



THE STATE UNIVERSITY of NEW YORK

MEMORANDUM

March 23, 2010

Office of the
Chancellor

State University Plaza
Albany, New York
12246

518 443 5355
fax - 518 443 5360

www.suny.edu

To: Members of the Board of Trustees

From: Nancy L. Zimpher, Chancellor

Subject: Streamlining of the State University Board of Trustees Policy on Assessment

I recommend that the Board of Trustees adopt the following resolution:

Whereas the State University of New York is committed to core values of broad-based access and opportunity and to the highest standards of academic excellence; and

Whereas the State University of New York and its campuses have been at the forefront of assessment and quality assurance for over three decades, and have been a national model of best practice; and

Whereas, in addition to meeting the assessment standards of the State University of New York, the University's campuses must meet the assessment standards of regional and programmatic accreditation; and

Whereas the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and programmatic accrediting bodies have significantly increased the rigor of their assessment standards in recent years in response to federal policy; and

Whereas, in response to the Board of Trustees' Re-engineering SUNY Initiative and requests from the Academic Affairs Committee for streamlining of the University's assessment policies and procedures to remove unnecessary duplication, the Provost's Advisory Group on the SUNY Assessment Initiative made recommendations that would achieve that goal while maintaining high standards of academic excellence and enabling campuses to meet or exceed rigorous regional and programmatic accreditation standards; now therefore, be it

Resolved that Trustees' Resolution 2004-92, adopted on June 22, 2004, be and hereby is, rescinded and, be it further

Resolved that effective in academic year 2010-11, each State University of New York campus shall enhance quality by developing and implementing plans for the regular assessment and review of institutional effectiveness, academic programs and general education, such that the campus meets or exceeds the assessment standards set by section 52.1(b)(3) of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (8 NYCRR §52.1[b][3]), the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and, as appropriate, programmatic accreditation bodies; and be it further

Resolved that in keeping with University policy, the regular review of registered academic programs by the campuses shall include, at minimum, the assessment of student learning and external review, to the extent necessary and appropriate, and the regular review of general education shall include the assessment of student learning in terms of the student learning outcomes of the SUNY General Education Requirement as established by this Board on January 19, 2010 in Trustees' Resolution 2010-006; and be it further

Resolved that in accordance with Section 6306(2) of the State Education Law, the State University Board of Trustees urges the boards of trustees of the community colleges operating under the program of the State University to adopt this policy; and be it further

Resolved that the Provost of the State University of New York shall review the findings of regional and programmatic accreditation bodies related to assessment on State University of New York campuses, and shall assist campuses when needed; and be it further

Resolved that the Provost of the State University shall work with leadership, faculty and others on the State University of New York's campuses to implement this resolution, shall provide the resources necessary to ensure regular consultation and assistance, including the formation of an assessment advisory group in consultation with faculty governance, and shall report periodically to the Board of Trustees of any additional steps that may need to be taken to insure the smooth implementation of this resolution in a fashion that enhances quality at the State University.

Background

This resolution updates the University's policy on assessment by acknowledging and affirming the University's strong, longstanding commitment to assessment for enhancing academic and other excellence. Recognizing the gains made and the evolving external standards in the area of assessment, this resolution rescinds the previous assessment approach and now permits each campus to develop assessment plans that are consistent with its mission and goals within the context of the State University's mission and goals, while maintaining academic rigor and meeting or exceeding external standards for assessment required by federal and state law.

Further, the resolution:

- removes overlapping and unnecessarily duplicative assessment requirements for campuses; and
- maintains a leadership and quality assurance role for the University Provost within the context of external expectations.

The resolution refers to section 51.21(b)(3) of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, which states that every registered academic program shall "*...show evidence of careful planning. Institutional goals and the objectives of each curriculum and of all courses shall be clearly defined in writing, and a reviewing system shall be devised to estimate the success of students and faculty in achieving such goals and objectives...*"

The resolution also refers to regional and programmatic accreditation bodies, which must meet national standards set by the U.S. Secretary of Education, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), or both.

- The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is recognized by both the U.S. Secretary of Education and CHEA. As shown in Attachment A, its Standard 7 requires assessment of institutional effectiveness and its Standard 14 requires assessment of student learning. To meet these rigorous standards, institutions must present evidence of comprehensive assessment plans, procedures and results, and show how results are used to inform improvement, planning and resource allocation.
- As shown in Attachment B, more than fifty programmatic accrediting bodies are recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education or CHEA, or both. They focus on specific disciplines or professional areas, and have rigorous requirements related to the assessment of student learning and other outcomes. As of fall 2009, every campus within the State University of New York had at least one program with programmatic accreditation, and

many campuses had dozens of such programs. All programs leading to New York State certification or licensure—in such fields as architecture, education, engineering and the health professions— must have programmatic accreditation. Many other programs—in such fields as the arts, business, forestry and public administration—voluntarily obtain accreditation as an emblem of quality. Even programs without programmatic accreditation can be influenced by the standards set by these accreditation bodies.

The resolution reflects a national consensus on how public university governing boards should promote assessment to enhance quality, as expressed in an October 2009 report issued by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes. The report recommends the following.

“Statewide planning and coordinating boards must confirm that all institutions under their scope of influence have effective internal systems of academic quality control supported by assessment data that conform to the expectations of both regional and specialized accreditation bodies. Use language that removes the specter of threat from assessment work. Offer incentives for campuses to develop and share sound practices of outcomes assessment.”

To implement this resolution, the University Provost will issue guidance for campuses and consult with campus leaders and faculty to identify promising ways to support campus assessment efforts. The Provost will maintain an assessment budget to encourage a variety of rigorous assessment approaches, although the Provost will no longer provide campuses with formula funding for assessment or pay for campuses to use national examinations and surveys. Depending on need, the Provost’s support for assessment on campuses might include coordination of consultant and mentor services, webinars, conferences, study groups, excellence recognition awards or other approaches.

Attachment

Attachment A Middle States Standards 7 and 14

Standard 7

Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Context

Assessment may be characterized as the third element of a four-step planning-assessment cycle:

1. Developing clearly articulated written statements, expressed in observable terms, of key institutional and unit-level goals that are based on the involvement of the institutional community, as discussed under Standard 1 (Mission and Goals);
2. Designing intentional objectives or strategies to achieve those goals, as discussed under Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal);
3. Assessing achievement of those key goals; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve programs and services, as discussed under Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), with appropriate links to the institution's ongoing planning and resource allocation processes.

The effectiveness of an institution rests upon the contribution that each of the institution's programs and services makes toward achieving the goals of the institution as a whole. This standard on institutional assessment thus builds upon all other accreditation standards, each of which includes periodic assessment of effectiveness as one of its fundamental elements. This standard ties together those assessments into an integrated whole to answer the question, "As an institutional community, how well are we collectively doing what we say we are doing?" and, in particular, "How do we support student learning, a fundamental aspect of institutional effectiveness?" Because student learning is a fundamental component of the mission of most institutions of higher education, the assessment of student learning is an essential component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness and is the focus of Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). Self-studies can thus document compliance with Standard 7 by summarizing the assessments of each accreditation standard into conclusions about the institution's overall achievement of its key goals.

The fundamental question asked in the accreditation process is, "Is the institution fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals?" This is precisely the question that assessment is designed to answer, making assessment essential to the accreditation process. Assessment processes help to ensure the following:

- Institutional and program-level goals are clear to the public, students, faculty, and staff;
- Institutional programs and resources are organized and coordinated to achieve institutional and program-level goals;
- The institution is indeed achieving its mission and goals; and
- The institution is using assessment results to improve student learning and otherwise advance the institution.

While the Commission expects institutions to assess institutional effectiveness, it does not prescribe a specific approach or methodology. The institution is responsible for determining its expected goals and the objectives or strategies for achieving them at each level (institutional and unit), assessment approaches and methodologies, sequence, and time frame. These may vary, based on the mission, goals, organization, and resources of the institution. Whatever the approach, effective assessment processes are useful, cost-effective, reasonably accurate and truthful, carefully planned, and organized, systematic, and sustained.

Useful assessment processes help faculty and staff make appropriate decisions about improving programs and services, developing goals and plans, and making resource allocations. To assist with interpretation and use of assessment results, assessment measures and indicators have defined minimally acceptable performance targets. Because institutions, their students, and their environments are continually evolving, effective assessments cannot be static; they must be reviewed periodically and adapted in order to remain useful.

Cost-effective assessment processes yield dividends that justify the institution's investment in them, particularly in terms of faculty and staff time. To this end, institutions may begin by considering assessment measures, indicators, "flags," and "scorecards" already in place, such as retention, graduation, transfer, and placement rates, financial ratios, and surveys. New or refined measures may then be added for those goals and objectives for which evidence of achievement is not already available, concentrating on the institution's most important goals. Effective assessments are simple rather than elaborate and may focus on just a few key goals in each program, unit, and curriculum.

Reasonably-accurate and truthful assessment processes yield results that can be used with confidence to make appropriate decisions. Because there is no one perfectly accurate assessment tool or strategy, institutions should use multiple kinds of measures to assess goal achievement. Assessments may be quantitative and/or qualitative and developed locally or by an external organization. All assessment tools and strategies should clearly relate to the goals they are assessing and should be developed with care; they should not be merely anecdotal information nor collections of information that happen to be on hand. Strategies to assess student learning should include direct—clear, visible, and convincing—evidence, rather than solely indirect evidence of student learning such as surveys and focus groups.

Planned assessment processes that purposefully correspond to institutional goals that they are intended to assess promote attention to those goals and ensure that disappointing outcomes are appropriately addressed. Institutions often have a variety of plans, such as a strategic plan, academic plan, financial plan, enrollment plan, capital facilities master plan, and technology plan. Just as such plans should be interrelated to ensure that they work synergistically to advance the institution, assessments should also be interrelated. At many institutions, effective institutional planning begins with academic planning, which in turn drives the other plans. If the academic plan calls for a new academic program, for example, the technology plan should ensure faculty and students in the new program will be able to use appropriate instructional technologies. Assessments of the technology plan should evaluate not just whether instructional technologies have been put in place but also how effectively those technologies have helped students to achieve the program's key learning outcomes.

Organized, systematized, and sustained assessment processes are ongoing, not once-and-done. There should be clear interrelationships among institutional goals, program- and unit-level goals, and course-level goals. Assessments should relate clearly to important goals, and improvements should clearly stem from assessment results. As noted earlier, because student learning is a fundamental component of the mission of most institutions of higher education, the assessment of student learning is an essential component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness. An institution may therefore create institutional effectiveness documentation that includes a component on assessing student learning (see Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning), or it may create a bridge between two separate sets of documentation, one for the assessment of student learning and one for other aspects of institutional effectiveness.

A commitment to the assessment of institutional effectiveness requires a parallel commitment to ensuring its use. Assessment information, derived in a manner appropriate to the institution and to its desired outcomes, should be available to and used by those who develop institutional goals and carry out strategies to achieve them. As discussed under Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), an accredited institution uses the results of assessment for institutional renewal: to maintain, support, and improve its programs and services. Assessment information should be used as a basis for assessing the institution's effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, for monitoring and

improving the environment for student learning, and for enhancing overall student success; to these ends, it should be linked to the institution's ongoing planning and resource allocation processes. Assessment results also should be used to evaluate the assessment process itself, leading to modifications that improve its relevance and effectiveness.

Fundamental Elements of Institutional Assessment

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:

- documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services; achievement of institutional mission, goals, and plans; and compliance with accreditation standards that meets the following criteria:
 - a foundation in the institution's mission and clearly articulated institutional, unit-level, and program-level goals that encompass all programs, services, and initiatives and are appropriately integrated with one another (see Standards 1: Mission and Goals and 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal);
 - systematic, sustained, and thorough use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that:
 - maximize the use of existing data and information;
 - clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing;
 - are of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions;
 - support and collaboration of faculty and administration;
 - clear realistic guidelines and a timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources;
 - sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable;
 - periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution's assessment process;
- evidence that assessment results are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal (see Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal) to improve and gain efficiencies in programs, services and processes, including activities specific to the institution's mission (e.g., service, outreach, research); and
- written institutional (strategic) plan(s) that reflect(s) consideration of assessment results.

Institutions and evaluators must consider the totality that is created by the fundamental elements and any other relevant institutional information or analysis. Fundamental elements and contextual statements should not be applied separately as checklists. Where an institution does not possess or demonstrate evidence of a particular Fundamental Element, the institution may demonstrate through alternative information and analysis that it meets the standard.

Optional Analysis and Evidence

In addition to the evidence inherent within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution's own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:

- analysis of the institutional culture for assessing institutional effectiveness, including:
 - the views of faculty and administrators on assessment;
 - faculty and administrators' understanding of their roles in assessing institutional effectiveness;
 - campus-wide efforts to encourage, recognize, and value efforts to assess institutional effectiveness and to improve programs and services;
- analysis of the quality and usefulness of institutional support for assessment efforts, including the quality and usefulness of:
 - written statements of expectations for assessment work;
 - policies and governance structures to support institutional assessment;
 - administrative, technical, and financial support for institutional assessment activities;

- professional development opportunities and resources for faculty and staff to learn how to assess institutional effectiveness and how to use the results;
- clear, appropriate criteria for determining whether key institutional goals and objectives have been achieved;
- analysis of whether the institution has sufficient, convincing, written evidence that it is achieving its mission and its key institutional goals;
- analysis of results of surveys of students and other relevant groups;
- review of evaluations of special, mission driven programs or projects, with recommendations for improvement, and evidence of action based on recommendations;
- evidence that institutional assessment findings are used to:
 - improve student success;
 - review and improve programs and services;
 - plan, conduct, and support professional development activities;
 - assist in planning and budgeting for the provision of programs and services;
 - support decisions about strategic goals, plans, and resource allocation;
 - inform appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs;
- evidence of renewal strategies, made in response to assessment results [included also under Standard 2 Optional Analyses]; or
- analysis of evidence that renewal strategies made in response to assessment results have had the desired effect in improving programs, services, and initiatives.

Standard 14

Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Context

Assessment of student learning may be characterized as the third element of a four-step teaching-learning-assessment cycle:

1. Developing clearly articulated written statements, expressed in observable terms, of key learning outcomes: the knowledge, skills, and competencies that students are expected to exhibit upon successful completion of a course, academic program, co-curricular program, general education requirement, or other specific set of experiences, as discussed under Standard 11 (Educational Offerings);
2. Designing courses, programs, and experiences that provide intentional opportunities for students to achieve those learning outcomes, again as discussed under Standard 11;
3. Assessing student achievement of those key learning outcomes; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve teaching and learning.

This standard on assessment of student learning builds upon Standards 11 (Educational Offerings), 12 (General Education), and 13 (Related Educational Offerings), each of which includes assessment of student learning among its fundamental elements. This standard ties together those assessments into an integrated whole to answer the question, "Are our students learning what we want them to learn?" Self-studies can thus document compliance with Standard 14 by summarizing the assessments of Standards 11 through 13 into conclusions about overall achievement of the institution's key student learning outcomes.

Because student learning is at the heart of the mission of most institutions of higher education, the assessment of student learning is an essential component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness (see Standard 7: Institutional Assessment), which additionally monitors the environment provided for teaching and learning and the achievement of other aspects of the institution's mission, vision, and strategic goals and plans.

The fundamental question asked in the accreditation process is, "Is the institution fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals?" This is precisely the question that assessment is designed to answer, making assessment essential to

the accreditation process. Assessment processes help to ensure the following:

- Institutional and program-level goals are clear to the public, students, faculty, and staff;
- Institutional programs and resources are organized and coordinated to achieve institutional and program level goals;
- The institution is providing academic opportunities of quality;
- The institution is indeed achieving its mission and goals; and
- Assessment results help the institution to improve student learning and otherwise advance the institution.

Assessment is not an event but a process that is an integral part of the life of the institution, and an institution should be able to provide evidence that the assessment of student learning outcomes and use of results is an ongoing institutional activity. While some of the impact of an institution on its students may not be easily or immediately measured—some institutions, for example, aim for students to develop lifelong habits that may not be fully developed for many years—the overall assessment of student learning is expected

whatever the nature of the institution, its mission, the types of programs it offers, or the manner in which its educational programs are delivered and student learning facilitated.

While the Commission expects institutions to assess student learning, it does not prescribe a specific approach or methodology. The institution is responsible for determining its expected learning outcomes and strategies for achieving them at each level (institutional, program, and course), assessment approaches and methodologies, sequence, and time frame. These may vary, based on the mission, goals, organization, and resources of the institution. Whatever the approach, effective assessment processes are useful, cost-effective, reasonably accurate and truthful, carefully planned, and organized, systematic, and sustained.

Useful assessment processes help faculty and staff make appropriate decisions about improving programs and services, developing goals and plans, and making resource allocations. To assist with interpretation and use of assessment results, assessment measures and indicators have defined minimally acceptable performance targets. Because institutions, their students, and their environments are continually evolving, effective assessments cannot be static; they must be reviewed periodically and adapted in order to remain useful.

Cost-effective assessment processes are designed so that their value is in proportion to the time and resources devoted to them. To this end, institutions can begin by considering assessment measures already in place, including direct evidence such as capstone projects, field experience evaluations, and performance on licensure examinations and indirect evidence such as retention and graduation rates and alumni surveys. New or refined measures can then be added for those learning outcomes for which direct evidence of student learning is not already available, concentrating on the most important institutional and program-level learning outcomes. Effective assessments are simple rather than elaborate and may focus on just a few key goals in each program, unit, and curriculum.

Reasonably-accurate and truthful assessment processes yield results that can be used with confidence to make appropriate decisions. Such assessment processes have the following characteristics:

Because there is no one perfectly accurate assessment tool or strategy, institutions should use multiple kinds of measures to assess goal achievement. Assessments may be quantitative and/or qualitative and developed locally or by an external organization.

Assessment tools and strategies should be developed with care; they should not be not merely anecdotal information nor collections of information that happen to be on hand.

Student learning assessment processes should yield direct—clear, visible, and convincing—evidence of student learning. Tangible examples of student learning, such as completed tests, assignments, projects, portfolios, licensure examinations, and field experience evaluations, are direct evidence of student learning. Indirect evidence,

including retention, graduation, and placement rates and surveys of students and alumni, can be vital to understanding the teaching-learning process and student success (or lack thereof), but such information alone

is insufficient evidence of student learning unless accompanied by direct evidence. Grades alone are indirect evidence, as a skeptic might claim, that high grades are solely the result of lax standards. But the assignments and evaluations that form the basis for grades can be direct evidence if they are accompanied by clear evaluation criteria that have a demonstrable relationship to key learning goals.

Planned assessment processes that clearly and purposefully correspond to learning outcomes that they are intended to assess promote attention to those goals and ensure that disappointing outcomes are appropriately addressed.

Organized, systematized, and sustained assessment processes are ongoing, not once-and-done. There should be clear interrelationships among institutional goals, program- and unit-level goals, and course-level goals. Assessments should clearly relate to important goals, and improvements should clearly stem

from assessment results. As noted earlier, because student learning is a fundamental component of the mission of most institutions of higher education, the assessment of student learning is an essential component of the assessment of institutional effectiveness. An institution may therefore create institutional effectiveness documentation that includes a component on assessing student learning (see Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning), or it may create a bridge between two separate sets of documentation, one for the assessment of student learning and one for other aspects of institutional effectiveness. The improvement of overall educational quality and the enhancement of effective teaching and learning is most likely to occur when faculty and administrators work together to implement a sound, institution-wide program of assessment. Because the faculty guide decisions about curriculum and pedagogy, the effective assessment of student learning is similarly guided by the faculty and supported by the administration.

A commitment to assessment of student learning requires a parallel commitment to ensuring its use. Assessment information, derived in a manner appropriate to the institution and its desired academic outcomes, should be available to and used by those who develop and carry out strategies that will improve teaching and learning.

Assessment results should also be used to evaluate the assessment process itself, leading to modifications that improve its relevance and effectiveness.

Fundamental Elements of Assessment of Student Learning

An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities.

- clearly articulated statements of expected student learning outcomes (see Standard 11: Educational Offerings), at all levels (institution, degree/program, course) and for all programs that aim to foster student learning and development, that are:
 - appropriately integrated with one another;
 - consonant with the institution's mission; and
 - consonant with the standards of higher education and of the relevant disciplines;
- a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning that meets the following criteria:
 - systematic, sustained, and thorough use of multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that:
 - maximize the use of existing data and information;
 - clearly and purposefully relate to the goals they are assessing;
 - are of sufficient quality that results can be used with confidence to inform decisions; and
 - include direct evidence of student learning;
 - support and collaboration of faculty and administration;
 - clear, realistic guidelines and timetable, supported by appropriate investment of institutional resources;
 - sufficient simplicity, practicality, detail, and ownership to be sustainable; and
 - periodic evaluation of the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the institution's student learning assessment processes;
 - assessment results that provide sufficient, convincing evidence that students are achieving key institutional and program learning outcomes;
 - evidence that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and is used to improve teaching and learning; and
 - documented use of student learning assessment information as part of institutional assessment.

Institutions and evaluators must consider the totality that is created by the fundamental elements and any other relevant institutional information or analysis. Fundamental elements and contextual statements should not be applied separately as checklists. Where an institution does not possess or demonstrate evidence of a particular Fundamental Element, the institution may demonstrate through alternative information and analysis that it meets the standard.

Optional Analysis and Evidence

In addition to the evidence inherent within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution's own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:

- analysis of institutional support for student learning assessment efforts, including:
 - written statements of expectations for student learning assessment work;
 - policies and governance structures to support student learning assessment;
 - administrative, technical, and financial support for student learning assessment activities and for implementing changes resulting from assessment; and
- professional development opportunities and resources for faculty to learn how to assess student learning, how to improve their curricula, and how to improve their teaching;
- analysis of the clarity and appropriateness of standards for determining whether key learning outcomes have been achieved;
- evidence of workable, regularized, collaborative institutional processes and protocols for ensuring the dissemination, analysis, discussion, and use of assessment results among all relevant constituents within a reasonable schedule;
- analysis of the use of student learning assessment findings to:
 - assist students in improving their learning;
 - improve pedagogies, curricula and instructional activities;

- review and revise academic programs and support services;
- plan, conduct, and support professional development activities;
- assist in planning and budgeting for the provision of academic programs and services;
- support other institutional assessment efforts (see Standard 7: Institutional Assessment) and decisions about strategic goals, plans, and resource allocation; and
- inform appropriate constituents about the institution and its programs;

- analysis of evidence that improvements in teaching, curricula, and support made in response to assessment results have had the desired effect in improving teaching, learning, and the success of other activities;
- analysis of the institutional culture for assessing student learning, including:
 - the views of faculty and institutional leaders on assessment;
 - faculty members' understanding of their roles in assessing student learning;
 - the quality and usefulness of institutional support for student learning assessment efforts;
 - campus-wide efforts to encourage, recognize, and value efforts to assess student learning and to improve curricula and teaching;
 - evidence of collaboration in the development of statements of expected student learning and assessment strategies;
 - evidence that information appropriate to the review of student retention, persistence, and attrition, is used to reflect whether these are consistent with student and institutional expectations [also included in Standard 8 Optional Analyses];
 - evidence of the utilization of attrition information to ascertain characteristics of students who withdraw prior to attaining their educational objectives and, as appropriate, implementation of strategies to improve retention [also included under Optional Analyses in Standard 8];
 - analysis of teaching evaluations, including identification of good practices; or
 - analysis of course, department or school reports on classroom assessment practices and their outcomes, including grading approaches and consistency.

SOURCE:

http://www.msche.org/publications_view.asp?idPublicationType=1&txtPublicationType=Standards+for+Accreditation+and+Requirements+of+Affiliation (January 2009)

Attachment B
**Programmatic Accrediting Agencies Recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education
and/or the Council on Accreditation in Higher Education (CHEA)**

AACSB International–The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc.
Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine
Accreditation Council for Midwifery Education
Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education
Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant, Inc.
Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications
American Academy for Liberal Education
American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education
American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences Council for Accreditation
American Association of Nurse Anesthetists Council on Accreditation of Nurse Anesthesia Educational Programs
American Bar Association Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
American Board of Funeral Service Education Committee on Accreditation
American Council for Construction Education
American Culinary Federation Foundation, Inc. Accrediting Commission
American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation
American Dietetic Association Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education
American Library Association Committee on Accreditation
American Occupational Therapy Association Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
American Optometric Association Accreditation Council on Optometric Education
American Osteopathic Association Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation
American Physical Therapy Association Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education
American Podiatric Medical Association Council on Podiatric Medical Education
American Psychological Association Committee on Accreditation
American Society for Microbiology American College of Microbiology
American Society of Landscape Architects Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
American Veterinary Medical Association Council on Education
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc., Accreditation Commission
Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs
Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering Aviation Accreditation Board International
Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs
Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
Commission on English Language Program Accreditation
Commission on Massage Therapy Accreditation
Commission on Opticianry Accreditation
Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs
Council for Interior Design Accreditation
Council on Chiropractic Education Commission on Accreditation
Council on Education for Public Health
Council on Naturopathic Medical Education
Council on Rehabilitation Education Commission on Standards and Accreditation
Council on Social Work Education Office of Social Work Accreditation and Educational Excellence
Joint Review Committee on Education Programs in Radiologic Technology
Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Nuclear Medicine Technology
Liaison Committee on Medical Education
Midwifery Education Accreditation Council
Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education
National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.
National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women’s Health Council on Accreditation
National Association of Schools of Art and Design Commission on Accreditation
National Association of Schools of Dance Commission on Accreditation
National Association of Schools of Music Commission on Accreditation and Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation

National Association of Schools of Theatre Commission on Accreditation
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
National Environmental Health Science and Protection Accreditation Council
National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, Inc.
National Recreation and Park Association Council on Accreditation
Planning Accreditation Board
Society of American Foresters
Teacher Education Accreditation Council Accreditation Committee

SOURCE: http://www.chea.org/pdf/CHEA_USDE_AllAccred.pdf (December 2009)