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Who is with us today?

Purpose

Review recent activity
Look beyond the annual reports

Standards for Student Achievement
Who are the players?

ACCJC

U.S. Department of Education (USDE)

What have we seen so far?

Institution- set Standards for Student Achievement
What are they, and where are they coming from?

College Reports to ACCJC

Here you will find a link to Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports that the Commission requires of member institutions between comprehensive visits.

- Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission

Here you will find links for completing Annual Reports and Annual Fiscal Reports. You will find the "Getting Started Instructions" by clicking the relevant form below.

- Annual Report Form
- Annual Fiscal Report Form
What are they, and where are they coming from?

This confirms that your 2011-2012 Annual Report to ACCJC was submitted by Dr. Geraldine Perri <gperri@citruscollege.edu> on 03/29/2013. Below is a copy of the information submitted. You may also re-print the report by logging on at https://www.accjc.org/annualreport.

2013 Annual Report
Final Submission
03/29/2013

Citrus College
1000 West Foothill Boulevard
Glendora, CA 91741-1899

General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Confirm logged into the correct institution's report</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Name of individual preparing report:</td>
<td>Irene Malmgren, Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Phone number of person preparing report:</td>
<td>626.914.8881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>E-mail of person preparing report:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imalmgren@citruscollege.edu">imalmgren@citruscollege.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>Provide the URL (link) from the college website to the section of the college catalog which states the accredited status with the accreditors:</td>
<td>scroll to page 7 - <a href="http://ow.ly/ju57g">http://ow.ly/ju57g</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just what do ‘they’ want of us?

Standards?

Targets?

Goals?
Wherefore Institution-set Standards?

ACCJC

But why, and why now?
U.S. Department of Education

Timing:
- New USDE Regulations effective for Spring 2013 visiting team training
- Reauthorization Process, December 2013
Compliance with USDE Regulations and Guidelines
(Evaluation Team Responsibilities)

…”success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission,…including as appropriate consideration of course completion, State licensing examinations, and job placement rates.” (S602.16(a)(1)(i)

Whether institutionally-developed standards to demonstrate student success are being used by the accreidtor in the accreditation assessment, and the institution’s performance with respect to student achievement is assessed.

(from ACCJC memorandum to external evaluation team members, Spring 2013.)
“It does not appear that the agency meets the following sections of the Secretary’s Criteria for Recognition.”

“The agency must demonstrate that it evaluates the appropriateness of the measures of student achievement chosen by its institutions. [§602.0(a)(1)(i)]”
2013 ACCJC Annual Report

Just what were we asked?
14a. Successful student course completion rate for the fall 2012 semester: ____%  

[Additional Instructions: Rate equals the number of students who receive a successful grade over the number of students who enrolled in the course.]

14b. Institution-set standard for student course completion rate: ____%  

[Additional instructions: A "standard" is the level of performance set by the institution to meet educational quality and institutional effectiveness expectations. This number may differ from a performance improvement "goal" which an institution may aspire to meet.]
Student Achievement Data - #15

15a. Percent of students retained from fall 2011 to fall 2012 semesters: _____%

[Additional Instructions: Rate equals the number of students who completed a course in fall 2011 and were enrolled in a course fall 2012.]

15b. Institution-set standard for student retention percentage: _____%

[Additional instructions: A standard is the level of performance set by the institution to meet educational quality and institutional effectiveness expectations. This number may differ from a performance improvement goal which an institution may aspire to meet.]
16a. Number of students who received a degree in the 2011-12 academic year: 

16b. Institution-set standard for student degree completion number: 

______
Student Achievement Data - #17

17a. Number of students who transferred to 4-year colleges/universities in 2011-2012: 

17b. Institution-set standard for student transfer to 4-year colleges/universities: 
18a. Number of students who completed certificate requirements and received a certificate in the 2011-12 academic year:

[Additional Instructions: The college defines the requirements for each of its certificate programs.]

18b. Institution-set standard for student certificate completion number: _____
How did we determine our responses?

- Taskforce formed...
- Clarified methods??
  - Called Commission staff for clarification
    (don’t change methods...)

A special taskforce was formed

Shared out as info

The Academic Senate

The Steering Committee

Reviewed by Cabinet

Reported out at Steering
Team Members

- SLOA coordinator
- Director of Institutional Research
- VPAA/Accreditation Liaison Officer
- Faculty accreditation co-chair
- Chief Information Officer
Small work group
- Reviewed 10 years of trend data
- Examined variables that affect the data (e.g., student fees)
- Developed recommendations

Faculty Senate
- Made adjustments to the recommendations

Strategic Planning Council
- Discussed and reviewed the standards

Governing Board
- Reviewed standards as part of their institutional effectiveness review (after the annual report was submitted)
SLOAC coordinators
Director of Institutional Research
VPI / Accreditation Liaison Officer
Faculty accreditation co-chair
Faculty Senate President

Team Members
Example
Historical Fall to Fall Persistence Rates
With Fall Fee Per Unit Overlay

Note: Fall'12 Fee Per Unit Was $46

Fall Base Term Fee Per Unit
Fall Base Term Head Count
Pct Here Following Fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fa'00</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>23,386</td>
<td>43.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'01</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>25,388</td>
<td>42.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'02</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>25,097</td>
<td>42.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'03</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>23,981</td>
<td>46.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'04</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>24,075</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'05</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>24,189</td>
<td>45.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'06</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>25,089</td>
<td>45.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'07</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>25,914</td>
<td>42.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'08</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>25,982</td>
<td>45.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'09</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>26,645</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'10</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>25,810</td>
<td>47.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa'11</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>24,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And you?....

- Methods
- Assumptions
- Reasoning
So then, how to Integrate....

- Integrated planning, evaluation, and resource allocation models
- Institutional Effectiveness metrics/Dashboards
  - Scorecard
  - Institution set standards*
  - Other internal measures
- Performance
  - Compare over time; adjust as necessary
  - Compare to peer college(s); adjust as necessary
  - Targets
- Quality of the metrics / What is actionable
But wait… What about the Bigger Picture?

Do we see a pattern here?
Barbara Beno’s CAIR Presentation, titled *Accreditation and Measures of Quality*

- Accreditation is moving away from evaluation of process alone to evaluation of outcomes.
- Colleges must demonstrate achievement of mission
- One of ACCJC’s concerns
  - How does a college evaluate its own performance?
  - Are its own standards reasonable?
- More metrics than just the indicators identified in the annual report
- Disaggregation by subpopulation
- Benchmarks and Goals
- Adjusting standards over time
Colleges are being asked to

- Set *Baseline or Standards*
- **Monitor** outcomes
- **Assess** progress to standards and goals
  ... with a whole host of metrics on *achievement outcomes*
- Easily digestable

And we can expect more of this to come.
“.... These data are examined in the context of the institution-set standards of satisfactory performance and goals for improvement of student success (student achievement and student learning).

The evaluation team cites this information as evidence of the institution’s accomplishment of mission.”
Current Prompts -

- Annual Report
- ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions
- Team member training
- Accreditation Standards
I.B.2 – The institution sets goals to improve its effectiveness consistent with its stated purposes. The institution articulates its goals and states the objectives derived from them in measurable terms so that the degree to which they are achieved can be determined and widely discussed. The institution members understand these goals and work collaboratively toward their achievement.
I.B.3 – The institution assesses progress toward achieving its stated goals and makes decisions regarding the improvement of institutional effectiveness in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, resource allocation, implementation, and re-evaluation. Evaluation is based on analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.
IV.B.1.b – The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

(See ACCJC Guide to Evaluating Institutions, July 2013)
I. A. 3 – The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resources allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.

I. B. 3 – The institution publishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement.

I. B. 5 – The institution assesses accomplishment of its mission through program review and evaluation of outcomes, goals and objectives through analysis of quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by program type and mode of delivery.

(ACCJC Accreditation Standards, First Reading, January 2014)
IV.B.3 – Through established policies and procedures, the CEO guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by:

[among others…]

© ensuring that the college sets institutional performance standards for student achievement;

(ACCJC Accreditation Standards, First Reading, January 2014)
IV.C.6 – The governing board regularly reviews key indicators of student learning and achievement and sets expectations through policy to improve academic quality.

Others?????

(ACCJC Accreditation Standards, First Reading, January 2014)
Share…

Common practices?
Insights?
Concerns?
Dr. Barbara Beno, Accreditation and Measures of Quality, presentation to CAIR, November 21, 2013

Trapp, Arnold, Meuschke, Kuo, LaManque, and Pacheco, Setting Institutional Standards for Student Achievement: Meeting the Call for Academic Quality. Presentation to Strengthening Student Success Conference, San Francisco, October 8, 2013

USDE update for External Evaluation Teams, spring 2013

U.S. Department of Education Staff Report to the Senior Department Official on Recognition Compliance Issues, December 2013

Accreditation Standards (first reading January 2014)

Eligibility Requirements for Accreditation (first reading January 2014)
Thank you for joining us.