

10/21/09

Student Achievement at the Institutional and Degree Level
Guidance on Disclosing Data to External Audiences

To address CFR 1.2 under

Standard 1

Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring

Educational Objectives

Prepared by

Task Force on Transparency & Accountability

for

Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Task Force Membership

The Task Force on Transparency & Accountability began work in October 2008. The following served as members:

W. David Conn, *Chair*

Vice Provost for Academic Programs & Undergraduate Education
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
dconn@calpoly.edu

Samuel J. Agronow

Deputy Director, Institutional Research,
Office of the President, University of California
samuel.agronow@ucop.edu

Mark Pavelchak

Academic Information Officer
Office of the Provost, University of Southern California
pavelcha@usc.edu

Carol Taylor

Active member of task force until January 2009
President, Vanguard University
carol.taylor@vanguard.edu

With staff assistance from:

Teri Cannon

Executive Associate Director, Western Association of Schools & Colleges
tcannon@wascsenior.org

Table of Contents

Background	4
Disclosing Data on Student Achievement to the Public	4
Organizing for Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination	5
Existing Systems of Disclosure.....	6
Task Force Recommendations.....	8
Public Reporting of Retention and Graduation Rates	10
Public Reporting on Student Learning.....	12
Public Reporting of Survey and Qualitative Research Results Related to Student Achievement.....	14
Public Reporting on Other Indicators of Student Achievement.....	16
Institutional Context for Achievement Data.....	18
Rubric for Institutional Self-Assessment	18
Appendix A: Retention and Graduation Rates	19
Appendix B: Time-to-Degree	23
Appendix C: Institutional Examples of Reporting Learning Outcomes.....	26
Appendix D: Recommendations on Conducting Student Surveys.....	27
Appendix E: Rubric for Institutional Self-Assessment: Disclosing Data to External Audiences.....	29
Selected Bibliography.....	34

Background

A revision to Criterion for Review 1.2, made by the Commission in February 2008, is shown in italics below:

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. *The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.*

CFR 1.2 is connected to other CFRs, such as 4.1, 4.2, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8, which reflect the Western Association of Schools and College's (WASC's) overall efforts to ensure that institutions act as learning organizations in gathering, analyzing, using, and disseminating data. The data on student achievement addressed by CFR 1.2 may or may not include all of the data disclosed to WASC in other contexts (e.g., in an institutional proposal for accreditation or a report on student success in a Capacity and Preparatory or Educational Effectiveness Review report).

This document was written specifically to address CFR 1.2 by providing **guidance** to WASC-accredited institutions as they seek to address the new requirement on the **public** reporting of data. The public to which this document refers is **external** to an institution. The effective internal use of data is critically important to meeting WASC expectations; however, this report does not address good practice for internal institutional purposes. A separate report is being developed to provide guidance on the use of data for studying and reporting to WASC on student success.

This document **does not mandate** any particular response to the CFR; however, it recommends "best practices" and provides a rubric (in Appendix E) by which institutions can self-assess their performance in relation to the criteria.

Disclosing Data on Student Achievement to the Public

Within the past few years, institutions of higher education have come under increasing criticism for an alleged lack of transparency and accountability. This criticism was reflected in the 2006 report of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education in the United States, commonly known as the Spellings Commission Report, and surfaced repeatedly in the Congressional debates leading to the 2008 reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act. It has been repeated often in state legislatures around the country by members of both major political parties.

Although institutions produce a wealth of public data about inputs (e.g., admission rates and test scores of entering students), historically, they have provided considerably less data about outputs (e.g., student achievement). A study by Holland et al., reported in 2009, took a

random sample of 20 schools in six different Carnegie Classifications and attempted to find data on each school's website that were identified in the Spellings Commission Report as important to the public. Locating the information on the websites turned out to be difficult. The findings of the study suggest that doctoral schools are better at providing outcomes data than baccalaureate or master's schools, but all fall short of 100%, even with regard to graduation rates. Much less is published on student learning outcomes, and the reporting of achievement data on graduate students is close to non-existent.

Current and easily accessible data about student achievement (e.g., retention rates, graduation rates, student learning, survey and contextual data) are essential to inform decision making by many higher education stakeholders, including prospective and current students, their families, employers, and public policy makers. Furthermore, institutions that make these data publicly available are arguably more likely to strive to improve the student achievement that the data reflect. Irrespective of the new WASC requirement reflected in CFR 1.2, many believe that increasing transparency is an important aspect of educational effectiveness, public accountability, and good practice.

It should be emphasized that what follows is intended to provide institutions with **guidance** in complying with CFR 1.2. It does not establish mandatory requirements beyond the expectation that data they do share should be readily accessible and in an easily understandable form. Furthermore, there is no need for institutions to share with the public all of the data that must be reported to WASC (e.g., in annual reports or during the process of accreditation or reaffirmation). It is appropriate for institutions to frame data for the public in the context of their own mission and circumstances.

Organizing for Data Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination

Many institutions, particularly small- to mid-sized ones, lack separate offices of institutional research and do not have extensive resources or staff time for data collection, analysis, and dissemination. These institutions might consider taking the following steps:

- Conducting a data inventory and audit (i.e., identifying the data that are regularly collected within the institution beyond those that are required to meet statutory and other reporting requirements). For example, all institutions are required to undertake program reviews and thereby generate data that might be usefully disseminated (e.g., to add richness to an institution's self-description). Many institutions participate in national surveys such as Your First College Year and the National Survey of Student Engagement.
- Establishing an oversight group comprised of institutional leaders.
- Developing a plan for data collection, analysis, and dissemination (i.e., working with the oversight group to decide what data should be collected, how it should be analyzed, and how much should be disseminated—in what format and to whom—taking cost into consideration).
- Implementing the plan.
- Undertaking periodic reviews (analogous to program reviews) to determine how widely and effectively the disseminated data are actually used.

Existing Systems of Disclosure

Several systems for disclosing data to the public have been developed during the last 15 years. The existing systems disclose data on undergraduates (but not on graduate or professional students). Undergraduate achievement data, for the most part, consist of measures that reflect student success in retention, graduation, and post-graduate achievement, along with direct measures of learning (e.g., tests; applications of rubrics to papers, projects, and theses; behavioral observations; oral exams; and performance appraisals) and indirect measures (e.g., survey results).

Two major systems of disclosure were developed in the 1990s: the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System and the Common Data Set. Both systems provide the public with a great deal of information about the colleges and universities, including some achievement data.

- [Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System \(IPEDS\)](#). This system collects data on six-year freshman graduation rates, broken down by gender, ethnicity, and athletic status. The Higher Education Act of 1992 mandated that all institutions that receive federal student financial aid must submit data to IPEDS. With the change to web-based reporting in 2000-2001 and new search tools added later, the system has become much more user-friendly than in the past. [The Education Trust](#) has recently made IPEDS' six-year graduation rate data even more accessible by providing a means of easily obtaining breakdowns by ethnicity and gender. Despite these improvements, achievement data available from IPEDS continue to be relatively unknown to many stakeholders.
- [Common Data Set \(CDS\)](#). This voluntary system was developed in 1996 by several college guide organizations, in collaboration with the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) and the institutional research community, as a means of standardizing higher education data collection. Included in the collection are the freshman one-year retention rate and four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates. Individuals who are interested in obtaining information from an institution's CDS can do so via one of the participating college guides (currently *College Board*, *Peterson's*, and *U.S. News*) or, in many cases, from the institution's own website.

While useful, both of the above systems share a key limitation: the retention and graduation rates they provide are frequently limited to full-time, first-time degree-seeking or certificate-seeking students who first enrolled in the fall semester, graduated from the same institution, and completed their program within 150 percent of the normal time to completion (usually six years). They, therefore, exclude large numbers of students who enroll part-time, who do not first enroll in the fall term, or who transfer from or to other institutions. Another key limitation is that neither one includes measures of student learning. The Spellings Commission Report expressed it this way:

Despite increased attention to student learning results by colleges and universities and accreditation agencies, parents and students have no solid evidence, comparable across institutions, of how much students learn in colleges or whether they learn more at one college than another.

Since the publication of the Spellings Commission Report, several new systems of reporting have been developed:

- [University and College Accountability Network \(U-CAN\)](#). This system, developed by the [National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities](#), currently provides achievement data on over 700 private institutions. Four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates are provided. In addition, institutions are encouraged (but not required) to provide links to learning outcomes data.
- [Voluntary System of Accountability \(VSA\)](#). This system, developed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), currently publishes “[College Portraits](#)” of over 300 public institutions. This system includes graduation rate data that have numerous enhancements over IPEDS, including graduation rates for transfer students and “enhanced” graduation rates for students who graduate from a different institution from the one in which they originally enrolled. Also, participating institutions must both link to institution-specific learning outcomes data (chosen at their discretion) *and* begin trial measurement of student learning gains using one of the following tests:
 - [Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency \(CAAP\)](#)—two modules: critical thinking and essay writing
 - [Collegiate Learning Assessment \(CLA\)](#)—complete test including performance tasks and analytic writing tasks
 - [Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress \(MAPP\)](#)—two sub scores of the test: critical thinking and written communication
- [University of California Accountability Framework](#). The University of California is developing an extensive system of accountability reporting. The first University of California Annual Progress Report is part of the comprehensive accountability framework announced by President Yudof in 2008. It measures campus- and University-wide performance in meeting core goals that reflect the University’s teaching, research and public service missions. It will be published annually in May. UC’s Annual Progress Report includes both undergraduate and graduate student graduation data, as well as survey data about undergraduate student experiences, students’ assessment of their learning outcomes, and degree aspirations and post-graduate plans of graduating seniors. Because coverage in any one area is necessarily limited, accountability sub-reports will be published periodically to take up specific issues in greater detail, including undergraduate student access and success.

In addition to the accountability reporting developed by the system-wide office, each UC campus has produced an accountability template similar in content to the VSA’s College Portrait and U-CAN. Campus accountability templates, which are available on campus websites, include undergraduate graduation rates and time-to-degree data, extensive student engagement measures as assessed by the [University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey \(UCUES\)](#), and a limited amount of self-assessed

student learning outcomes data from UCUES.

- [USA Today/National Survey of Student Engagement \(NSSE\)](#). *USA Today* has developed a website to make NSSE survey data publicly available. The site allows searches by university type (e.g., research university, baccalaureate college) and by geographic region. The system is voluntary, and at present, many schools do not make their NSSE data available to *USA Today*.

Review of Existing Systems of Disclosure

All of the existing disclosure systems have value. With them, the public has far greater access to achievement data than it did 10 years ago. However, several limitations are inherent in the systems:

1. Only one of the systems requires the reporting of learning outcome results.
2. The value of retention and graduation rate data is greatly enhanced when it reflects the entire undergraduate population, including breakdowns by economic status, gender, racial-ethnic group, and discipline. Some of the systems do not go far enough in disaggregating retention and graduation rate data.
3. The systems are uneven in the degree to which they include student survey data. Survey data can provide a valuable additional perspective on student experiences and learning that complements other measures of student achievement.
4. Although WASC does not encourage the development of institutional rankings, nevertheless, there may be legitimate reasons for making comparisons of student achievement between institutions (e.g., for benchmarking purposes). The existing systems make such comparisons difficult, especially for institutions that wish to compare themselves to both public and private institutions.
5. None of the existing systems provides a means of disclosing achievement data for graduate students.
6. Finally, none of the existing systems allows institutions to explain institutional context—mission and temporary or ongoing factors unique to the institution that affect student achievement results—beyond providing links to other websites.

Task Force Recommendations

The following are the Task Force's recommendations for institutions to develop a framework for reporting student achievement data that addresses the above limitations.

Deciding What to Publish

It is sometimes difficult to decide which data should be made public. This report categorizes data elements as either “***highly recommended***” or “***recommended***” for publication. Data

elements identified as “highly recommended” are those most critical in providing the public with a way to evaluate student success at an institution. They are also those outcomes which are most central to the institution’s mission. This said, considerations of data availability; cost of obtaining data, sample, or cell size for a statistic; and, most importantly, “appropriateness” of the data element for an institution need to be taken into account when determining which data elements within these two categories can be reported. For example, it is not expected that institutions will develop new measures of student learning at substantial cost, especially when other measures or proxies are available to report. Similarly, caution should be observed in implementing the recommendations that encourage disaggregation of data, to ensure that statistics based on small, and thus unreliable, populations *not* be reported. Finally, institutional context should guide all data reporting. For example, if an institution is primarily undergraduate with only one or two small graduate or professional programs, data reporting should focus on outcomes for the undergraduate populations and should include the graduate/professional programs only *if* data are readily available and reliable. If an institution delivers instruction primarily on-line, this might be noted in the reporting because of the possible effect on certain metrics (e.g., time to degree); however, expectations for student learning should be the same, irrespective of the instructional mode.

Where Data Should be Published

It is ***highly recommended*** that, at a minimum, data on student achievement should be published on a readily accessible website that is compatible with major browsers, complies with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and is easily found (e.g., via a direct and clearly visible link from an institution’s homepage and/or from other pages commonly read by prospective students, parents, employers, etc.). In addition, as appropriate and feasible, the use of other modes of publication is ***recommended***, such as printed documents and electronic bulletins. Some institutions have encouraged the formation of parents’ networks with which the information can be shared.

Reporting “Value Added” Statistics

How much does an institution contribute to student learning above and beyond what the students brought with them when they first enrolled? Do students in various ethnic and socioeconomic groups graduate at higher rates than “expected”? Knowing how much value an institution adds to student outcomes is, to some, a *very* important measure of student success (e.g., see McPherson & Shulenberger, 2006). But not all the experts in student learning assessment agree that value added can be measured accurately and reliably. Banta (2007), for example, argued that the reliability of “gain scores” and “residual scores” is negligible. Shavelson et al. (2007) addressed the criticisms of Banta and others, arguing that the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) at least does provide a reliable measure of value added. Additional research on the reliability and validity of value-added measures in undergraduate testing, to be published in 2009, may shed more light on this controversial issue.

Some of the measures described in this report have built-in “value added” components. For example, those institutions participating in the Voluntary System of Accountability report learning outcomes on the CLA, MAAP, or CAAP tests, controlling for a single measure: the institutions’ mean SAT scores. In addition, *U.S. News and World Reports* publishes

“expected” (vs. actual) graduation rates based on a regression formula which uses average institutional characteristics; however, this practice is considered controversial by some institutions and observers. In a similar manner, the [Education Trust](#) has developed a regression model with the six-year graduation rate as the dependent variable and 11 indicators, chosen because they account for significant amounts of variance in the model.

The above measures aside, the ability to produce reliable and meaningful “expected” outcomes usually involves collecting a number of “control measures” (e.g., SAT scores, high school grades, majors, socio-economic status, measures of diversity) and then employing them in a statistical model to determine “expected” amounts of learning, “expected” graduation rates, etc. For many WASC institutions, doing this may require considerable resources in data collection and analytic wherewithal. For this reason, this report does *not*, for the most part, recommend the reporting of value-added statistics. On the other hand, it does not discourage the reporting of said statistics if the institution has the ability to produce them.

If an institution chooses to report “value-added” statistics, it is ***highly recommended*** that the methodology used to collect and analyze these data also be reported. In other words, the “control variables” and populations for the value-added modeling need to be identified. In addition, the statistical model (e.g., linear regression, logistic regression, recursive partitioning) needs to be fully described. Finally, relevant comparisons between “expected” and “actual” outcomes need to be clearly reported.

Public Reporting of Retention and Graduation Rates

The Task Force recommends providing retention and graduation data that combine the best of the IPEDS and CDS reports with the advances made by the VSA system. These recommendations reflect the fact that CFR 1.2 requires the reporting of data for graduate and professional students, as well as undergraduates. (Recommendations at a more fine-grained level are provided in Appendix A.)

Highly recommended

1. Data for both first-time freshmen (IPEDS cohort) and upper-division transfer students. Report the percentage of the transfer population that is “upper-division.” Upper-division transfers typically are defined as having completed 60 or more semesters of course work prior to transferring.
2. Separate reports for graduate and professional students, further separating, if possible, those in terminal degree academic master’s programs from those in PhD programs. A separate report for clinical and professional master’s degrees and doctoral degrees, in addition to PhDs, may be desirable, depending on how these degrees are classified by the institution.
3. One-year retention rates for freshmen, transfers, non-doctoral graduate students, and professional students.
4. Four-, six-, and eight-year graduation rates for freshmen and two-, three-, and

four-year graduation rates for transfer students. (IPEDS now mandates the eight-year graduation rate for freshmen.)

5. Two-, three- and four-year graduation rates for academic master's degrees and seven- and 10-year graduation rates for academic doctoral degrees. (The Council of Graduate Schools reports seven- and 10-year rates.)
6. Graduation rates for the "typical" number of years to complete a degree in a professional field at the master's or doctoral level (e.g., M.D., LL.D., MBA, JD, EDD, PsyD, etc.). "Typical" time-to-degree completion should be defined for each degree program.
7. Breakdowns by gender, ethnicity, and economic status.¹
8. Breakdowns by discipline for academic graduate and professional degree programs. (Institutions may want to consider aggregating across years if the number of degrees awarded per year in most programs is small.)
9. Overall retention and graduation rates for the five most recent academic years. Breakdowns by gender, ethnicity, economic status, and discipline (graduate and professional degrees) for at least the most recent academic year.
10. For the report of graduation and retention rates in small degree programs or in situations where breakdowns by gender, ethnicity, or economic status create small cells, years should be grouped into three-, four-, or five-year blocks. Data should be aggregated or redacted when cell sizes drop below "5."

Recommended

1. Retention and graduation statistics for upper-division *community college* transfers who enter in the fall term.
2. Retention and graduation statistics for non-traditional populations (e.g., those who first enroll in terms other than fall, all transfers, lower-division transfers, transfers from four-year colleges).
3. Two or more years of breakdowns of retention and graduation rates by gender, ethnicity, economic status, and discipline (for graduate and professional degrees) so that changes in these rates can be ascertained for these subpopulations.
4. Institutions with large undergraduate student populations or specialized populations (e.g., professional degree programs) should provide breakdowns by

¹IPEDS reporting requirements now include the reporting of graduation rates for students who (a) receive a Federal Pell Grant and (b) receive subsidized Federal loans and do not receive Pell Grants.

discipline as defined by the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP).²

5. Two-year retention rates for freshmen and PhDs.
6. Retention and graduation rates for academic (research) doctorates other than the PhD, on the same time schedule as the PhD
7. Using data from the National Student Clearinghouse, institutions should supply “enhanced” graduation rates. (“Enhanced” graduation rates would include students who begin at the institution but graduate elsewhere.)
8. Time-to-degree statistics for recent freshmen, transfer, graduate, and professional cohorts. (Specific details on how this can be done for freshman cohorts are located in Appendix B.)

The Task Force is aware that there is not consensus about how to collect and report data on graduate and professional degree retention, graduation rates, and time-to-degree. Some possible templates that can assist institutions in collecting these data are as follows:

- [The PhD Completion Project](#)
- [University of Colorado-Boulder](#)

A more complete depiction of the recommendations for reporting retention and graduation data may be found in Appendix B.

Public Reporting on Student Learning

The “gold standard” evidence of educational effectiveness involves clear demonstrations of student learning at the degree and institutional levels. Institutions use a variety of approaches to measure learning, in addition to the standardized testing approaches being piloted by schools participating in the VSA. Approaches to measuring student learning include both direct and indirect methods, as mentioned previously (under “Existing Systems of Disclosure”). One promising test approach that is not currently being examined by the VSA, but is being used by some institutions, is Insight Assessment’s [California Critical Thinking Skills Test \(CCTST\)](#). Insight Assessment also produces specialized tests for business, health science, legal studies, and military studies.³

Because institutions have different missions, WASC encourages institutions to measure student learning—at both the graduate and undergraduate levels—in ways that they consider valid, appropriate, and consistent with the way faculty view learning. At the same time, each

²Two-digit CIP definitions (the appropriate level of aggregation for most schools) are located [here](#).

³The standardized tests mentioned in this document are included because of their widespread popularity but are not specifically endorsed by WASC. Generally, they are useful for assessing learning at the institutional level but not for assessing learning at the degree level.

institution should share its approach to measuring student learning with the public. The Task Force, therefore, recommends that institutions provide links to summary explanations of their approach and to recent representative data. For undergraduates, as applicable, evidence of learning (e.g., changes in critical thinking) at the institutional and degree levels should be provided for as many academic programs as possible. For graduate and professional students, reports by degree program are usually the most valuable.

Because each institution is unique, it is likely that a wide variety of approaches will be taken in reporting student learning to the public. That said, institutions can learn from one another. Examples of how various WASC and non-WASC institutions are currently reporting on student learning are provided in Appendix C. In cases where an institution has yet to develop a systematic approach or collect any data, it is valuable to provide a *plan* (including a timeframe) for generating its approach and data. An example of an institution's plan is also available in Appendix C.

Highly recommended

1. Institutions are encouraged to disclose degree level learning outcomes results that have already been collected. Because of mandates by systems (e.g., CSU) or accrediting bodies in fields such as applied science, computing, engineering, technology (ABET), and business (AACSB) to produce learning outcomes results, many institutions have learning outcomes results in at least a few fields. In instances where the learning outcomes specified by system or accreditation mandates vary from those based on faculty input, institutions are encouraged to disclose and explain the differences.
2. Institutions should develop and make public assessment plans at the institutional level and, eventually, in all degree programs.
3. As those plans are implemented, institutions should make the results public.

Recommended

As the institution's assessment program matures, institutions should show the following:

1. How student learning at the institutional and program levels has changed over a period of time.
2. How programs have been modified as a result of learning outcomes (and related) results.
3. How learning outcomes results relate to other measures of student achievement, such as graduation rates and survey responses.

Again, the goal of this report is to provide **guidance** rather than to prescribe solutions for institutions. Institutions may need to consider their ability to produce these data and the cost of doing so. Within this context, institutions should strive to provide as much information as is reasonably possible.

Public Reporting of Survey and Qualitative Research Results Related to Student Achievement

Surveys

Surveys are not a means of measuring learning directly but can provide an invaluable, additional perspective on the student experience as it pertains to learning.

Several types of survey questions can provide results relevant to student achievement:

1. **Reported outcomes.** Surveys are a useful way to capture information about outcomes other than graduation. For example, senior or “six-month out” surveys provide opportunities to measure the proportion of students who have received job offers or have been accepted to graduate school. Alumni surveys are an opportunity to learn about employment (and promotion) in fields related to students’ degree majors. Alumni surveys can be especially powerful when merged with experiences as an undergraduate or graduate student. For example, in preparing their landmark text *Shape of the River*, Bowen and Bok (1998)

made comparisons between students’ educational experiences and their civic and employment outcomes. This cohort analysis method yielded interesting evidence about the effectiveness of higher education and could serve as a model for future research, especially if generational differences in the cohorts are addressed or controlled. (Brooks, 2005)
2. **Perceived gains.** Some surveys include questions that ask students or graduates to estimate what they learned or the skills they acquired along various dimensions. One must treat perceived gain survey results with caution because of reliability issues, such as the halo effect (Pike, 1999). Nevertheless, results of these surveys can be useful, especially when combined with curricular data. For example, one might compare the responses of undergraduates who have or have not completed a general education requirement on relevant perceived gain factors. Or one might compare the responses of students before and after a change in a curricular requirement.
3. **Student engagement.** There is widespread agreement among educational researchers that, at the undergraduate level, active engagement with the subject matter enhances student learning (e.g., Carey & Aldeman, 2008; Kuh, 2003). Engagement appears to be a strong predictor of both learning and college GPA (Agronow, 2008). Some evidence suggests that “*self-reports*” of learning from surveys correlate with actual learning outcomes (Lattuca, Terenzini, & Volkwein, 2006). Surveys of student engagement capture the extent to which faculty structure their courses to facilitate engagement through practices such as active learning, collaborative learning, and community-based projects. Student engagement surveys also measure the extent to which students engage with the subject matter on their own. Independent of its apparent positive effect on learning and academic performance, student engagement is also desirable in its own right. Thus, data on engagement are thought to be of great intrinsic value for purposes of continuous improvement within an institution and for students and their families in the college

selection process.

At least four national surveys include student engagement items:

- a. [University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey \(UCUES\)](#)
- b. [National Survey of Student Engagement \(NSSE\)](#)
- c. [College Senior Survey \(CSS\)](#), developed by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at UCLA Higher Education Research Institute
- d. [College Student Experiences Questionnaire \(CSEQ\)](#).

Whether institutions use one of these or design their own engagement survey, the Task Force recommends that institutions report their senior-level responses relating to the following six constructs, all of which have been shown to correlate with learning (Keller, 2007, as cited in Keller & Hammang, 2008):

- Group learning
 - Active learning
 - Experiences with diverse groups of people and ideas
 - Student satisfaction
 - The institution's commitment to student learning and success
 - Student interaction with faculty and staff.
4. **Qualitative research.** Student research techniques that fall under the “qualitative” label include focus groups, in-depth interviews, and direct observation. Techniques such as these can provide an important additional perspective on student achievement. They can help answer questions such how or why achievement occurred (or did not occur), how faculty helped (or hindered) the process, what positive (or negative) outcomes occurred beyond what was intended, and whether expectations were reasonable.

Highly recommended

1. Institutions should make public summaries of existing survey data related to student achievement in the areas of reported outcomes, perceived gains, and student engagement for the most recent administrations of each survey.
2. A review of existing survey results should be conducted with an eye toward identifying student subpopulations whose voices are not currently being heard through survey results (e.g., transfer students, graduate students).
3. The principle of “garbage in, garbage out” suggests that institutions abide by key principles of survey design and administration. See Appendix D for a

brief discussion of some of these principles.

4. Institutions are encouraged to make public any qualitative research results that provide a unique additional perspective on student achievement.

Recommended

1. Institutions should break down survey results related to student achievement in terms of gender, ethnicity, and economic status.
2. As the program of survey results matures, institutions should show how student responses on surveys related to student achievement change over time.

Public Reporting on Other Indicators of Student Achievement

As applicable, based on an institution's mission, the use of other indicators of student achievement is ***highly recommended***. Institutions should conduct a review of possible "other" indicators that would shed additional light on student achievement and begin capturing data along key dimensions to the extent that is feasible.

Some of these indicators may be readily available, while others are not. The Task Force encourages campuses to disclose data on as many of these indicators as is possible, within their budgetary limitations.

- At the ***undergraduate*** level, additional data would include indicators such as course completion rates, performance on state licensing examinations, job placement rates, and evidence from external constituencies such as parents, employers, and professional organizations. Institutions are expected to have these data for internal use (as expressed in CFR 2.7 and 4.8) and may wish to publish these data in keeping with the intent of CFR 1.2.
- At the ***graduate*** level, additional data would include a variety of unique achievement indicators, such as the following:
 - Advancement to candidacy.
 - Participation in research opportunities.
 - Participation in future faculty programs.
 - Publication(s) and/or professional presentations.
 - Review of student work (e.g., dissertations or discipline equivalent, such as comprehensive exams, culminating projects). Because rubrics can be developed to assess not only contributions to the field but also oral skills demonstrated during the defense and writing skills demonstrated in the dissertation or thesis, useful outcome data on student learning could be

published.

- Results of licensing exams, as applicable.
 - Placement results.
 - Impacts of students in the field of study (e.g., patents, awards, grants).
- Other data sources that institutions can use to demonstrate achievement at the **graduate** level include the following:
 1. [NRC Survey](#) : A revision of the NRC Survey, scheduled to be released in 2009, promises to provide a number of measures of student success in a standardized format at both the graduate and professional levels.
 2. [CGS PhD Completion Project](#): This seven-year grant-funded project, sponsored by CGS, Pfizer, and the Ford Foundation, is aimed at improving PhD completion rates through institutional interventions and sharing of best practices.
 3. [Survey of Earned Doctorates](#): Current graduate students complete this survey at the time they submit paperwork for their degree. It covers topics such as time to degree, financial support, debt related to education, and post-graduation plans.
 4. [Other NSF Surveys](#): The NSF conducts several other surveys that tend to focus on the science, engineering, and health fields and on graduate education. See www.nsf.gov/statistics/survey.cfm for details.
 5. [National Association of Graduate-Professional Students \(NAGPS\) National Doctoral Program Survey](#): Student ratings of information provided to prospective students regarding curricular breadth and flexibility, teacher training, professional development, time to degree, mentoring, program climate, and overall satisfaction. Data are posted on the web by discipline and by institution for programs that exceed a minimum number of responses. (As noted on the website, however, "participants are self-selected, and as a result, their responses may not fully reflect the opinions of the entire graduate student population. Participants' educational affiliations were not verified.")
 6. [Graduate surveys conducted via consortia](#) (e.g., Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium [HEDS] and the AAU Data Exchange [AAUDE]). Members of these consortia should work with their organizations to participate in their respective graduate student surveys.
 7. [Surveys conducted by various academic associations](#) and other researchers, including the "Improving Doctoral Education: Recommendations from the PhDs—Ten Years Later" study (Nerad & Cerny,

2000).

Institutional Context for Achievement Data

Achievement data in isolation from other information about a campus are of limited use. First, each institution is unique in terms of mission, history, financial resources, geography, and a variety of other factors. For example, institutions that serve a predominantly residential body of students who enter mostly as freshmen might be expected to produce different results in terms of student achievement (e.g., time to degree) than other institutions serving a predominantly commuter population of upper-division transfer students. Other contextual issues may be more short-lived but still have a powerful impact on achievement statistics. Times of stress in the state or national economy (e.g., a recession) can disrupt graduation rates and time to completion, as can natural disasters, such as floods or earthquakes, affecting the local area. We encourage institutions to write detailed descriptions about their unique institutional context, both in comparison to other institutions and in terms of the effects that particular situations or events are having on the ability of students to achieve the institution's intended outcomes.

Rubric for Institutional Self-Assessment

Appendix E contains a rubric that institutions may use to assess their performance in meeting the expectations of CFR 1.2. As noted previously, the focus of this report is on providing data to an external (rather than internal) audience. Criteria to keep in mind are ease of access and use, clarity of information, helpfulness, and materiality (i.e., do the data help the user to understand the institution or make data-driven and well-informed decisions about the institution).

Appendix A: Retention and Graduation Rates

Detailed Recommendations

General

- Data should be reported at least at the “*Developed*” level as defined in CFR 1.2. (i.e., data, findings, and analyses of retention and degree completion data include subgroup data over time and are easily accessible to the public in multiple venues).
- Where possible, data should be comparable to those reported by other institutions via IPEDS or other reporting methodologies (e.g., methods specified for completion rates by the Voluntary System of Accountability).
- *Caution should be used in reporting data containing small cells (less than five). Recommended methods of aggregation (combining levels of variables or combining years) or redaction should be used to eliminate the reporting of small cells.*

Populations

All statistics should be reported for each of the following populations:

Highly Recommended

1. First-time, full-time freshmen who first enter in fall term (IPEDS cohort).
2. Upper-division (junior-level or higher) transfers who first enroll in fall term. Upper-division transfers typically have completed 60 or more units prior to transferring.
3. Academic master’s degree.
4. Professional master’s degree.
5. PhD degree.
6. Professional/clinical doctorate.

Recommended

1. Freshmen and upper-division transfers who first enroll in terms other than fall.
2. All transfers, lower-division transfers, and/or transfers from four-year colleges
3. Upper-division community college transfers who first enter in fall term.
4. Academic (research) doctorates other than the PhD.

Elements

The following statistical elements should be reported:

Highly Recommended

1. Retention after one year of enrollment (for all populations except PhD).
2. Graduation rates after two or three years of enrollment (for upper-division transfers and academic master's degrees).
3. Graduation rates after four years of enrollment (for upper-division transfers; first-time, full-time freshmen; and academic master's degrees).
4. Graduation rates after six years of enrollment (first-time, full-time freshmen only).
5. Graduation rates after seven years of enrollment (PhD only).
6. Graduation rates after eight years of enrollment (first-time, full-time freshmen and PhD only).
7. Graduation rates after 10 years of enrollment (PhD only).
8. Graduation rates after "typical" period of time to complete degree (professional degrees only, e.g., M.D., LL.D., MBA, JD, EDD, PsyD, etc.)

Recommended

1. Time to degree for all populations (may be expressed in terms of "elapsed time" or "enrolled ['seat'] time"). These data will be more valuable if the report is based on "exiting cohort" rather than "entering cohort." See discussion in Appendix B.
2. Retention rates after two years of enrollment for freshmen and PhD.
3. Graduation rates after two or three years of enrollment, including students transferring to other institutions (upper-division transfers only).
4. Graduation rates after four years of enrollment, including students transferring to other institutions (upper-division transfers and first-time freshmen).
5. Graduation rates after six or eight years of enrollment, including students transferring to other institutions (first-time, full-time freshmen only).

Time Periods

Highly Recommended

1. Overall retention after one year of enrollment, for most recent five years.
2. Overall graduation rates for most recent five years.
3. As appropriate, years may be grouped into three-, four-, or five-year blocks to avoid report of small cells.
4. Retention after one year of enrollment for most recent year for subpopulations defined below.
5. Graduation rates for the most recent year for subpopulations defined below.

Recommended

Graduation rates and retention for *two or more* cohorts-years, for each subpopulation defined below.

Subpopulations

Highly Recommended

1. Racial-ethnic group based on the new IPEDS reporting requirements for ethnicity and race. Data typically will be reported for the following:
 - a) Nonresident alien
 - b) Race and ethnicity unknown
 - c) Hispanics of any race
 - d) American Indian or Alaska Native
 - e) Asian
 - f) Black or African American
 - g) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - h) White
 - i) Two or more races.
2. Gender (male, female, unknown).
3. For graduate and professional degrees, discipline (with multi-year aggregation as necessary for small cell sizes).
4. Socioeconomic status as defined by the new IPEDS reporting requirements (Federal Pell Grant recipients, subsidized Federal loan recipients, and students who receive neither).

Recommended

1. For freshmen and transfers, discipline, as defined by the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) using two-digit categories.
2. Subpopulations that are not traditional (e.g., non-fall term entrants, lower-division transfers, transfers from four-year colleges).

Comments/Rationale for Recommendations

1. Caution about Reporting Small Cells: Reporting should avoid small cells (less than five) for two reasons: (a) Small cell sizes may allow identification of specific students, which may constitute a violation of a student's privacy rights under FERPA, and (b) the data from small cells simply may not be very reliable. Therefore, combining categories (disciplines, ethnic groups) or combining years along with redaction may be employed.
2. Graduation Rates: Two-year graduation rates for upper-division transfers and four-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen are important for parents/students' ability to determine how many students complete their degrees in an "expected" amount of time.
3. Populations: Upper-division transfers are considered "traditional" transfers by most institutions. Although some systems (e.g., UC in its Accountability Report) consider "upper-division community college" transfers as "traditional," this is not universal across the range of WASC institutions.

Reporting is specific to the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree because of the special place that degree holds in the academy. Reporting retention and graduation rates for other graduate academic doctorates may be desirable for some institutions but should be kept separate from reports for the PhD.

4. Subpopulations: Although retention and graduation rates will vary in a meaningful manner when reported by ethnic group and by gender, reporting of data based on the combination of these subgroups will lead to many small, unreportable cells.

While it is desirable to report two or more years of trend data for subpopulations, it is not "highly recommended" because of the burden it would pose on some institutions with limited analytic resources.

5. Discipline: Reporting these statistics by broader two-digit Classification of Instructional Programs - CIP Discipline (optional for undergraduates) is likely to be important to prospective students and their parents, even if the data are not required in standard reporting (e.g., not required by IPEDS).

*A full discussion of the CIP taxonomy, including a list of the two-digit codes used in this table, is located [here](#).

Appendix B: Time to Degree

Undergraduates

The methodology described below was developed by the AAU Data Exchange in 2007 but should apply to any institution that awards bachelor's degrees. The goal is to collect time-to-degree data by discipline for the student population described as follows:

1. Included as a bachelor's degree (award level "5") in the institution's most recent IPEDS Completions Survey submitted during the Fall Data Collection of the current year, and
2. Awarded to a student who originally became a first-time, degree-seeking undergraduate while enrolled at the institution (regardless of whether he/she had also previously attended the institution as a non-degree-seeking student), and
3. Awarded to a student who was registered for a *full-time* credit load (12+ credits or full-time summer load) in his/her first term at the institution as a degree-seeking undergraduate, and
4. Awarded to a student who did not first enter the institution as undergraduate transfer student, and
5. Awarded to a student who does not hold a bachelor's degree awarded by any institution that was included in a previous IPEDS Completions Survey.

Under these criteria, the population may include multiple bachelor's degrees awarded to the same student during the same survey year (the same as in the IPEDS Completions survey). Also, the population may include degrees awarded to students who left the institution for a period of time and then returned, perhaps bringing transfer credits from another institution. Finally, the population will include degrees awarded to students who entered their undergraduate careers in spring, winter, or summer terms, in addition to students who entered in a fall term.

Data should be collected on a subset of the largest degree-producing majors at the institution. The two-digit CIP codes associated with those disciplines should be reported in order to enhance comparability to other institutions. Time to degree is to be calculated with a backward-looking procedure by establishing cohorts of all degree recipients from July 1 through June 30 of a given academic year and then determining when each student in the cohort first started at the institution.

There are several possible ways to report time to degree, including the following:

1. Elapsed years
2. Registered semesters/quarters
3. Number of credits taken.

All of these are acceptable although it is preferable to report elapsed years, if possible. (Most institutions use this approach.)

Graduate Students

Relative to what is available for undergraduates, guidance on collecting time-to-degree information is sparse for PhD students and virtually nonexistent for master's and professional students. The National Science Foundation collects time-to-degree data through the Survey of Earned Doctorates, but these data are self-reported and subject to some inaccuracy and omission. In addition, the NRC has developed a time-to-degree procedure in its PhD assessment project; however, at this writing, the validity of this procedure is unknown. The AAU Data Exchange is currently developing a measure of PhD time-to-degree based on the NRC format, with the addition of population counts and statistical descriptors beyond the median. Other changes include more explicit definitions, which are consistent with those used in PhD completions, and a means by which schools can explain special circumstances. While awaiting these developments, institutions should collect time-to-degree data drawn from institutional records.

The following time-to-degree methodology, which can be used for master's and doctoral students, is adapted from the University of Colorado-Boulder (www.colorado.edu/pba/degrees/tdintro.htm):

1. Begin by identifying the population of all master's and doctoral degree recipients over at least a three-year period.
2. From that population, exclude the following:
 - i. Graduate-level students who had no on-campus enrollment in regular courses prior to earning their degree. (They may have had enrollment in continuing education.)
 - ii. Students who were in the combined bachelor's/master's degree programs.
 - iii. Students who did graduate-level work at another institution before their first term at the institution.
3. Based on the population identified, determine the year of entry before less than one percent of the population first enrolled (do this separately for master's and doctoral students). Alternatively, an institution may prefer to use a year of entry reflected by its own policy regarding maximum time to degree. Eliminating students who enrolled prior to this year will minimize the effect of outliers on time to degree.
4. The time to degree for doctoral-level students should include ALL of the time from entry as a master's student or as a doctoral student. This is not the time from completion of the master's degree to the doctoral degree but from the time of entry at the graduate level to the doctoral degree.
5. In counting elapsed time, three terms (fall, spring, and summer) are counted as one year.

- i. One year + one term = 1.3 years
- ii. One year + two terms = 1.7 years

Appendix C: Institutional Examples of Reporting Learning Outcomes

This following list is not meant to be exhaustive and will change as more institutions develop good examples of how learning outcomes should be reported and as links become outdated or unavailable.

1. [Point Loma Nazarene University](#). This institution has developed an extensive program of learning outcomes assessment, both at the institutional level (12 measures related to General Education courses) and at the degree level (64 different undergraduate and graduate academic programs). The PLNU site also describes how co-curricular programs are assessed.
2. [California State University System](#). This is a link to an explanation about how learning outcomes assessment is being conducted at each of the 23 CSU campuses. There are links to NSSE and CLA results (see VSA description above) and also links to their “teaching commons” where CSU faculty members can share their methods of assessing learning in particular majors.
3. [University of Hawaii at Manoa](#). Current year assessment reports are located [here](#), and reports from previous years are located [here](#).
4. [Colorado State University](#). According to this website, Colorado State faculty members have “developed research methods for determining learning effectiveness for over 500 planning objectives spread over 169 academic programs in eight colleges that include knowledge, intellectual skills, social skills, application and others.” Its [PRISM Archive is intended for the public](#). [One can](#) click on [learning outcomes](#) to view them by department or click on to view outcomes by program level to learn how they will be researched.

Appendix D: Recommendations on Conducting Student Surveys

A complete look at students through the lens of survey results—one that aspires to adequately capture the “value-added” of a college education—requires the collection of data on inputs, environment (including engagement), and outcomes achievement. (Astin, 1993).

This view suggests that institutions should regularly administer entering student surveys, engagement surveys, senior surveys, alumni surveys, and graduate student surveys. Some institutions are also gaining valuable insights about students through surveys of employers and parents. Entering student surveys provide a baseline of expectations and a look back at prior habits regarding engagement, etc. Engagement surveys can quantify what students do with their time both in and out of the classroom and how they interact with faculty and other students. Senior surveys can measure engagement retrospectively and are also important because they can capture information about employment offers, post-graduation plans in general, degree aspirations, and the perceived value of an undergraduate education. Alumni surveys (including six-months-out surveys) are ideal for measuring achievement in the form of professional positions obtained and graduate degrees earned. Graduate student surveys can also help to capture the value-added nature of graduate training.

Following the principle of “garbage in, garbage out,” it is also important that institutions adhere to basic survey design principles as well as considerations that might affect the quality of the data. For example, senior surveys are best conducted toward the end of the students’ last semester, prior to graduation, and alumni surveys should not be connected to appeals for donations. Consistently adhering to these principles also facilitates comparisons across institutions, which many institutions would like to be able to make. A list of general and specific recommendations is included below.

Cross-institutional comparisons will also be facilitated by the inclusion of common “core” questions in various surveys.

Guidelines for Administering Engagement, Senior and Alumni Surveys

General

- Ask a core set of questions in each survey. One source of core questions for senior and alumni surveys is the AAU Data Exchange, which recently developed core questions for both types of surveys. Core questions for engagement surveys can possibly be adapted from the standardized surveys mentioned in this report (e.g., UCUES, CSS, CSEQ, NSSE), if permission is obtained from the authors of those surveys. (Of these, the CSS is perhaps unique because it includes many questions typically found on both engagement and senior surveys). The core questions may be incorporated into existing surveys of graduating seniors and alumni or conducted as a separate survey.
- Strive for the best possible response rates, and make them public.
- Keep individual student/graduate survey data confidential.

- Survey the complete senior or alumni cohort, or use sampling procedures and provide metadata/documentation on sampling, including population, sample, and respondent counts for sampling groups (e.g., gender, race, school).
- Consider obtaining demographic data and data on majors from alumni/student records, and join them to the survey data. (This practice prevents the need to ask for these data via a survey—shorter surveys generally produce higher response rates.)
- Determine data collection procedures locally, based on institutional practices and policies, including policies of the local Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Senior Survey

- Survey graduating seniors as close to their graduation as possible.
- Document whether the survey includes graduates from the entire academic year or only from the spring term.

Alumni Survey

- Include in the target population as many as the five most recent graduating cohorts, as desired by the institution (e.g., one, two, three, four, and five years out), as well as cohorts at 5-year intervals beyond that (e.g., 10, 15, and 20 years out).
- Do not connect the survey in any way to an alumni-giving solicitation.

Reporting of results

- Break down results of core questions (at a minimum) by gender, ethnicity, matriculation status (freshmen or transfer) and, optionally, two-digit CIP code.

Appendix E: Rubric for Institutional Self-Assessment: Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Criteria for Review 1.2

Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. ***The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.***

Key Descriptive Terms → ↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION	INITIAL	EMERGING	DEVELOPED	HIGHLY DEVELOPED
Communication and transparency (CFR 1.2) ⁴	Little or no data, findings, and analyses re: student achievement available to external audiences.	Some data, findings, analyses from assessment of student achievement available but may be incomplete and/or difficult to access or understand.	Data, findings, and analyses of student achievement generally available, easily accessible; chosen for relevance to external audiences. Available in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	Data, findings, and analyses of student achievement widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable and useful to multiple external audiences. The institution demonstrates its ability to provide data at the institutional, program, and degree levels. Data, findings, and analyses are readily available in multiple venues, easily accessible, and easily comprehensible to multiple external audiences.
Retention Data— including subgroup data ⁵ over a period of at least 5 years	CDS (freshmen) retention data provided for 5 years; however, no subgroup disaggregation and analyses provided.	CDS (freshmen) retention data provided for 5 years, along with breakdowns by gender, ethnicity, and economic status.	CDS (freshmen) retention data provided for 5 years, along with multiple disaggregations of data by gender, ethnicity, economic status, and discipline.	In addition to providing fully disaggregated retention data by multiple categories, additional data provided. Explanatory material provides contextualization and analyses.

⁴ Modelled on WASC's Educational Effectiveness Framework: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning.

⁵ Basic subgroup data should include race/ethnicity, gender, economic status, and discipline.

Criteria for Review 1.2

Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. ***The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.***

Key Descriptive Terms → ↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION	INITIAL	EMERGING	DEVELOPED	HIGHLY DEVELOPED
Student Engagement ⁶ — including subgroup data over a period of at least 5 years	Little or no public data, findings, or analysis related to student engagement; no data by subgroup or over time.	Some student engagement data, findings, and analyses made public, including subgroup data over time but may be incomplete or difficult for external audiences to access or understand.	Data, findings, and analyses re: student engagement generally available, including subgroup data and data over time; chosen for relevance to multiple external audiences. Data available to the public in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	Data, findings, and analyses re: student engagement, including subgroup data over time, widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable and useful to multiple external audiences. Available in multiple venues and easily accessible.
Undergraduate Graduation Rates— including subgroup data over a period of at least 5 years	IPEDS graduation rate data published for a 5-year period, including breakdowns by gender and ethnicity.	IPEDS graduation rate data provided for a 5-year period, including breakdowns by gender and ethnicity. Supplemented by data on economic background and discipline.	Enhanced graduation rates (e.g., National Clearinghouse) provided for freshmen, and graduation data provided for transfer students.	In addition to disaggregated graduation data, analyses and contextualization provided to explain and identify factors associated with graduation rates.

⁶ Although it is not required by CFR 1.2, the task force recommends that data on student engagement be published. See also CFR 2.10.

Criteria for Review 1.2

Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. ***The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.***

Key Descriptive Terms → ↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION	INITIAL	EMERGING	DEVELOPED	HIGHLY DEVELOPED
Undergraduate Student Learning—institution-level student learning outcomes, including subgroup data over time	Little or no data, findings, or analysis related to institutional learning outcomes published. Limited or no subgroup data available. Limited or no trend data or data for multiple years available.	Institution-level student learning outcomes published. Some data, findings, and analyses related to these outcomes available, including subgroup data. Data may be incomplete and difficult to access or understand.	Data, findings, and analyses from assessment of institutional learning outcomes generally available, including subgroup data over time; chosen for relevance to external audiences. Data available to the public in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	Data, findings, and analyses from assessment of institutional learning outcomes, including subgroup data over time; widely available, skillfully framed, and contextualized to be understandable; useful to multiple external audiences. Available in multiple venues, easily accessible.
Undergraduate Student Learning – general education, including subgroup data over time	Little or no data, findings, or analysis related to general education learning outcomes published. Limited or no subgroup data available. Limited or no data available over time.	General education outcomes are published. Some data, findings, and analyses of general education learning outcomes published, including subgroup data over time, but may be incomplete, difficult to access or understand for external audiences.	Data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of most general education learning outcomes published, including subgroup data over time; chosen for relevance to multiple external audiences. Data available to the public in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	Data, findings, and analyses of achievement of all general education outcomes, including subgroup data over time, widely available to the public, skillfully framed, and contextualized to be understandable and useful to multiple external audiences. Available in multiple venues, easily accessible.

Criteria for Review 1.2

Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. ***The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.***

Key Descriptive Terms → ↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION	INITIAL	EMERGING	DEVELOPED	HIGHLY DEVELOPED
Undergraduate Student Learning – within academic majors/programs, including subgroup data over time	Little or no data, findings, or analysis related to student learning by program (i.e. within majors) published. Limited or no subgroup data available. Limited or no data available over time.	Program learning outcomes from many departments published. Some data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of program-level student learning outcomes published, including subgroup data over time, but may be incomplete, difficult to access or understand for internal or external audiences.	All program-level learning outcomes published. Data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of some program learning outcomes published, including some subgroup data over time; chosen for relevance to multiple external audiences. Data available to the public in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	All program-level student learning outcomes published and readily accessible in a systematic manner. Data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of program learning outcomes published for all programs. Subgroup data over time are published. Data widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable and useful to multiple external audiences. Available in multiple venues, easily accessible.
Student Learning—graduate and professional students	Little or no data, findings, or analysis related to student learning for graduate or professional students. Limited or no subgroup data available. Limited or no data available over time.	Program learning outcomes for many graduate and professional programs published. Some data, findings, and analyses about achievement of outcomes within graduate or professional programs published, including subgroup data over time, but may be incomplete, difficult to access or understand for internal or external audiences.	All program learning outcomes for graduate and professional programs published. Data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of most outcomes published including subgroup data over time; chosen for relevance to multiple external audiences. Data available to the public in multiple venues and easily accessible (e.g., various website links).	All graduate and professional program student learning outcomes published and readily accessible in a systematic manner. Data, findings, and analyses re: achievement of all outcomes published, including subgroup data over time. Data widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable and useful to multiple external audiences. Available in multiple venues, easily accessible.

Criteria for Review 1.2

Disclosing Data to External Audiences

Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. ***The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.***

Key Descriptive Terms → ↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION	INITIAL	EMERGING	DEVELOPED	HIGHLY DEVELOPED
Overall: The institution can best be described as:	Isolated examples of transparency and public disclosure of graduation and retention data and data on student achievement. Commitment to be transparent but lack of plan for transparency.	Committed to transparency related to public disclosure of educational objectives and student learning. Some public disclosure of data, but a substantial number of areas require attention and improvement. May not have a systematic plan for transparency.	Clear commitment to transparency related to educational objectives and student learning. Public disclosure plan or system in place, and substantial and relevant data disclosed in useful and accessible ways. A few areas require attention and improvement.	Fully committed to transparency, demonstrated by a strong and well-supported plan for disclosing student achievement data to the public. Data available at the institutional, degree, and program level for all programs. Data include disaggregated retention and graduation rates and evidence of student achievement at all levels and for all programs. Trend data, data over time, and useful contextualization included.

Selected Bibliography

- Agronow, S. J. (2008). Demographic, pre-college and engagement variables that affect UC GPA and student learning outcomes as assessed by UCUES. *A Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) Working Paper*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California. Retrieved October 21, 2009, from <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/events/serusymposium2007/docs/SERU.Agronow%20Demographics.pdf>
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banta, T. W. (2007, January 26). A warning on measuring learning outcomes. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/01/26/banta>
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (2000). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brooks, R. (2005). Measuring university quality. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(1), 1-21.
- Carey, K., & Aldeman, C. (2008) Ready to assemble: A model state higher education accountability system. *Education Sector*. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from http://www.research/research_show.htm?doc_id=751639
- Holland, N., Fink, N., Baur, D. E., Francis, S., & Lenio, J. (2009, June). *Institutional visibility: An examination of publicly available data at higher education institutions*. Paper presented at the 49th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta, GA.
- Keller, C. M., & Hammang, J. M. (2008). The voluntary system of accountability for accountability and institutional assessment. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 39-48.
- Klein, S., Benjamin, R., Bolus, R., & Shavelson, R. (2007). The collegiate learning assessment: Facts and fantasies. *Evaluation Review*, 31(5), 415-439.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE. *Change*, 35(2), 24-32.
- Lattuca, L. R., Terenzini, P. T., & Volkwein, J. F. (2006). *Engineering change: A study of the impact of EC2000*. Baltimore: ABET. Retrieved October 21, 2009 from [http://www.abet.org/ Linked%20Documents-UPDATE/White%20Papers/Engineering%20Change.pdf](http://www.abet.org/Linked%20Documents-UPDATE/White%20Papers/Engineering%20Change.pdf)
- McPherson, P., & Shulenberger, D. (2006). *Improving student learning in higher education through better accountability and assessment: A discussion paper for the National*

Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). Retrieved MONTH DAY, YEAR, from http://www.voluntarysystem.org/docs/background/DiscussionPaper1_April06.pdf

National Postsecondary Education Cooperative. (2009) *Information Required to Be Disclosed Under the Higher Education Act of 1965: Suggestions for Dissemination*. Washington, DC.

Nerad, M., & Cerny, J. (2000). Improving doctoral education: Recommendations from the PhDs – Ten years later study. *Council of Graduate Schools Communicator*, 33(6).

Pike, G. R. (1999). The constant error of the halo in educational outcomes research. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(1), 61-86.

Ruben, B., Lewis, L., & Sandmeyer, L. (2008). *Assessing the impact of the Spellings Commission: The message, the messenger, and the dynamics of change in higher education*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Shulenburg, D., Mehaffy, G., & Keller, C. (2008). The voluntary system of accountability: Responding to new era. *Liberal Education*, 94, 4.

U.S. Department of Education, Commission on the Future of Higher Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Washington, DC.