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Overview

• Situating Equity in 2020 Standards
• About My Journey to President
• Lessons Learned Along the Way
NWCCU 2020 Standards – Equity Gaps

The institution articulates its commitment to student success, primarily measured through student learning and achievement, for all students, with a focus on equity and closure of achievement gaps, and establishes a mission statement, acceptable thresholds, and benchmarks for effectiveness with meaningful indicators. The institution’s programs are consistent with its mission and culminate in identified student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, credentials, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs. Programs are systematically assessed using meaningful indicators to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes for all students, including underrepresented students and first-generation college students.
NWCCU 2020 Standards – Equity Gaps

- 1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

- 1.D.4 The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

- 2.G.1 Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, and with a particular focus on equity and closure of equity gaps in achievement, the institution creates and maintains effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning and success.
My Journey to President
Seattle Central College professor Carl Livingston leads the march through the halls to the South Plaza of campus beginning the yearlong 50th anniversary celebration on September 22, 2016. (Alan Berner/The Seattle Times)
Lessons Learned

• What we call the work of equity has changed, but the work is still the same
• For student success we have models that work- TRIO
• We have to move beyond “fixing our students” to transforming our institutions
• Leadership Matters
Labeling Equity Work

- A rose by any other name would smell as sweet
- What is it that we seek to do with diversity, equity and inclusion in higher education?
- Fundamental belief in equitable opportunity and justice for all
- Hesitancy about leading with racial equity
Student Success Models

• Intrusive and mandatory advising with case management approach
• Social and emotional support
• Academic and social integration
• Flexible emergency funding

• All elements of TRIO
Moving Beyond Students

• Who is throwing babies in the river?
• Systemic and institutional transformation is needed
• What does that mean and how do we do that work?
• WA State Community and Technical Colleges work on Guided Pathways with equity at its center
Leadership Matters

• Setting diversity, equity and inclusion as a campus-wide priority, dedicating resources to the work and holding teams accountable

• Communication about diversity, equity and inclusion in speeches, campus publications, strategic plan

• Showing up at events, community meetings

• Everyone leads, not just the President

• 2020 Standards will require leadership, institutional commitment and not doing business as usual
Thank You!

- Q&A
- Facilitated Discussions
Breakout Sessions on Student Achievement

How to Use Data to Tell the Story of Your Institution

What Data to Communicate on Student Achievement
Overview of 2020 Standards

Crosswalk for 2010/2020 Standards
2010 to 2020 Standards Revision

Ron Larsen, Sr. VP
March 4, 2020

Adapted from a presentation by
Pamela Goad, Exec. VP

Commission Meeting
January 8, 2020
Origins

1917  Constitution adopted
1921  Cooperative Standards Created

Originally Two Commissions
(1) Commission on Secondary Schools
(NASC separated in 2004 – new logo created)
(2) Commission on Higher Schools
Higher Education Act of 1965

Subpart 2---Accrediting Agency Recognition  Sec 496

(a)criteria required......

(A) success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission....including as appropriate, consideration of State licensing examinations, course completion, and job replacement rates

(B) curricula

(C) faculty

(D) facilities, equipment, and supplies

(E) fiscal and administrative capacity

(F) student support services

(G) recruiting and admission practices

(H) measures of program length and the objectives of degrees or credentials offered

(I) record of student complaints
## 2009 versus 2010 Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness</td>
<td>1-Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Educational Program and Effectiveness</td>
<td>2-Resources and Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Library and Information Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Governance and Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Physical Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Institutional Integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Planning and Implementation</td>
<td>4 – Effectiveness and Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation and Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Revised Standards 2009 to 2010

- Nine Standards to Five Standards
- 214 standard elements to 142 standard elements
- Aligned Institutional planning and accreditation
- Assessment emphasis
The 2010 Revised Standards – Lessons Learned

• Complexity does not necessarily lead to meaningful measures (more indicators is not better)
• Institutional strategic planning and accreditation can complement one another – or not
• Few institutions included direct measures of student learning
• Adjustments needed
2020 - A new environment

- Reauthorization of Higher Education Act
- Negotiated rulemaking
- Political environment
- Calls for transparency and disaggregated data
- Enrollment and financial challenges
- Managing change
Process and Revision Timeline

Survey
Sept-Dec 2018

Town Halls & Annual Meeting
Sept-Dec 2018

Committee Review & Recommendation
Dec 2018

Commission Review & Recommendation
Jan 2019

Public Comment
Feb-Mar-Apr-May 2019

Committee
2nd Review
June 2019

Additional Public Comment
July 2019

Commission Decision and Publication
Aug 2019

Training
Oct-Dec 2019

Implementation
Jan 2020

Members Vote
You Are Here
2010 to 2020 Revised Standards – Change Summary

• Five Standards to Two Standards
• 142 standard elements to 47 standard elements
• Year 3 Mid-Cycle – *Formative Review*
• Year 6 PRFR – 2020 Standard Two – 29 standard elements
• Year 7 EIE Review – 2020 Standard One – 18 standard elements
## Comparisons with last two sets of Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>1-Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>I-Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Educational Program and Effectiveness</td>
<td>2-Resources and Capacity</td>
<td><strong>1-Student Learning (Ed. Program) and Student Achievement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Library and Information Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Governance and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Physical Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Institutional Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3 – Planning and Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4 – Effectiveness and Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5 – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation and Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 – Governance, Resources, and Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 to 2020 – What’s Changed?
2020 Standards

STANDARD ONE

STUDENT SUCCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS

• Institutional Mission
• Improving Institutional Effectiveness
• Student Learning
• Student Achievement
S1. Example 1: Learning Outcomes

(2020) 1.C.3 The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

(2010) 2.C.2 The institution identifies and publishes expected course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Expected student learning outcomes for courses, wherever offered and however delivered, are provided in written form to enrolled students.
(2020) 1.A.1 The institution has a mission statement that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

(2010) 1.A.1 The institution has a widely published mission statement – approved by the governing board – that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.
S1. Example 3: General Education

(2010) Applies to baccalaureate degree programs and transfer associate degree programs

Outcomes in the areas of:
• humanities and fine arts
• mathematical and natural sciences
• social sciences
• communication
• computation
• human relations

(2020) Applies to all associate and bachelor level programs

Competencies include:
• communication skills
• global awareness
• cultural sensitivity
• scientific and quantitative reasoning
• critical analysis and logical thinking
• problem solving
• information literacy
2020 Standards

STANDARD TWO
GOVERNANCE, RESOURCES, AND CAPACITY
• Governance
• Academic Freedom
• Policies and Procedures
• Institutional Integrity
• Financial Resources
• Human Resources
• Student Support Resources
• Library and Information Resources
• Physical and Technology Infrastructure
S2. Example 4: Equity Gaps

(2020) 2.G.1 Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, and with a particular focus on equity and closure of equity gaps in achievement, the institution creates and maintains effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning needs.

(2010) 2.D.1 Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, the institution creates effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning needs.
S2. Example 5: Periodic Reviews

(2020) 2.F.4 Faculty, staff, and administrators are evaluated regularly and systematically in alignment with institutional mission and goals, educational objectives, and policies and procedures. Evaluations are based on written criteria that are published, easily accessible, and clearly communicated. Evaluations are applied equitably, fairly, and consistently in relation to responsibilities and duties. Personnel are assessed for effectiveness and are provided feedback and encouragement for improvement.
Particular 2010 Standard areas now de-emphasized

- Core Themes
- 2010 Standard 3 on Planning and Implementation
- Board oversight of institutional policies
- Board self-evaluation
- Assessment at the course level
- 25% boundary on credit for prior learning
- Continuing Education and non-credit courses
- Auxiliary services and co-curricular programs
- Fundraising
- Hazardous or toxic materials
Student Achievement – New Standards
Measures of Student Achievement Derived from the Higher Education Act (HEA)

- Graduation Rate
- Retention Rate
- Persistence Rate
- Student Loan Cohort Default Rate
Direct and Indirect Measures of Student Learning

**Direct Measures**
- Faculty Grades – rubric oriented
- Standardized tests, exams
- Pre- and Post-Test Designs
- Competency-based demonstration
- Portfolios

**Indirect Measures**
- Faculty Grades – DFW, for example
- Surveys and Reflections
- Course evaluations
- Graduation Rates
- Retention Rates
New Student Achievement Standards

STANDARD 1.D.1-4

• Disaggregated indicators for student achievement
• In comparison with regional and national peer institutions
• Used for continuous improvement
• Transparent methodologies to inform strategies, allocation of resources, and to mitigate perceived gaps
Advancement

*What gets measured gets improved.*

Peter Drucker
The New Cycle of Evaluation

- Seven years
- No institutional evaluation calendars have been changed
- For two years – institutions can choose the 2010 or 2020 standards
# Complete Reporting Cycle of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL REPORT</th>
<th>MID-CYCLE REPORT Standard One</th>
<th>POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND FINANCIAL REVIEW (PRFR) Standard Two</th>
<th>EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (EIE) Standard One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Disaggregated Data  
• Student Achievement  
• Financials | Report and Onsite Review  
• Assessment  
• Data Collection and Analysis  
• Planning | Report and Offsite Review  
• Financial Performance  
• Policies and Regulations | Report and Onsite Review of Student Success  
• Institutional Mission and Effectiveness  
• Student Learning  
• Student Achievement |
| • Annual Submission  
• Staff Review | • Onsite peer review in Year 3  
• Staff review of evaluation reports for Commission Meeting consent agenda | • Offsite peer review in Year 6  
• Findings reported to Institutional Effectiveness Evaluation Team for Year 7 | • Onsite peer review in Year 7  
• Review findings from PRFR  
• Commission Decision |
Resources

- Accreditation Handbook
- Visit Logistics Handbook
- Models
- Rubrics
- Ongoing trainings
- Standards Crosswalk 2010 to 2020
- Guidelines for Reports
Questions?
Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Workshop
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Cycle of Evaluation by Year and Report

Selena M. Grace, NWCCU Senior Vice President
sgrace@nwccu.org
Cycle of Evaluation: Mid-Cycle, PRFR, EIE

Selena M. Grace
Senior Vice President

March 4, 2020
EIE Workshop
Annual Report

• Due no later than August 1

• Template Available in the Spring

• Provides NWCCU Awareness
  • Substantive Changes
  • Budget Changes
  • Enrollment Changes

• Updating Template
Mid-Cycle

- Due 5 Weeks in Advance of Campus Visit
- Conducted in 3\textsuperscript{rd} year of 7 year cycle
- Self-Evaluation
- Peer Review Team Visit to Campus
Important to Note for Mid-Cycle

- Addition of Student Achievement Discussion

- Addition of Institutional Effectiveness Measures

- Addition of Benchmarked or Comparator Institutions

- Request for Two Programs Evaluated to be Institutionally Representative Efforts (and not Programmatically accredited Under a CHEA-Recognized Agency’s Format)
Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review - PRFR

** Spring – March 1  **  ** Fall – September 15  **

- Focused Primarily on Standard Two
- Capacity, Infrastructure, Strengths & Weaknesses, Priorities, Plans
- Off-Site, Peer Review Team
- PRFR Review Summary is Not Made Public
Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness - EIE

- Due 8 Weeks in Advance of Campus Visit
- Conducted in year 7 of cycle
- Self-Evaluation
- Peer Review Team Visit to Campus
Important to Note for EIE Visits

- Focus on Student Success (Student Learning and Student Achievement)
- PRFR and Transition Framework
- Attestation of Met Eligibility Requirements (PRFR)
- Team Size and Assignments
- Utilize Checklists and Rubrics for Discussion
- Support the Process of Engagement and Feedback
Questions
Measuring Student Achievement

Jess Stahl, NWCCU Vice President of Data Science and Analytics
jstahl@nwccu.org
Measuring Student Achievement

Jess Stahl, DBH
VP, Data Science & Analytics
“Why Measure Student Achievement?”
Decoding the Standards
What makes an indicator meaningful?

• Reflects an institutional priority
  • Equitable learning outcomes...
  • Measured by disaggregated assessment data

• Helps improve teaching and learning
  • New attendance policy...
  • Measured by change in drop rate by the second week of the term
NWCCU 2020 STANDARDS

Standard One – Student Success, and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution articulates its commitment to student success, primarily measured through student learning and achievement, for all students, with a focus on equity and closure of achievement gaps, and establishes a mission statement, acceptable thresholds, and benchmarks for effectiveness with meaningful indicators. The institution’s programs are consistent with its mission and culminate in identifying student outcomes leading to degrees, certificates, credentials, employment, or transfer to other higher education institutions or programs. Programs are systematically assessed using meaningful indicators to assure currency, improve teaching and learning strategies, and achieve stated student learning outcomes for all students, including underrepresented students and first-generation college students.

🌟🌟
Improving Institutional Effectiveness

1.B.1 The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

1.B.2 The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

1.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

1.B.4 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

Student Learning

1.C.1 The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

1.C.3 The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

1.C.5 The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

1.C.6 Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

1.C.7 The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.
Specific “metrics” for student achievement. (MINIMUM)

1.D.1 Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

1.D.2 Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

1.D.3 The institution’s disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution’s website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

1.D.4 The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.
Resources

**IPEDS & NWCCU Basic Institutional Data Form**

**Accreditation Handbook**

Appendix B: Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness - Standards 1.B.1 – 1.B.4
Appendix C: Rubric for Student Learning- Standards 1.C.1 – 1.C.9
Appendix D: Rubric for Student Achievement - Standards 1.D.1 – 1.D.4
Appendix F: A Guide to Using Evidence in the NWCCU Accreditation Process

**Additional Resources (NWCCU Assessment Essentials workshops):**

AAHE Principles of Good Practice: Aging Nicely (2013)
SAMPLE: Three-Year Assessment Plan(adapted from Berea College Student Learning Outcomes – TEMPLATE ANNUAL REPORT
VALUE Rubrics

Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education is a campus-based assessment approach developed and led by AAC&U

Student Achievement Measure (SAM)
SAM is a transparency initiative where higher education institutions track students across institutions to create a more complete picture of undergraduate student progress and completion within the higher education system. SAM is used by institutions to support legislative inquiries about their graduation rates. In some instances, SAM showed that an additional 20% of the starting cohort of students had transferred out and graduated elsewhere.

Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA)
The VFA is the principal accountability framework for community colleges with measures defined to encompass the full breadth of the community college mission and the diversity of students' goals and educational experiences.

The VFA gauges student progress and outcomes including pre-collegiate preparation (such as developmental education and Adult Basic Education), academic progress and momentum points, completion and transfer measures, and workforce outcomes for career and technical education.
Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP)

Dashboards include:
- Enrollment Counts
- Credit Accumulation Rate by Year
- Credit Completion Ratio
- Gateway Course Completion by Grade
- Retention/Persistence (1st to 2nd year and term-to-term)
- Outcomes Measures
- Credentials Conferred
- Time to Credential
- Transfer
- Executive Summary

Each dashboard can be filtered by:
- Age
- Gender
- Race/ethnicity
- First generation status
- Cohort
- Cohort term
- Credential type sought
- Enrollment status
- Attendance status
- Dual and summer enrollment
- Pell status
- Academic preparedness in Math & English
- GPA range
Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP)

Outcomes by Cohort

Completion Rates by Enrollment Type
Postsecondary Data Partnership (PDP)
**Total Transfer-Out**

- 4,467
- 68.4%

**Transfer-Out to 2-Year**

- 2,445
- 54.7%

**Transfer-Out to 4-Year**

- 2,022
- 45.3%

**Average Credits Earned Before Transfer**

- 12.1

---

**What is the KPI measuring?**

1. **Transfer out rate**: At what rate are your students transferring to another two or four year institution? Try clicking on the "transferred within" button above to see how many students transfer within > 0 - 2, > 2 - 3, > 3 - 4, > 4 - 6 or > 6 - 8 years.

2. **Transfer with credential rate**: Are your students earning a credential before they transfer to another institution?

3. **Post-Transfer Completion rate**: At what rate are your students earning a degree after they transfer? Try clicking on the "destination institution type" to limit the population of students in the dashboards to those only transferring to a 4 year institution. How many of these students are earning a degree post transfer?

---

**Credential Earned Post-Transfer by Overall**

- **Associate**: 234 (34.8%)
- **Bachelor’s**: 147 (21.7%)
- **Certificate**: 171 (25.2%)
- **No Credential**: 128 (19.9%)

---

**Total Transfer-Out by Overall**

- 2011-12: 426
- 2012-13: 486
- 2013-14: 561
- 2014-15: 576
- 2015-16: 552
- 2016-17: 678

- **Associate**: 67.6%
- **Bachelor’s**: 72.2%
- **Certificate**: 54.9%
- **No Credential**: 78.0%

---

**Selected Filters**: Cohorts: All | Credential Type: All | Earned Credit Milestone: All | Enrollment Type: All | Attendance: All | Dual/Summer Enrollment: All | Age Group: All | Race/Ethnicity: All | Gender: All | Pell Grant Recipient: All | First Generation: All | GPA Range: All | Math Prep: All | English Prep: All
What are students learning?

Are ALL students learning?

Are students meeting their goals?

Are ALL students meeting their goals?
Announcements & Updates
Thank you for joining us today!

Look for a feedback survey in your inbox later this week, we want to hear from you.