percentage of students needing developmental instruction to raise their basic skill levels to the required collegiate level for successful academic performance. Each fall semester, an average of [80%+] of incoming first-time freshman test into at least one developmental course for remediation of basic skills.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] monitors the number of undergraduate students reaching or surpassing 30, 60, or 90 cumulative earned credit hours in each academic year as defined by student classification... Approximately [50=+] % of [Institution’s] undergraduate enrollment (excluding high school students) is made up of low-income students who depend on financial aid to attend college. Low-income students who do not complete college in four years are more likely to drop out or borrow money since most financial aid is limited to four years. Encouraging students to complete at least 30 credit hours per year is crucial.”</p> <p>- “As [70+] % of [Institution] students enroll part-time, the College has also identified Fall-to-Fall persistence rates of part-time FTICs as a student achievement measure.”</p> <p>- “[IPEDS Outcomes Measure] was selected as an additional program completion measure since it includes all students, regardless of enrollment status. Over the last five years, approximately #% [more than 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.”</p> <p>- “Licensure/Certification Pass Rates are used as a key measure of student achievement for [Institution’s] technical education students, who comprise nearly 50% of the total student population.”</p> <p>- “Graduate production is a nontraditional measure of achievement that reflects the mission of community colleges. Like many community colleges, [Institution] serves a large population of students that are not counted in the more traditional IPEDS 150% graduation rate, such as students restarting their education or attending school to seek new careers. However, they are represented in the graduate production rate. The graduate production rate is calculated by counting all awards in an academic year and dividing by the fall term full-time equivalent (FTE).”</p> <p>- “The College also monitors the academic success of student-athletes because they comprise a significant portion of our overall student population. For Fall ****, there were # student-athletes identified as members of school sponsored teams, which represented #% [almost half] of the overall student headcount enrollment.”</p>

I. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
		<p>- “[T]he institution does not identify, evaluate, or publish appropriate goals and outcomes for student achievement at the master’s level, nor does it utilize multiple measures to document master’s student success.”</p> <p>- “[I]nstitution’s narrative mentions professional schools, but Committee members could find no [student achievement] data [for graduate students.]”</p> <p>- “While the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found evidence of student achievement for graduate students with some of the licensure and certification exam pass rates, the Committee was unable to determine if the institution’s student achievement goals are appropriate for the scope of graduate students enrolled and the graduate programs offered.”</p>	<p>- Reference to educational programs / curricular structure</p> <p>- Reference to commonly used/accepted metrics that are relevant / appropriate to the institution</p> <p>- Reference to research literature / best practice models</p> <p>- Description of the internal institutional process of selecting measures</p>	<p>- “Transfer to a university is a key measure of student achievement at the community college, especially for students who are majoring in Associate of Arts and Associate of Science programs or taking core courses.”</p> <p>- “Nursing is the largest program at the College and drives enrollment to a large degree. Thus, given its imprint on the College and the overall number of students enrolled, results from the Nursing Licensure exam are used as a measure of student achievement.”</p> <p>- “An additional measure of program completion is the admissions rates from pre-clinical tracks into clinical programs. Consistent with the college mission, the general studies program includes tracks that provide the opportunity to earn admission into both the nursing and radiologic technology associate degree programs. Since the purpose of these tracks is to provide a pathway into a clinical program, the program graduation rate does not provide an accurate assessment of student achievement for this program. Thus, the admission rates are tracked.”</p> <p>- “Thesis completion is a key indicator of graduate student achievement, as well as the appropriateness of [Institution] graduate curricula and student support services.”</p> <p>- “Recognizing the importance of internships to students gaining meaningful experience in their field of study and ultimately securing employment, [Institution] has tracked the number of students completing internships each year.”</p> <p>- “Portfolio Scores -- Throughout the curriculum, students work on course projects and assignments with the goal of building a final collection of work that demonstrates their skills and experiences acquired during their program. Most students in diploma, associate degree, and baccalaureate degree programs take the portfolio course at key points in their programs. This course serves as the formal process in which students’ collections of work becomes their professional portfolio. During the course, the portfolio is evaluated (and graded) by their faculty. These scores are used as indicators to measure program effectiveness and represent indicators of student achievement.”</p> <p>- “Persistence rates are commonly used student progress measures for both two-year and four-year institutions.”</p> <p>- “The retention of the first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students is a standard metric that [Institution] tracks and reports to federal and state governing bodies each year.”</p> <p>- “In its effort to identify appropriate metrics, [Institution] considers metrics espoused by external agencies and organizations, such as the Institute for Education Sciences (IES), the [State] Department of Education (*DOE), the Aspen Institute, Achieving the Dream (ATD), and the American Association of Community Colleges (AACCC).”</p> <p>- “[T]hese criteria, or items measured, are standard measures of success and common indicators of student achievement in higher education and are therefore justified as acceptable measures for this reason as well. State regulators, federal regulators, regional accreditors, program accreditors, and various college ranking agencies use these measures in their own compliance, evaluative, and funding processes, further reiterating the commonality and appropriateness of these measures as indicators of student achievement in general at student achievement at *** College.”</p> <p>- “The four student-achievement [measures] listed above were chosen either because they are the most tangible indicators (retention rate, graduation rate, ASR) used by external audiences (e.g., IPEDS) to judge the academic quality of an institution as compared to other institutions or because they are based on best practices that research shows ... have a positive effect on student success (e.g., HIPs).”</p> <p>- “The College examines gateway course attempts and completions. Literature suggests that students who attempt and pass gateway English and math in their first academic year have a high probability of completing their credentials; therefore, the College tracks First-Time-in-College students’ course-taking patterns in these gateway courses.”</p> <p>- “First College-Level Course Completion -- This metric is defined as the number of students who successfully complete their first college-level course in math, reading, or writing during the academic year. First College-Level Course Completion is the first milestone students can achieve in their respective pathways. It comes directly from the ... Community College Success Points Model.”</p> <p>- “Student Thriving - Grounded in positive psychology, the Thriving Quotient is a research-validated and nationally benchmarked measure that quantifies the degree to which human flourishing takes place in the lived experiences of undergraduate students in college.”</p> <p>- “Student Engagement [Participation rates in High-Impact Practices or HIPs] ... Research has shown that students who are involved in HIPs are more likely to finish their programs of study ... [Institution] acknowledges that participation rate is an indirect assessment and that analysis of the relationship between HIPs and specific outcomes among the institutions’ students should be conducted in the future. Still, the institution maintains that sufficient research has been conducted on the benefits of HIPs that increasing this rate is extremely likely to be of benefit to students.”</p> <p>- “Identification of these metrics came as part of an overall process to better understand the causes of the College’s low retention rates...Course Success Rates -- In 2014-2015, *** College began a campus-wide study to better understand causal factors impacting low student retention at the College. The study involved partnering with John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education (JNGI). We learned that first-year students were not only our largest population, but that they also had our lowest retention rates. Furthermore, the group discovered that if students earned two or more grades of D, F, Withdrawal, or Incomplete (DFWI) they were #% more likely to leave the institution. Foundational courses with high enrollment, and high DFWI rates are referred to by the Gardner Institute as gateway courses because they frequently act as requisite portals to upper-level course work and degree completion.”</p> <p>- “The Institutional Effectiveness Leadership Council (IELC) met to review data and determine appropriate measures of student achievement. The council selected a total of six measures (3 institutional and 3 program).”</p> <p>- “The student achievement variables...were established by the Office of the Executive Vice President of Enrollment Management and Student Success in consultation with student services personnel across the College ..., and approved through the Student Services Council, Instructional Affairs Council, and College Executive Council.”</p> <p>- “In 2015-16, the College established a sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Task Force to review the student achievement criteria being used and to identify additional achievement criteria that [Institution] could utilize to evaluate student success. As part of their charge, the sub-committee was asked to provide [a] rationale for each criterion they recommended to gauge student achievement, ...”</p> <p>- “As the institution sought to establish the metrics for measuring student achievement, it relied on a collegial and participatory process of broad engagement with community and business leaders, students, faculty, other employees, and the Board of Trustees. Through these internal and external feedback sessions, metrics were selected and targets were established. College faculty were engaged during faculty meetings in the process of defining major challenges faced by [Institution’s] students, defining the best measures of student achievement, and setting goals and expected outcomes.”</p>

II. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p style="text-align: center;">II. THRESHOLDS OF ACCEPTABILITY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Reference data point for a given measure of student achievement that represents a minimum level of acceptable performance set by the institution itself in the context of its mission, student populations, programs, and strategic priorities. In other words, thresholds indicate levels of performance below which the institution does not want to fall or levels of performance that trigger alarm.</p>	<p>- Not identifying thresholds of acceptability for selected measures of student achievement</p>	<p>- "Solid rationale and comparative data were provided for all measures and were used to identify goals and for these measures, but the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not find thresholds of acceptability." - "Not only targets are required, but also low thresholds that would trigger concern and action for improvement must be provided." - "The Committee could not find evidence of documented thresholds for the number of certificates/degrees earned (a goal level was established but could not identify minimum achievement level)." - "The Committee was unable to determine the threshold of acceptability for each metric listed. Though a performance data point was referenced for each metric the committee could not identify a minimum performance level and a goal performance level for each metric." - "While the institution reported a baseline for each of the # institutional [measures], it is unclear to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee if the baselines represent thresholds of acceptability." - "The institution offers a number of data points to illustrate student achievement, including training, retention, enrollment, and student research. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of thresholds for acceptability with the exception of enrollment."</p>		
	<p>- Not discussing APPROPRIATENESS of established thresholds of acceptability for selected measures of student achievement</p>	<p>- "Committee could not find ... justification for the thresholds of acceptability that were established." - "The institution does not state how ... thresholds are ... are appropriate for the mission." - "The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee also noted that the rationale for the threshold of acceptability was not clearly apparent for some of the selected metrics..." - "The institution has set a minimum acceptability rate of 14% for six-year graduation rates over a three-year period, but it did not provide a rationale..."</p>	<p>- Reference to institution's own trend data</p> <p>- Reference to peer or other external reference group performance / commonly accepted standards</p>	<p>- "The threshold of acceptability is set at #% which is the college's lowest rate in the past six years." - "This threshold was set because the institution's leadership does not want to drop below this point, which was the low mark in the four-year window prior to the strategic plan's implementation." - "The Threshold of Acceptability is the minimal acceptable level of achievement and equates to the College's average performance over the last 3-5 years of historic data. Due to recent increases in student success...establishing the recent performance average as the threshold criteria serves to provide a mechanism to monitor whether the College sustains a general upward trajectory in outcomes." - "The threshold of acceptability for each student-achievement [indicator] is the lowest score earned over a multi-year period. A drop below the threshold of acceptability for a goal will initiate a more focused evaluation by the appropriate committee (Retention Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, etc.), which will then make actionable recommendations for improvement to the President's Executive Staff." - "[Institution] has set its minimum threshold to be # awards, which represents the average of the last four years of data. Justification for Minimum Threshold: To achieve the College's goal of # awards, [Institution] believes that falling below this level would represent an indicator that something was not proceeding as expected." - "[T]he minimum threshold is the average two-year mean score minus the STD*2 (%)." - "In most cases, thresholds of acceptability are calculated by subtracting the previous year's actual value from the current goal; then, 70 percent of that number is added to the previous year's threshold. If the university fails to make progress equal to 70 percent of that goal, the institution does not meet the threshold of acceptability. In cases in which the university surpasses a goal, the threshold of acceptability for that goal is prorated by 0.3 units less than the goal." - "At a minimum, the institution expects to exceed the statewide average for all [measures]..." - "Based on three years of data for each measure, baseline levels are set two standard deviations below the system mean..." - "[Minimum threshold is to] meet or exceed [State] Board of Regents community college mean. Utilizing [state system] sister institutions in determining the minimum expected threshold provides us with similar institutions to gauge [Institution's] success." - "Our formal institutional goal is to meet or exceed the median retention rate of our identified set of # peer institutions. The rationale for this target is that [Institution] should be able to support student achievement at or above a level similar to that of other institutions which have similar missions, are of similar size, have similar student populations, and operate with a comparable resource base." - "The College uses the average results of the IPEDS Comparison groups as the threshold of acceptability for the Eight-Year Graduation Rate [OM]." - "This threshold is an average of senior respondents in Southeast private institutions participating in the NSSE." - "The minimum threshold of #% was chosen because this is the average of the national scores for the end of rotation exams for 2016, 2017, and 2018." - "The minimal targets (thresholds of acceptability) for graduation rates shown below may seem low. However, based on the low-income and high [ethnic group] population served by [Institution], these targets are justified and are in keeping with [Institution's] peer institutions." - "A minimum threshold of #% is set by the Chair of the Accounting Program for students who pass the CPA the first time serves to ensure that we exceed national CPA pass rates." - "The threshold of acceptability is set at #% by the program as there is no state/national pass rate requirement, and # is commonly accepted as a passing grade."</p>
		<p>- "A clear, specific rationale for the minimum performance level for each student achievement metric was not provided beyond a general statement that each were 'based upon historic averages previously identified for each measure and comparative state and national data'."</p>	<p>- Reference to external accountability standards</p>	<p>- "[T]he Federal Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress standard of a minimum of 67% completion of all courses attempted cumulatively..." - "The Carl Perkins Measures and Standards, a federal program administered by the state, sets benchmarks for all workforce education programs at an 85% placement rate within one year of graduation..." - "The state sets the threshold of accountability for all indicators." - "[State] Fiscal Accountability Authority has established performance funding criteria which include an #% graduate placement rate. Therefore, #% is a minimum threshold [for graduate placement measure]..." - "For licensure rates, [Institution] uses #% as the minimum threshold per recommendation by the [State Coordinating Board]." - "The minimal target, or threshold for acceptability, for Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) examination pass rates is the state requirement (%)." - "For the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX-RN) for nursing graduates, the state of *** requires a first-time pass rate of #%, which provides the minimum threshold of acceptability in this case." - "Minimum thresholds of acceptability for Radiologic Science and Nursing are based on JCERT and ACEN accreditation minimums, which are #% for Radiologic Science and #% for Nursing. For education, the minimum threshold of acceptability is based on the minimum score required for certification; #% as established by The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)." - "Benchmarks for minimum required achievement are determined by the Commission of Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA) standards ... and historic correlation of internal assessments with performance on nationally standardized examinations."</p>

			<p>- Description of the internal institutional process of setting thresholds of acceptability</p>	<p>- "The Retention Advisory Board has established [minutes] and the Strategic Planning Council has endorsed [minutes] the threshold of acceptability (minimum expectation) for retention of first-time, full-time (FTFT) students at #%...The Retention Advisory Board set the threshold of acceptability...based on a review of [Institution's] retention rates over the past decade..."</p> <p>- "...[T]he thresholds of acceptability undergo an annual review for consistency with the institutional mission and the students the institution serves. The annual review, to include approved revisions if any, is completed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee each February and is primarily predicated on historical data of the institution."</p> <p>- "The threshold and goal for the six-year completion and first-time completion at the same institution rates are determined by the Assessment and Planning standing committee. This committee is composed of University Transfer and Workforce Solutions faculty as well as [Institution] staff members."</p>
--	--	--	---	---

III. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p style="text-align: center;">III. GOALS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Reference data point for a given measure of student achievement that represents a target level of performance set by the institution itself in the context of its mission, programs, resources, and student populations. In other words, goals indicate levels of aspirational or strategic performance that the institution is striving to achieve.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not identifying goals/targets for selected measures of student achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Goals, in some cases, appear to be implied rather than explicitly stated or do not appear to have been identified.” - “The institution provided five years of IPEDS data showing an increase in graduation rate from ~#% to ~#%. 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 institution has not identified target levels of performance for the remaining two metrics (completion rates and course success rates), making it difficult or impossible for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee to interpret these metrics with respect to student achievement and institutional improvement.” 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The off-site review committee observed that across the majority of student achievement measures, a clear justification for the thresholds of acceptability ... failed to be presented.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference to institution’s own trend data / baselines / thresholds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “For each measure, ...the goal is set at #% above the previous two-year average...” - “To set the target, [Institution] averaged the last four years of data and set an increase of #%.” - “The target of #% presumes an increase of #% each year through 2025.” - “The target is to increase the rate # percentage points annually from the baseline rate of the academic year 2013-2014.” - “[Institution’s] achievement goal for its graduation rate is to exceed the threshold by #% as the college strives to perform above the base standard.” - “The ‘challenge’ goal is the five-year average of the metric plus #%. This goal speaks to [Institution’s] desire to seek continuous improvement in the educational programs and services provided to its students.” - “[Institution] has identified the aspirational goal for this indicator to be 10 percentage points above the institutional five-year average. The Institution believes that this goal is appropriately balanced between aggressiveness and obtainability in relation to historical data.” - “The aspirational goal is equal to the two-year average rate plus the STD*2 (#%).” - “University-wide strategic goals are calculated based on a regression analysis of historical trends combined with the predicted impact of any initiatives that have been implemented.”
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not discussing appropriateness of established goals/targets for selected measures of student achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “[T]he institution did not discuss how its chosen goals ... for student achievement are appropriate to its mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of academic programs it offers.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference to peer or other external reference group performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The standard achievement goal for [Institution] students is to complete their education with fewer excess Semester Credit Hours at rates above those of students who completed programs at other [State] two-year institutions.” - “The goal for graduation rates of first time, full-time students within six years is to meet or exceed the average of peer institutions (see list and process).” - “To determine the target level for this variable, the College reviewed the graduation rates of peer and aspirational institutions within the state of ***. As a ..., the College set the expected at [levels]...These targets will allow the College to remain higher than its peers and strive to close the gap with the aspirational institutions.” - “Aspirational goals are set with peer institutional comparison data, when available, with an added standard deviation of 1.” - “Based on three years of data for each measure..., excellence levels are set one standard deviation above the [S]ystem mean.” - “[T]he college seeks to score above the 3-yr. average of [system] peer median scores as calculated by the National Community College Benchmark Project.” - “We have also set a goal to meet or exceed the median first-time fall 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 (IPEDS) tool.” - “The goal established for the graduation rate was a #% increase over five years. Achieving this goal would place the University’s graduation rate in line with the national average.” - “Exceed the fall-to-fall retention rate for [Institution] students by #% compared to the state average on a five-year trend. The target of a #% increase was based on an analysis of prior years’ trends and the College’s intent to exceed state retention averages.” - “This target of #% was identified as it represents exceeding both the [Institutional Association 1] mean (#%) and the [Institutional Association 2] mean (#%). Further, surpassing this identified target represents achieving the top quartile of the [Institutional Association 1].” - “[Graduate School and Job Placement Rates] The targets are set by comparison to National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) data from their 2017 report: ‘First Destinations for the College Class of 2017: Findings and Analysis’. Single year target levels of performance for both graduate school and job placement rates are set using the national averages reported in the NACE report.”
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reference to external accountability standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Generally, institution-level targets align with the statewide/system goals and objectives.” - “The goal set by the [State Coordinating Board] is that #% of the graduates of each institution will be working or enrolled within one year of graduation.” - “[State System] has set forth a retention goal of #% for the college. This goal is agreed upon yearly by the Commission and the President of the college.” - “[Institution] has set a pass rate goal of # percent for the NCLEX-RN exam which is # percentage points above the # percent required by the [State Board.]” - “The institutional performance target for the passage of licensure/certification exams is parallel to that of the professional accrediting agency standards.” 	

IV. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p style="text-align: center;">IV. OUTCOMES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment results or findings (data/evidence) documenting actual performance levels on a given measure of student achievement.</p>	<p>- Not reporting outcomes data on all selected measures of student achievement</p>	<p>- “The institution identified course completion as their final metric of student achievement but provided no actual data on course completions ...”</p> <p>- “While the institution provided evidence of measuring three different student success measures, they only discussed the results of two of those measures. Retention rate outcomes were not discussed.”</p> <p>- “The institution provided embedded tables [with outcomes data] as screenshots that were unreadable and directed the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee to [institutional IE Office] website, and the Committee was unable to locate the specific information the institution expected the Committee to review.”</p>		
	<p>Not EVALUATING outcomes data on selected measures of student achievement</p>	<p>- “While the university supplied data for several indicators, the university did not provide sufficient evaluation of its ... outcomes for student achievement.”</p> <p>- “Capstone course completion rates and job placement rates are provided without any discussion of how this data has been evaluated with respect to student achievement.”</p>	<p>-Reference to pre-set contextual data points (i.e., minimum thresholds, target goals)</p> <p>- Reference to trend data / institution’s performance dynamics over time</p>	<p>- “The Fall 2016 cohort’s graduation rate of # percent fell in between the threshold of acceptability and the achievement goal.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] was at the above baseline, below average level in College Transfer Performance Rate.”</p> <p>- “The goal set by the [State System] is that #% 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.”</p> <p>- “The goal for the College is to exceed the state and national completion rates. Over the past seven years of fall cohort data, the College has consistently achieved above the state and national rates.”</p> <p>- “For the reporting periods of 2016-18, # of # Nursing students passed the Vocation Nursing State licensure exam for a #% pass rate. This exceeded the #% Agency Threshold of Acceptability, but did not reach the #% Institutional Achievement Goal.”</p> <p>- “[Institution’s] retention rates track closely to the peer median target, though it is likely that two of the three most recent cohorts (2016 and 2018) will exceed the target.”</p> <p>- “Data for [Institution’s] 2016 cohort show all students and Hispanic students missing the achievement goals for both First-to-Second Year (#%) and First-to-Third Year (#%) retention rates by roughly # or more percentage points. However, the threshold of acceptability was met.”</p> <p>- “An evaluation of the findings shows the total number of transfer-out students or transfer-out students with an award is below the projected benchmarks...The University recognized that action needed to be taken to reach the projected benchmarks and mitigate the missed targets. Outlined below are initiatives that were implemented to increase the number of students from neighboring community colleges: ... [description of initiatives]”</p> <p>- “The goal for retention requires a #-point increase per year to achieve the goal of a #% increase by 2023. When this was not achieved in 2018-2019, reviews by the Strategic Plan Strategy Council resulted in a recommendation to the vice president of enrollment management for campus ‘retention summits.’ This tactic was developed and further supported by the College’s participation in Achieving the Dream (ATD). The idea was further discussed by the Cabinet, an action plan was developed, and formal retention summits were implemented beginning fall 2019.”</p> <p>- “For the most recent cohort (Fall 2016 incoming students who graduated in 2020), our four-year graduation rate was #%, which is several points lower than normal and due to several students who deferred their degrees--electing to return to [Institution] for a fifth year--with the introduction of our [Degree Completion] program; the program was one solution to help our students impacted by the pandemic but had the effect of some students delaying graduation.”</p> <p>- “In 2014, the two-year retention rate between the freshman and sophomore years at [Institution] was #%. The retention rate experienced a slight decrease in 2015 and 2016. However, in 2017 and 2018 the rate began to increase with a retention rate of #% in 2018. We believe this is due to the implementation of Learning Communities and Freshman Power Week in conjunction with the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The result of the change in the way the Institution orientates students to the learning environment has helped to increase retention by #% from 2017 to 2018.”</p> <p>- “The developmental reading success rate appears to have been impacted by the sudden transition to totally online learning due to COVID-19 in the spring of 2020. The developmental reading success rate for fall 2019 was approximately #%. This rated decreased to #% in the spring of 2020. The rate increased to #% in the summer of 2020 as students and faculty adjusted to the online modality.”</p> <p>- “The eight-year graduation rate for [Institution] has followed an upward trend for the last five years, and has increased 10% over that period. Much of the improvement has been attributed to a professional advising center, and to a student success initiative that (1) reaches out to students who are missing graduation by a few credits and (2) reaches out to students showing other high-risk factors.”</p> <p>- “The overall percent of course completions by students for all course levels increased from #% in 2015-16 to #% in 2017-18. From 2015-16 to 2017-18, the percent change for developmental course completion is #%, undergraduate course completion is #%, and graduate course completion is #%. Institutional Research completed an analysis of courses and instructors with the highest number and percentage of students failing or withdrawing. Institutional Effectiveness then held a working session with academic colleges and departments to share the data and discuss strategies for how better to (a) support students who are struggling and (b) strengthen instructor effectiveness. College and departmental leaders, as appropriate, then incorporated this work into their unit plans. In addition, the course completion rates data are also available to the public on [Institution’s] website.”</p>

IV. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
		<p>- “A graph is provided showing retention rates from five previous academic years (2015-2016 through 2019-2020). However, no discussion or interpretation of this data is offered and because the target is vague and non-specific, the committee is unable to determine just how this metric of student achievement is being evaluated and used.”</p> <p>- “[W]hile 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.”</p>	<p>- Reference to trend data / institution’s performance dynamics over time + Pre-set reference points (i.e., thresholds, goals)</p> <p>- Reference to peers or other external reference group performance</p>	<p>- “[Institution’s] retention rate has grown from a low of #% for the fall 2012 cohort to #% in the fall 2016 cohort. This growth is good, but not yet reaching our target of #% set in the 2012-18 Strategic Plan.”</p> <p>- “The number of [Institution] graduates with student debt has dropped over the reported period #%, exceeding the threshold comparison but failing to meet the standard achievement goal comparison group.”</p> <p>- “The certification rate for Teacher Education graduates was #%, which was substantially higher than the 2018 level. While the target from the [State Board] was not met, the University is moving closer to meeting it through targeted interventions and additional support to preservice teachers.”</p> <p>- “[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 (+#%) gain in this metric for the 2016 graduating class. While the percent of 2017 graduates enrolled or employed within one year dipped to #%, it remains above the minimum acceptable threshold of #%.”</p> <p>- “As Table # demonstrates, the college-wide graduation rate has exceeded the threshold of acceptability of #% each year and has met the goal of #% graduation rates most years. However, a decline in the graduation rate has occurred over the last several years and did not meet the goal in 2018. The graduation rate for each individual program has fluctuated over the years but has always exceeded the threshold of acceptability, with the exception of the general studies program...”</p> <p>- “The percentage of students working or enrolled within six months after earning a degree remained #% for 2016-2019, three percentage points above the threshold and three below the target. For 2020, the percentage of graduating seniors reporting employment or graduate school attendance dropped to #%, unsurprising considering the reduction in available positions and overall uncertainty related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The institution’s long-term objective is still to attain the #% national average, although that objective might not be met until after 2021, as the pandemic is still affecting the employment market.”</p> <p>- “The success rate in MTH ***/*** declined from the Fall 2015 cohort to the Fall 2018 cohort. The decline in Fall 2018 can be attributed in part to the implementation of a multiple measures placement policy. Students were able to place into MTH ***/*** based not only on placement test scores, but high school GPA and course completion as well as other factors. The success rate for the Fall 2019 cohort increased by nearly two percentage points over the prior year, but still failed to meet the threshold of acceptability. The success rate in MTH ***/*** has fallen below the threshold of acceptability for the three most recent cohorts. As such, the mathematics discipline continues to review the data and identify appropriate course supports to ensure better student outcomes.”</p> <p>- “The first to second year retention rate for each cohort has improved since the baseline was established in 2015. Each cohort is moving toward its target. [Institution] has implemented a number of strategies identified in the University strategic plan to improve retention rates, specifically those among first-time students. These strategies include hiring professional advisors, redesigning the First Year Seminar, and reorganizing student success to the division of Academic Affairs under the position of associate provost for undergraduate education and student success. A complete list of strategies from 2017-2019 is provided [link].”</p> <p>- “The goal ... is #% for the [State Teacher Certification General Knowledge Test] first-time pass rate. We have struggled to reach this level for one-time attempts for all four sections (English language arts, essay, math, and reading). Over the last three years, the first-time pass rate dropped from #% (2015-2016) to #% (2018-2019). Our pass rate percentage for multiple attempts is also below the desired #%; we are currently at #%. ... In reaction to the low pass rates and because many students are scheduling single subtests instead of all four, the College of Education has incorporated more emphasis on [General Knowledge Test] preparation in EDUC # (Language Arts for Educators) and EDUC # (Math and Science for Educators) through additional practice tests and review of content on the subtests, offers individualized tutoring, and has developed EDUC #, a zero-credit course starting Fall 2020 that is specifically designed to help students pass the [General Knowledge Test] Math section. In addition, the COE has a Compliance Coordinator tracking test results and requiring students who have not passed the [General Knowledge Test] to be on an action plan.”</p> <p>- “[Institution’s] Fall 2017 cohort retention rate for full-time and part-time enrolled students exceeded the peer institutions, while meeting or exceeding the threshold of acceptability rate of #%.”</p> <p>- “[Peer School 1] is the only two-year college that (like [Institution]) serves the [Metro] area and is [Institution’s] lead competitor. Presently, their graduation rate is #% versus [Institution’s] rate of #%. [Peer School 2] is the second closest school to [Metro area], and it holds at #% graduate rate versus [Institution’s] #%. However other larger community colleges have better graduation rates to include [Peer School 3] at #%, [Peer School 4] at #% and [Peer School 5] (which is the largest community college in the state) at #%.”</p> <p>- “With graduates earning a median wage of \$# in 2017-2018, [Institution] ranked among the top three institutions in the State University System for this metric.”</p> <p>- “In fiscal year 2015 (the most recent year available) the national student loan cohort default rate was # percent, and the cohort default rate for [State] was # percent. In this same year, the [Institution] cohort default rate was # 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.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] Associate of Arts transfer rates were identified as falling below the [State System] average. [Institution] has consequently established multiple transfer agreements and partnerships with several institutions to include ***, ***, and ***. Transfer agreements are additionally being secured with *** and ***. [Institution] has also strengthened its undergraduate applied research initiatives, which includes developing special topic courses related to the student’s discipline and holding regular student forums that discuss undergraduate research opportunities. [Institution] has also established guided educational pathways to improve student success and transfer outcomes.”</p>

IV. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
		<p>- “The reports included the metric, thresholds of acceptability, and targets. While each graphic did show the institution’s actual data for the particular year, no further explanation in the narrative was provided...”</p> <p>- “The institution did not meet the threshold of some of its ... metrics... included in Table 1, however, the accompanying narrative states all metrics exceeded the threshold.”</p> <p>- “[There is no] sufficient evidence that the institution has documented efforts at improvement where the self-identified thresholds were not met.”</p>	<p>- Reference to trend data / institution’s performance dynamics over time + Peer group performance</p> <p>- Reference to performance of student sub-populations</p> <p>- Description of the internal institutional outcomes data review and evaluation processes</p>	<p>- “[Institution’s] six-year graduation rate has increased from #% for the Fall 2010 cohort to #% for the Fall 2013 cohort. [Institution’s] six-year graduation rate is about #% below the system-wide average (#%).”</p> <p>- “The IPEDS ... Data Feedback Report shows that [Institution’s] 2017 6-year graduation rate was #%. ... [O]ur peer group, which is comprised of [State Institutional Segment] yielded higher graduation rates, #% and #% respectively. Although [Institution’s] graduation rate was #% points lower than our ... peers, it marked the highest graduation rate on record in the University’s history. [Institution’s] 2018 6-year rate slightly decreased to #%, but this marks only the second time in the University’s history that the graduation rate has exceeded #%. This is perhaps more profound when considering the highest graduation rate in our history was achieved by the 2011 Cohort, which preceded our admissions change from open admissions. We were able to achieve successes with these students due to infrastructure improvements in academic advising, tutoring services as well as new academic technology relating to degree audits and degree planning.”</p> <p>- “The College’s three-year graduation rates have fluctuated over the past four years, ranging from #% to #%. In comparison with the State-Level Peer Group, the College’s three-year rates have lagged behind, though the College has had greater increases over time than its peer group (# percentage point change as compared to a # percentage point change). The College’s four-year graduation rates have increased steadily over time from #% to #%. In comparison with the State-Level Peer Group, the College’s four-year rates have lagged, though the College has had greater increases over time than its peer group (# percentage point change as compared to a # percentage point change). The College’s six-year graduation rates have decreased over time. In comparison with the State-Level Peer Group, the College’s six-year rates have continuously lagged behind.”</p> <p>- “For the 2018 cohort [Institution] saw less disparity in persistence rates among the demographic subgroups, with African-American students in particular making significant gains to be almost at parity with their Hispanic and white peers.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] examines its job placement rate by select student characteristics to identify achievement gaps between student groups. Among 2017-18 graduates, students who identified as white, Black/African American, or Asian; female students; and older students had lower job placement rates than their peers. The job placement rate for Hispanic/Latino students was nearly # percentage points higher than the College-wide average.”</p> <p>- “Pell recipients experienced gains in both four-year and six-year graduation rates, #% to #% in the four-year rate and #% to #% in the six-year rate.”</p> <p>- “Current graduation rates for graduate students ranged from #-#%. The on-ground cohort did not yet meet its 2021 target (#%) and was one percentage point below the threshold (#%). The graduate online cohort rate (#%) met the target (#%) and exceeded the threshold (#%). The military cohort rate (#%) did not yet meet its 2021 target (#%) and did not meet the threshold (#%).”</p> <p>- “Course Completion -- Reports are disaggregated for various units to review data and develop action plans to address areas of concern, including course modality (Distance Education, Dual, Traditional, Hybrid), division, program, course and subject. For example, the gap between online and traditional pass rates was #% in 2014. After identifying this gap, professional development for online faculty was updated with initiatives such as Blackboard Re-Certification every five years. Additional distance learning department staff were hired, and mandatory first-time online student Blackboard orientation was designed. The difference between face-to-face and online metrics was reduced to four percentage points.”</p> <p>- “Due to the large discrepancy between target and actual rates, persistence rates and specific targets are disaggregated by student groups to address issues with regard to persistence ... Persistence rates for each disaggregated student group have declined in recent years. A Persistence Taskforce has been formed to address this issue. The Taskforce’s proposed activities based on baseline data reviewed, activities that have been actually implemented, the results and the recommended actions are summarized and documented using the College’s Taskforce Planning and Evaluation Template. Disaggregation of data (...) show students that are less likely to persist include part-time, male, Pell recipient, and developmental students.”</p> <p>- “Based on observations that our minority students—particularly African Americans and even more particularly male African Americans—are retaining and therefore graduating at a lower rate than the rest of our student body, the college has made several investments. First, we implemented two initiatives: The Black Male Initiative and Woman to Woman. Both initiatives focus on listening to, encouraging, and supporting African American students on their educational journeys. Additionally, the college engaged ***, an external consultant, in a major, two-year retention initiative called ‘Moving the Needle.’ As a result of Moving the Needle, retention rates for the student body as a whole have increased #%, and a majority of this change is due to the improved first-time retention rates of African American students, which now match the retention rates of the student body as a whole.”</p> <p>- “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.”</p> <p>- “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).”</p> <p>- “The Academic Outreach Retention Initiative (AORI) group met for the first time in the Fall 2017 semester to develop a plan for identifying students at risk for leaving [Institution]. In collaboration with the Center for Student Success, the AORI group uses course completion information to identify students who have two or more Ds, Fs, or Ws each semester. At the end of each semester since Spring 2018, department chairs have worked with these students to adjust their schedules as needed for the following semester and to appoint liaisons for them with the Center for Student Success. As a result of AORI’s work, there was a #% increase in freshman to sophomore retention between 2017 and 2018.”</p>

V. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p style="text-align: center;">V. KEY STUDENT COMPLETION INDICATOR (KSCI)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Student achievement measure/criterion selected by the institution in Fall 2018 from a set of standard undergraduate graduation rate metrics to document, monitor, track, and report trends in student credential completion rates.</p>	<p>- Not clearly/explicitly identifying selected Key Student Completion Indicator (KSCI)</p>	<p>- "The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine which graduation rate is the metric previously identified with SACSCOC as the primary measure."</p> <p>- "The Institution did not identify their Key Student Completion Indicator (KSCI) or mention if it was included. This does not make it possible for the Off-Site Reaffirmation to determine how the institution assesses its KSCI."</p> <p>- "It is implied, but unclear in the narrative, what specific metric the institution has chosen for measuring graduation rate."</p> <p>- "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 ... requested by SACSCOC in [August] 2018."</p>	<p>- Clear identification of selected completion indicator</p>	<p>- "For our traditional undergraduate program, we monitor the six-year graduation rate of our incoming first-time, full-time undergraduate cohorts. This metric is the same as the IPEDS graduation rate (150% standard time) for [Institution]. This metric is the student completion indicator that we have selected for consideration by our institutional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on College (SACSCOC)."</p> <p>- "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 SACS-COC that we would prefer to be reviewed based on our IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Data Education System) 6-year graduation rate, which is the "traditional" 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."</p> <p>- "[Institution] selected the IPEDS OM [Outcomes Measure] from the options presented by SACSCOC because it is the most representative of the [Institution] student population. The IPEDS OM captures the award and enrollment statuses of four cohorts of degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students: first-time, full-time; first-time, part-time; non-first-time, full-time; and non-first-time, part-time. The measure also reports the enrollment status of students who did not earn an award at the eight-year point."</p> <p>- "[Institution] selected the IPEDS Outcome Measure 8-year graduation rates as a student achievement measure. The measure is appropriate for the College as our student population, although dedicated, do stop out. Some students have taken as long as ten years to complete a credential."</p> <p>- "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."</p> <p>- "The College chose the National Student Clearinghouse data because the data better reflects [Institution's] role as a comprehensive community college that prepares students for not only for a career, but also for transfer to a baccalaureate granting institution."</p> <p>- "In 2018, the institution was given the opportunity to choose the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (NSCRC) completion rate as its KSCI. It did so, recognizing that part-time students remain an important part of [Institution's] enrollment. Students often change degree levels, and many students transfer to and graduate from other institutions. Capturing all post-secondary awards earned by students in each cohort, whether at [Institution] or another institution, better measures the institution's contribution to student success."</p> <p>- "The Seminary tracks graduation rates for the purpose of documenting student success and as required for the identified Key Student Completion Indicator. Graduation rate is calculated on a six-year time frame for the MDiv and DMin degrees and a four-year time frame for all MA degrees (200% time frame). These time frames are defined by the Seminary's theological accreditor (Association of Theological Schools [ATS]) and are appropriate for graduate theological education."</p>
	<p>- Not discussing performance dynamics on the selected KSCI</p>	<p>- "Please note that the institution should include an analysis of the institution's progress from the baseline completion [level on the KSCI]."</p> <p>- "[W]hile the institution addressed graduation rates and the IPEDS Outcome Measure 8-Year Award Rate as part of its response to CR 8.1, it did not specifically address its established baseline as reported to the Commission and subsequent performance against this baseline. Institutions are required to provide such discussion in order to demonstrate compliance with this standard."</p>	<p>- Discussion of performance dynamics on KSCI (current vs baseline)</p>	<p>- "[Institution] chose the IPEDS 'new' Outcome Measure (8-year award rate). The 8-year award rate for the past two years is provided in the table below. While the College acknowledges that the 8-year award rate has decreased between the two years reported, the data reflects cohorts from 2010 and 2011. Any recent changes towards positive impacts in graduation rates would not be indicated in the table below."</p> <p>- "The College's baseline for the Outcome Measure is #%. Subsequent performance dropped to a low of #% and then increased to #%. While this is disconcerting, the College's threshold of #% was not crossed."</p> <p>- "The College uses the 2015-2016 8-year graduation rates as its baseline data. Monitoring data associated with each of these supports the College's efforts to ensure that it is serving its constituents in an equitable manner. Tables ... below shows the percentage changes in graduation data from reporting year 2015-2016 through 2019-2020. Data show an overall improvement in First-time Full-time and Part-time graduation rates..."</p> <p>- "Trend data and the current target are shown in the Table #: Historical IPEDS Graduation Rate. [Institution's] baseline data that was reported to SACSCOC is based on FY 2016 and was #%. The College has seen continued growth in IPEDS graduation rate from baseline year. In addition, [Institution] is above our selected peer groups..."</p> <p>- "Graduation rates for the 2017 cohort, in some cases and to some degree, were likely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, that disrupted the spring semester of the 150% timeframe. This postulate is particularly true for career education, which has fewer convenient options to move courses online."</p>

V. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
	<p>- Not disaggregating KSCI data</p> <p>- Not discussing disaggregation <i>methodology/rationale</i></p>	<p>- "The institution uses the IPEDS 6-yr graduation rate as its SACSCOC required student completion metric. Although trend data related to this metric were reported, no disaggregated information ... [was] provided."</p> <p>- "The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find ... disaggregated data for [KSCI] metric that breaks down graduation rates by sex, race, or other important demographic variables."</p> <p>- "No rationale was provided, however, regarding the selection of specific categories to disaggregate by,..."</p> <p>- "Data for graduation rate were disaggregated by degree and degree type, but no rationale was provided for why these categories were chosen."</p> <p>- "The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not find rationale for why the institution chose ethnicity and gender, but not other possible demographic categories, for disaggregation of [KSCI] rates, despite the presence of other possible categories in the narrative..."</p> <p>- "The institution provided disaggregated data for a single population, first-generation college students but no other variations of student populations. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find a rationale for this disaggregation."</p>	<p>- Disaggregation of KSCI data and <i>description/justification</i> of disaggregation methodology or approaches</p>	<p>- "Of those who began their studies in fall 2017, #% graduated and #% transferred out; #% of the male students versus #% of the female students graduated; 60% of the Hispanic/Latino students, #% of the white students, and #% of the black students graduated."</p> <p>- "The [disaggregation variables] were selected to be consistent with the completer metrics tracked by the [State] Board of Regent's Outcome-Based Funding Formula. During this reporting year, [Institution] reported large number of Pell, Adult and Equity Gap completers and has opportunities to increase completers in programs that lead to 4- and 5-star jobs."</p> <p>- "[Institution] reviews disaggregated graduation rate data by the following: gender, ethnicity, academically disadvantaged, economically disadvantaged, and student intent. Disaggregating graduation rates by these student characteristics allows review by populations that are traditionally underserved in higher education as well as the focus populations of state initiatives such as the *** Strategic Plan, Perkins Grant Special Populations, the Guided Pathways initiative, as well as the college's QEP focus."</p> <p>- "At [Institution], approximately one-fifth of students are first generation students, or students who are the first in their family to attend college. First generation students often face significant financial, cultural, and academic barriers, which can make the completion of a college credential difficult. As such, it is important to evaluate their graduation rate as compared to their peers."</p> <p>- "Graduation rates are disaggregated by gender, race, age, and Pell eligibility... With regard to the institution's rationale for the way it disaggregates its graduation data, disaggregating the data by gender, race, age, and Pell-eligibility aligns well with the students the College serves (as an open access institution, with a fairly even split of students graduating with certificate or AAS degree programs and AA/AS degree programs). The institution serves individuals of varying ages, and a good portion of its students are Pell-eligible. There is a fairly even mix of males and females. Finally, the area is fairly homogeneous. It is important to the institution that it disaggregates its graduation data by ethnicity to help support diversity and inclusion."</p> <p>- "IPEDS Graduation Rate is disaggregated by Gender and by Developmental Education (starting in developmental vs. college-ready).... In addition to disaggregation by gender to address equity gaps, the disaggregation by developmental education status allows the College to monitor the progress of students who start in Developmental Education (after becoming college-ready; KPI 2 - College Readiness) as around 50% of the students in graduation cohorts start in developmental coursework."</p>

V. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
	<p>- Not evaluating disaggregated KSCI outcomes and (if applicable) outlining subsequent data-informed improvement plans or actions.</p>	<p>- “The institution provided evidence of disaggregated graduation rate data by gender and race/ethnicity in the reports from the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, but the institution did not discuss the data in its narrative...”</p> <p>- “The institution provided the IPEDS report with number of graduates disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender. However, the institution provided no analysis...”</p> <p>- “While the institution did disaggregate their six-year graduation rates by 1) type of degree, 2) major, 3) race/ethnicity, 4) age, 5) gender, and 6) registration type, it provided no discussion of how it has evaluated ... this data ...”</p> <p>- “Disaggregation of the graduation rate by gender, ethnicity/race and financial aid was found for 2020 and 2021. There was little or no narrative which accompanied the graphics in terms of evaluation, interpretation of results...”</p> <p>- “[G]aps in achievement [on the selected KSCI metric among student segments] were identified, however, the institution did not discuss any ongoing institutional strategies to seek improvement in the achievement of at-risk student populations.”</p> <p>- “The institution disaggregated IPEDS graduation rate data by gender, student type, and developmental education; however, it did not provide a discussion of institutional strategies utilized to improve the achievement of at-risk students by gender, student type and developmental education.”</p> <p>- “The institution disaggregated its data by gender and reported what appears to be significant differences in graduation rates between male and female students, but it did not provide any indication of how the institution is using this disaggregated data to seek improvements.”</p>	<p>- Discussion of KSCI data disaggregation results and data informed improvement actions (if applicable)</p>	<p>- “IPEDS 8-year completion rates disaggregated by ethnicity. The equity gaps exposed by these data are concerning. The degree completion rates for Black students were #% in 2010 [cohort], #% in 2011, and #% in 2012. Although the completion rates increased, the success rates are simply unacceptable. The completion rates for American Indians are better than Black students, but there is a tremendous equity gap when compared to White students. As such, the college has implemented several initiatives to decrease equity gaps, ... [description of multiple initiatives]”</p> <p>- “[Institution’s] female and Black FTFT graduation rates have been significantly lower than those of [Institution’s]’s comparison group’s overall cohort median, though there has been a significant upward movement in Black completion rates for the 2015 cohort, exceeding the cohort median.... The continuing low graduation rates for female students is troubling, given that women comprise almost two-thirds (>% in 2019) of [Institution’s] total student population. Awareness of this gap has been raised via faculty professional development and on-boarding training, but these best practices sessions (relationship building, active and collaborative engagement, etc.) have not yet demonstrated an impact on female student retention and require further action.”</p> <p>- “As a result of the analysis of disaggregated graduation data, the College has identified disparities in the completion rates of white and minority populations. The College has implemented ongoing institutional strategies to seek improvement in the achievement of these identified populations. These institutional strategies include [City] Guided Pathways to Success, [State] Pathways to Success and Retention, and grants addressing achievement gaps in graduation rates.”</p> <p>- “Graduation rates are higher for non-remedial, more college-ready, as measured by the ACT standardized exam, than for less prepared students. Two ongoing [Institution] strategies for closing the gap are (1) an active Success Center, and (2) [Success Path Program]. All full-time faculty are required to devote at least one hour per week to provide inter-disciplinary tutoring services in the Success Center. To bolster Success Center student participation, [Institution] developed an early alert/referral system within the ... intranet portal for faculty to use in referring students to the Success Center.”</p> <p>- “Examining data by demographic categories revealed that male students, students who are Black or Hispanic, and students on Pell do not perform as well as other students. To help improve the graduation rate among these populations, the institution has focused on diversity issues and awareness. The Student Government Association rolled out a peer mentoring program with members of the SGA serving as mentors. Additionally, the institution recently ... joined the Achieving the Dream initiative to help identify best practices and work to reduce these performance gaps. Going forward, [Institution] believes that, by increasing engagement of students in these populations, as described in its QEP, the associated graduation rates will improve.”</p> <p>- “After reviewing disaggregated graduation rate data, [Institution] created the Male Education Network (MEN), a program designed to provide, foster a sense of belonging, and empower men to excel in higher education. In Fall 2019, MEN launched with # male students in two cohorts of [course]. Students find out about MEN through the general session in New Student Orientation. Certified Advisors then manually register students who are interested into the [course] sections designated for PAC MEN students. The Fall 2019 cohort created a student life organization and voted for Officers. The Officers spread the word about the MEN Program during Club Rush for Spring 2020 and had a MEN Spring Pin Ceremony. For the second cohort (20/21) the processed changed significantly due to COVID-19 and the transition to remote learning. A MEN flyer was sent to the Advising Team Leads and they shared with Certified Advisors. The Certified Advisors would speak to students considered to be a good fit for MEN.”</p> <p>- “[KSCI] overall, six-year completion rates increased from #% to #% from the 2011 to 2013 cohorts. Rates for White, non-Hispanic students increased from #% to #%. However, the rate for Black students declined from #% to 28% - #% lower than for White students for the 2013 cohort. In addition, the rate for Hispanic students decreased by #% from 2012 to 2013, after a #% one-year increase. Disaggregation of completion rates by race/ethnicity highlighted the need for a concerted effort to address inequitable outcomes. The disparity is particularly striking for Black students, who comprised #% of the [KSCI] cohort of first-time students for 2013, and #% of the total student body in fall 2020. ... In 2019, the institution created and filled the position Director of Diversity Initiatives. Forty percent of the Director’s responsibilities are focused on retention of traditionally underrepresented, marginalized students, while the remaining responsibilities encompass recruitment, community outreach, and campus programming. ...Since the hire of a Director of Diversity Initiatives, the Office of Diversity & Inclusion (ODI) has since led the following initiatives: Intercultural Resource Center...Office of Diversity & Inclusion Leadership Academy & Networks... Assessment & Early Intervention ... While the impact on completion rates will become evident in a few years, the institution is already seeing promising results, by examining fall-to-fall retention rates as a short-term indicator of improvement in the longer-term completion rates. The fall-to-fall retention rate from 2018 - 2019 to 2019 - 2020 increased for Black students (entire student body) from #% to #% and also for Hispanic students from #% to #%, while the increase for white students was less significant from #% to #%. This increase for Black and Hispanic students already constitutes an effective reduction in performance gaps that is indicative of future improvement in our completion rates.”</p>

VI. Selected Compliance Components of CR 8.1	Selected General Non-Compliance Factors	SAMPLE Excerpts from Peer Review Committee Report Narratives re: Findings of Non-Compliance	General Institutional Strategies in Building Case for Compliance	SAMPLE Illustrative Excerpts from Institutional Compliance Certification Report Narratives
<p style="text-align: center;">VI. PUBLISHING</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Communicating student achievement measures, associated goals and outcomes in a way that is reasonably discoverable and accessible to internal and external institutional constituents as well as the general public</i></p>	<p>- Not publishing GOALS <i>and</i> OUTCOMES for <i>all</i> selected student achievement measures</p>	<p>- “The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee could not find that the institution publishes goals and outcomes for the other two measures (***) and (***)”</p> <p>- “For retention and graduation rates, outcomes (results) are published by the institution on its Consumer Information webpage, but not the goals themselves. (These appear in the strategic plan [document], which appears to be an internal document.)”</p> <p>- “It is unclear if this information [goals and outcomes] is appropriately published, meaning accessible to the public.”</p>	<p>- Comprehensive data presentation in a single, clearly specified location</p>	<p>- “Student Achievement data are published on the [Institution] website under the About tab.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] publishes the student achievement measure goals and outcomes (including thresholds of acceptability and appropriate performance levels) on the student right-to-know web page.”</p> <p>- “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.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] publicly publishes results of student achievement goals and performance outcomes on the webpage of the College’s Research and Analytical Services under the Fact Book section.”</p> <p>- “The University’s website publishes a dashboard of targets and progress for each of the student success metrics.”</p> <p>- “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 [student achievement measure], both the goal and minimum acceptable level are published, as well as the data obtained for the past five years.”</p> <p>- “All of the measures are published on the College’s website on the Student Achievement Scorecard... This scorecard displays the student achievement measures as well as historical data for three to four available periods, the target for when historical data is available, and the target set for the upcoming period.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] publishes its goals and outcomes related to the institutional criteria for overall student achievement in a centralized place on the College’s website. Goal and outcome statistics appear on the Office of Institutional Research’s webpages under the “HEA/HEOA Retention, Graduation, and Employment Information” section of the site. The specific web page for these metrics is “Combined Student Achievement Data.” ... In addition to the centralized publication of these goals and outcomes, outcomes for retention rates and graduation rates are published in greater detail in other sections of the Office of Institutional Research’s website for longitudinal comparisons and tracking. For example, under the “Academic Statistics” section of the site, a “Freshman Class Retention and Graduation Rate” table presents data back to 1979.”</p>
	<p>- Not publishing goals and/or outcomes in a comprehensive, discoverable, user-friendly way</p>	<p>- “Student achievement data are not published collectively but various measures can be found on the IPEDS website, [Institutional] Facts and Figures website, [Institutional] Fact books webpage, and [Institutional] Quick Facts webpage.”</p> <p>- “The university provided a screenshot of its Institutional Effectiveness page, which identified a link to Student Achievement data; however, the data page was not provided.”</p>	<p>- Use of good practices in information presentation / website navigation</p>	<p>- In accordance with SACSCOC’s Policy on Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure, [Institution] publishes its Statement of Goals for Student Achievement and Success on the College’s website - www.[institution].edu/studentsuccess - (screenshot).”</p> <p>- “To provide full transparency, the College publishes student achievement outcome data for all stakeholders and the general public. Information is summarized and presented on the College website in a user-friendly format as shown in [set of Infographics]...Prospective students and other stakeholders can easily access this information on the College’s data-rich webpage and follow the links to full-source document.”</p> <p>- “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.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] makes student achievement data publicly available. It is published on the [Institution] website and readily accessible within one click from the landing page by clicking on Accreditation, then selecting the Student Achievement link from the Accreditation page.”</p> <p>- “[Reports] that provide Student Achievement information can be located by inquiring in the institutional search bar , direct access on the [Institution] homepage or using the campus quick link menu to reach the Office of Institutional Effectiveness webpage. All publications are provided in digital format, and available via open access.”</p>
	<p>- Not providing screenshots of web published information (i.e., exclusively relying on live links)</p>	<p>- “The online assessment results, the IPEDS Feedback Report from 2019, and the NCES Trend Generator were live links, and the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to verify results or if analysis was available as live links were not to be considered for compliance.”</p> <p>- “The off-site review committee observed inconsistencies in what is reported in the compliance narrative and what is published on the institution’s student achievement website.”</p>	<p>- Internal student achievement data review, dissemination, and pre-publication review</p>	<p>- “As part of a model for continuous improvement, [Institution] communicates university-wide goals and thresholds of acceptability to its colleges and schools via the data-driven [Accountability Communication Protocol] process designed to inform institutional decision-making. [Accountability Communication Protocol] general sessions, occurring three times annually, aim to (1) ensure alignment of unit-level strategic initiatives with university-wide goals; (2) review each academic unit’s contribution to these goals and assess progress toward goal attainment every semester; (3) monitor [Institution’s] immediate instructional, curricular, and operational needs, and monitor the impact of these needs on the university’s mission and position relative to the performance-based-funding model utilized by the State University System; and (4) ensure that strategic plan goals are met by 2025. During these sessions, the president and provost lead discussion with colleges, schools, and vice presidents to promote the attainment of institutional goals.”</p> <p>- “The Student Achievement Standing Committee that was established in 2018 has been charged with monitoring the data associated with the student success measures...”</p> <p>- “[Data on student achievement measures] are analyzed annually (e.g., November 2019, January 2020) by the Data Analysis Group (DAG), a standing College committee of faculty and staff, as well as the president’s Leader Team to evaluate the College’s effectiveness and need for potential student success interventions.”</p> <p>- “Student achievement outcomes are reviewed by the appropriate groups at the College. In addition to distribution and review by various groups at the College, all criteria are reviewed annually by the President and the President’s Cabinet. When needed, these groups recommend possible actions that need to be taken related to these student achievement outcomes. An example of a completed review /action process is shown in the review of course completion rates by the Faculty Academic Standards Committee [evidence provided].”</p> <p>- “Student achievement measures are also presented regularly to various stakeholders. The President reports regularly to the College Community on student achievement indicators (see convocation presentations from August 2019 and August 2020), and annually to the Board of Trustees through an [Institution] Performance Updates.”</p> <p>- “The Student Success Report Card is presented to the [Institution] Board of Trustees (BOT) annually. The BOT acknowledges the report, which then is reflected in the meeting minutes, making the Report Card a public record. Additionally, a summary of the report card is posted on the institution’s website.”</p> <p>- “Goals and outcomes are updated and published annually and maintained by the Director of Institutional Research.”</p> <p>- “[Institution] has a dedicated Student Consumer Information Web Page where the goals and outcomes are published and updated annually. A group of key personnel meet semi-annually to review the information contained on the web page, ensure required information is present and accurate, and recommend improvements, as necessary. Minutes of the Fall 2019 review provide evidence of this oversight.”</p>