

News from the Front:
What We Need to Know About the Fifth Year Report

MAKING ASSESSMENT WORK WORKSHOP
ANGELA BRYAN, DIRECTOR
SEPTEMBER 14, 2018

UWF

Agenda

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Relevance of Regional Accreditation
- ▶ Changes to Principles of Accreditation
- ▶ SACSCOC Annual Report Card
- ▶ Fifth Year Report
- ▶ Student Outcomes: Educational Programs 8.2.a
- ▶ Rationale for 8.2.a
- ▶ Reviewer Concerns
- ▶ Questions

UWF

Relevance of Regional Accreditation

- ▶ Regional Accreditation Status through SACSCOC and other regional accreditors provides 3 recognizable goals for institutions:
 - ▶ Provides Access to Title IV Funds
 - ▶ Facilitates the transfer of credit among accredited institutions
 - ▶ Public Symbol of Quality
- ▶ The Compliance Report is a institution's story of quality education.
 - ▶ Addresses ALL parts of the institution, not just Academic Affairs.

UWF

Changes to Principles of Accreditation

- ▶ The new Principles of Accreditation were affirmed by a vote of the College Delegate Assembly of SACSCOC on December 5, 2017.
- ▶ Focus remains on quality enhancement
- ▶ Removes duplication of standards and requirements
- ▶ Standards and requirements are completely reorganized
 - ▶ Old numbering is no longer valid
 - ▶ New organization and referencing of standards

UWF

SACSCOC Annual Report Card

Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles in Decennial Reaffirmation Reviews: 2017 Reaffirmation Class

Review Stage I: OFF-Site Committee (n=75)			Review Stage II: ON-Site Committee (n=75)			Review Stage III: C&R Board of Trustees (n=75)		
Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Incorporated in Non-Compliance	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Incorporated in Non-Compliance	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Incorporated in Non-Compliance
1.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	95%	1.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	56%	1.	3.3.1.3 (IE - Educational Programs)	17%
2.	3.3.1.3 (IE - Administrative Support)	59%	2.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	31%	2.	3.3.1.2 (IE - Administrative Units)	10%
3.	3.3.1.2 (IE - Administrative Units)	54%	3.	3.3.1.1 (IE - Educational Programs)	25%	3.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	10%
4.	3.3.1.1 (IE - Educational Programs)	51%	4.	3.3.1.2 (IE - Administrative Units)	22%	4.	3.3.1.5 (IE - Community/Public Service)	8%
5.	3.2.14 (Intellectual Property Rights)	50%	5.	3.3.1.3 (IE - Educational Support)	22%	5.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	8%
6.	3.3.1.5 (IE - Community/Public Service)	47%	6.	3.3.1.5 (IE - Community/Public Service)	17%	6.	3.3.1.3 (IE - Educational Support)	7%
7.	2.8 (Diversity)	43%	7.	3.5.1 (General Education Competence)	14%	7.	3.5.1 (General Education Competence)	6%
8.	3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)	41%	8.	3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)	11%			
9.	3.2.9 (Financial Appropriateness)	35%	9.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	10%			
10.	3.4.11 (Academic Program Coordination)	35%	10.	3.3.1.4 (IE - Research)	8%			

Fifth Year Report

- ▶ IE – Educational Programs (8.2.a) is included on the Fifth Year Report
- ▶ The Fifth Year Report is ALL OFF-SITE.
 - ▶ No opportunity to communicate face-to-face with reviewers.

Student Outcomes: Educational Programs – 8.2.a*

- ▶ "The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on **analysis of the results for student learning outcomes** for each of its educational programs."

The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 6th ed. 2018.

*formerly 3.3.1.1

UWF

Rationale for 8.2.a

- ▶ "The expectation is that the institution will **engage in ongoing planning and assessment** to ensure that for each academic program, the institution develops and assesses expected student learning outcomes.
- ▶ Expected student learning outcomes specify the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in courses or in a program.
- ▶ **Shared widely within** and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution's success at achieving its mission and can be **used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions.**"
Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 3rd ed., 2013.
- ▶ **In short, this should be a reflective process for faculty to review data on student learning to improve the educational program.**

Reviewer Concerns

- ▶ **Are Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) identified for each program?**
- ▶ **Are program faculty assessing the SLOs for their program?**
- ▶ **Is the institutional process robust?** Expectation is that **all programs** participate in program Assessment and Use of Results.

UWF

Reviewer Concerns

- ▶ **Did program faculty participate in the process?**
Expectation is that program faculty will participate in the making the action plan for improving student learning in the program.
- ▶ **Is the process ongoing?** Expectation is at least 2 -3 cycles of assessment data and Use of Results
- ▶ **Is there evidence that assessment data was collected?**
Expectation is to see actual numbers in the reports.

UWF

Reviewer Concerns

- ▶ **Was the assessment data disaggregated by modality?**
Data should be disaggregated so that differences between modalities can be addressed in Use of Results if necessary.
- ▶ **Is there evidence of "Use of Results?"**
Should be evidence that faculty made decisions regarding curriculum and/or pedagogy.
- ▶ **Does the Use of Results address any differences in student learning based on modality as appropriate?**

UWF

So what should we do?

Begin preparing **now** to provide the **strongest evidence** possible of a robust and ongoing **culture of continuous improvement at UWF!**




