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Introduction

On November 25, 2014 the Pacific Northwest Learning Consortium (PNLC) convened a symposium at Pacific Lutheran University with representatives from 17 higher education institutions located across the Pacific Northwest.

The symposium was attended by a small number of institutions in the region and in no way is intended to be representative of the diversity of ideas the majority of institutions might promote across the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. Rather, our goal is to engage in a conversation among colleagues and to do so in a manner that supports our institutions and uplifts the direction and goals of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

Three goals were spelled out for the day:

- Learn through exchange of information regarding experiences in accreditation
- Gain insight on campus strategies in assessment and accreditation
- Document the conversation for future reflection and learning

The agenda attached at the end of the document was used only to guide conversation. The dialogue was open ended in nature, giving opportunities for individuals to ask questions and pursue lines of inquiry of interest to the participants.

In the morning each individual was given an opportunity to introduce themselves and discuss issues of interest about accreditation and student learning. This resulted in conversations among the participants that took many different tangents.

The afternoon was comprised of two parts. First, small group discussions were conducted at tables for select questions. After the small group discussions, the full group engaged in a dialogue on each question. Listed below are the prompts selected by symposium participants:

- How are institutions dealing with using core theme indicators to ensure they are meaningful and lead to improvement? What strategies are being used to avoid creation of numerous indicators that may trivialize the true goal or be simply easy to measure and not reflective of the educational goals desired?

- What process are institutions using to develop indicators? Is it working? Why or why not?

Following these discussions, the rubric for assessing student learning outcomes provided by the NWCCU at the Mid-Cycle Evaluation training in September of 2014 (see appendix) was discussed. Each group was asked to discuss a section of the rubric, and modify if desired on poster paper and place on the wall. Groups then cycled through each and made further modifications to the original ideas.
As clarity and consensus was reached during the conversations the group defined together the insight(s) that captured the conversation on a particular topic. The major conclusions and insights are provided in the remainder of this document.

The following individuals attended the symposium listed alphabetically, by institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diehl</td>
<td>Shanda</td>
<td>Clark College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Alec</td>
<td>Everett Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Everett Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohall</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>George Fox University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requa</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Green River Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Green River Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixon</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>North Seattle College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bautsch</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>North Seattle College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veazey</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schleeter</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamada</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson</td>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Renton Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knous Westfall</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Renton Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdeep</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Saint Martin's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Saint Martin's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Seattle Pacific University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maring</td>
<td>Bayta</td>
<td>Shoreline Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulton</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>The College of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaman</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Warner Pacific College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Warner Pacific College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaelis</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Whitworth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulin</td>
<td>Wilma</td>
<td>Yakima Valley Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **What is the optimal blending of strategic plans, core themes and other initiatives?** As a member of an evaluation team, how might one examine the extent to which such activities are aligned or structured in a manner beneficial (or not) to the institution?

The connection between core themes, strategic planning and other leadership initiatives can sometimes create confusion. Some institutions have aligned core themes with strategic planning while others have written core themes in a manner that do not lend themselves to alignment with strategic plans. Core themes sometimes describe the character of an institution (leadership, reason, faith) and at other times are constructed in ways that relate to the functions of the enterprise (scholarship, educational excellence) and usually a bit of both.

Strategic plans often represent aspirational goals of an institution. An institution might be involved in fundraising for a capital campaign and reach out to alumni to support the construction of a new building. The fundraising and the construction of a building are operational in nature and not necessarily tied to the activity that will eventually occur in the building. It is the learning and activities in the building, once constructed, that supports a core theme. Similar incongruities spring up that involve grants, initiatives and special programs. It is difficult at times for institutions to relate the important work on the ground level into the global core theme lexicon.

Are core themes to be a mirror of what the institution is and strategic plans a picture of where the institution aspires to be (operations, market position)? A difficulty discussed was that when there is alignment there may be a desire to manipulate some of the indicators as strategic plans sometimes serve a purpose different from the continuous improvement goal of core themes. Participants desired more clarity on how core themes and strategic plans should relate to each other.

**Summary of Conversation:**

*Further clarity with respect to the desired connection or intended lack of connection between strategic plans, core themes and other campus initiatives is desired. If alignment is the optimal configuration, operational activities might fit into core themes if they are permitted to be presented as a narrative describing how the activity will, in the end, result in a core theme outcome. In other words, the fundraising activity, construction contracts and procurement of materials are not core theme indicators but a narrative describing how such activities lead to learning (a core theme) might be appropriate. A numeric indicator for achievement seems ill-placed in such a circumstance.*
2. How can institutions prepare for/ better understand the focus to student learning outcomes?

PNLC participants expressed appreciation for the steps NWCCU has made in creating a formative Mid-Cycle Evaluation in which the purpose of the visit models the continuous improvement methodology being asked of institutions. It is clear accreditation has shifted from the old method of inputs to a description of mission fulfillment and student learning outcomes.

The Mid-Cycle Evaluation is asking institutions to provide two examples of how it has “operationalized its mission and core themes progressing from objectives to indicators to outcomes to mission fulfillment.” Some institutions experienced visits that surprised them somewhat and gave a sense that accreditation is exclusively about student learning. Given the shift and the high stakes nature of accreditation, institutions have some concern about how they will be evaluated in the future.

Some institutions prepared for the Mid-Cycle Evaluation by providing the two examples of student learning but were evaluated much more broadly. In other cases, some institutions were prepared for a broader discussion about core themes, objectives and mission fulfillment and were surprised by the focus on student learning as opposed to student outcomes. Questions posed during the discussion included:

Is the exercise to demonstrate simply two examples or should institutions be prepared to demonstrate how all outcomes are being properly examined and connected to learning outcomes?

Can the exercise be about student outcomes (employment, transfer) or specifically student learning – and is it only about the student learning in the two examples or overall? (Such confusion may be a fundamental difference between how 4 year private institutions and 2 year community colleges prioritize their mission).

If the Mid-Cycle Evaluation is intended to be judging student learning broadly, what is the point of providing only two examples and how can institutions best prepare? If the evaluation is to be more holistic, a more comprehensive curriculum map would provide such connection but would lack the narrative without a great deal of further preparation.

Summary of Conversation:

Participants applaud the student learning focus of accreditation while equally stressing the formative nature of such a task. PNLC participants appreciate the Mid-Cycle Evaluation direction but given its novelty, there was some confusion on expectations. If student learning outcome achievement is to be a determining factor in achievement of mission fulfillment, and therefore accreditation status, we are concerned the continuous improvement, formative nature of authentic improvement in teaching and learning may not be operationalized as it should. We believe the processes for ensuring assessment of learning is the important feature to be evaluated. Student learning is about what we know and what we are doing about it; not a simplified criterion of achievement.
3. Can indicators and the criteria for achievement change from one review to the next? One year to the next?

There is uncertainty about the ability to change objectives, indicators and thresholds of achievement. In one sense, using a continuous improvement mind set, one can rationalize the need for indicators and thresholds to change often as they are a target based on current goals and conditions that may shift with changing internal and external circumstances. Some institutions view the objectives and indicators as quite solid and unchangeable as they are the target for mission fulfillment. For example, an institution desires a higher rate of retention but in a given cohort, a larger number of students leave the institution than expected and for very good reasons (family, medical, personal). If the institution understands the reasons and can articulate them, can the threshold be changed? If so, and this is reasonable, it makes the notion of mission fulfillment somewhat ineffable.

Given the high stakes nature perceived of accreditation by institutions, the current demand for meeting mission fulfillment is somewhat of a paradox. However, if the model for accreditation is continuous improvement there is a great sensibility to the approach.

Summary of Conversation:

We believe it is important to not simply allow, but to applaud institutions that modify their objectives, indicators and thresholds as needed to meet internal and external demands. While such a stand would make clear the goal of continuous improvement, it also creates confusion for institutions trying to achieve a pre-determined threshold of performance. We believe the focus of accreditation is continuous improvement, not the achievement of a prior aspiration that may no longer be applicable.
4. There appears a disconnect, at times, between what an institution believes it needs to do to prepare for accreditation visit compared to how an evaluation is conducted.

PNLC participants do not pretend this is a simple matter or that there is any particular process or regulation to blame. Given the formative nature of improvement (both for our institutions and the accreditation process itself) perhaps this “disconnect” is a natural part of the landscape and is of value in that it identifies areas in need of understanding and communication.

In our exercise we find two particular areas of most interest. First, the shift to student learning assessment processes in the Mid-Cycle Evaluation as described in #3 above. Second, the different evaluations an institution experiences from one evaluation team to the next. Given the human and subjective nature of accreditation, it seems vital that intensive and continuing collaborative conversation and dialogue be facilitated to enhance understanding of the standards and the criteria used in evaluations. This should include both evaluators and the staff and faculty involved in creating accreditation reports.

Summary of Conversation:

Convene regular and more frequent opportunities for institutions to discuss interpretations and implementation of standards. We believe such a dialogue would improve the quality and effectiveness internally of the accreditation process.
5. How much of an accreditation report can be guided by indirect measures?

PNLC participants recognize this is an unanswerable question. However, the variation in responses to the value of indirect measures indicates some understanding is needed. Robust research shows indirect student evidence through self-report data is an excellent source of formative information to guide improvement in student engagement. In addition, research shows student self-report satisfaction with their learning experience predicts student learning. Given these facts, indirect evidence of student engagement is a critical component in formative assessment that can guide continuous improvement.

While quantifiable benchmarks (such as the proportion of indicators that are indirect) are unlikely to assist in such an endeavor, we believe an understanding of the appropriate and beneficial use of indirect indicators would be beneficial. We view evaluator training as a priority to ensure there is a consistent treatment regarding the importance of indirect student evidence to guide improvement.

Summary of Conversation:

Discuss appropriate and meaningful use of indirect measures – when it is beneficial and why, how to use such information for continuous improvement and the process to make such an exercise useful. Research shows campuses have a great deal of data, much of which is not used to improve the institution. Helping institutions utilize important self-report student data would greatly benefit improvement in learning and should not be discounted because it is indirect evidence.
6. “Mission Fulfillment” is laudable yet creates dissonance

A vigorous discussion was held regarding mission fulfillment. Some institutions fear losing accreditation status based on comments from evaluation teams. Participants steeped in experience with NWCCU accreditation made it clear that losing accreditation status is a long process and that the purpose of a recommendation is to promulgate change, not shut down institutions.

The perceived high stakes nature of accreditation and the wording of mission fulfillment mix into a volatile brew of fear and concern for many, particularly those uninitiated into the ways of accreditation. PNLC participants recognize the external pressures on higher education to meet public demands that may be poorly understood inside an institution but we also believe the wording of mission fulfillment may be causing more problems than it is solving. Mission fulfillment appears as a high stakes and quantifiable line in the sand; a perception that is not actualized in the evaluation process.

In reality, institutions are asked to demonstrate they are utilizing information in sensible and responsible ways to inform progress toward goals of learning and institutional effectiveness.

Summary of Conversation:

“Mission Fulfillment” might be modified to something similar to the list below:

- Advancing Mission
- Progress Towards Mission Fulfillment
- Advancing Mission Fulfillment

These suggestions appear more fitting to how PNLC participants are effectively operationalizing the concept of mission fulfillment. It seems that if an institution is not meeting the goal of Advancing Mission it would be reasonable to give opportunities to improve and return to a continuous improvement process. This is the current process. On the other hand, if an institution is not fulfilling its mission, it seems it should not be accredited. Semantics perhaps but it gives a high-stakes sense to the process that is not actualized in the process.
7. The cycle of Evaluation visits

PNLC participants appreciate the formative nature of the Mid-Cycle Evaluation and see it as a positive step in aligning the accreditation process with the goals of accreditation. At present, institutions are required to submit a Year 1 report, go through a 3rd year Mid-Cycle Evaluation and then have a final Year 7 report and visit. This is followed immediately by a Year 1 submission the following term.

We believe the Year 1 report is not as useful as it might otherwise be and under the current process is a reporting and compliance exercise as there is not time for an institution to digest the Year 7 recommendations and submit a meaningful report in less than a year.

Summary of Conversation:

PNLC participants felt strongly that a more useful and meaningful process would result from a reporting structure similar to the following:

Year 2 – The current Year 1 Report
Year 4 – Mid-Cycle Evaluation
Year 7 – Year 7 Report
8. Length and Content of Reporting

Institutions that have been in existence for many years have procedures in place to operate in a legitimate fashion. Responding to each of the standards, particularly in Chapter 2, while rigorous, is a lengthy task that does not often lead to innovative change. Including the basic institutional data form and eligibility requirements seems an unnecessary exercise. Such submissions are descriptions. Accreditation is more appropriately an analysis of conditions and information.

Summary of Conversation:

- Eliminate basic institutional data information and eligibility requirements. Create a standardized data format, similar to IPEDS, for institutions to submit data and separate this reporting process from continuous improvement accreditation.

- Eliminate or reduce need to respond to every standard (Chapter 2) for institutions in good standing.

- Limit total pages permitted in report – brevity requires more thought than verbosity
  - Limit Year 7 report length to 20 pages per core theme or some set number
  - Set limits on sections in Chapter 4

- Have institutions assess performance at the level of the objectives rather than indicators.
9. Create alternative reaffirmation process guided by institutional change projects

Other regional accreditors (SACS, HLC for example) have created alternative accreditation processes in which institutions engage in an institutional improvement project. This method is aligned with the intent of continuous improvement and use of data to demonstrate success.

For institutions applying for initial accreditation, it seems reasonable to respond to all of the standards and perhaps these institutions would go through the existing process. For institutions with a long record of being in good standing, there could be a separate reporting process to collect information to verify compliance with many of the standards. With such a process in place, these institutions (the vast majority) are instead reaffirmed by engaging in meaningful change leading to enhanced student learning.

Such plans might go through initial approval with justified, clearly articulated and measurable outcomes based on existing data and an explanation of why the plan is aligned with institutional mission and goals. An institutional improvement process would require investment in time and resources leading to meaningful change at each institution and not be done in administrative isolation. It is more aligned with how our institutions already operate and is consistent with the direction of the revised standards. Constraints might be placed on such efforts – for example, an institution can only do the change process once before going through a standard Year 7 process the following cycle.

An additional value of this approach is the inter-institutional learning that results. Evaluation teams analyze a variety of changes and innovative approaches being implemented and take those lessons learned back to their own campuses. These efforts are publicized at innovative change conferences in which NWCCU institutions can learn from other’s efforts modeling the values we espouse as institutions of higher learning.

*Summary of Conversation:*

Discuss the possibility of an alternative reaffirmation process in which institutions select a meaningful change initiative aligned with the needs of the campus. The change initiative is deep in nature but not necessarily broad in scope. In this manner it is actionable and not detached from the core academic enterprise where there is no ownership or clear accountability. Each initiative contains clear and measurable outcomes related to student learning/outcomes and has existing data to support the rationale for the effort (perhaps the initiative must be related to high impact practices as described by NILOA). In addition, required institutional time and resources are clearly identified. An evaluation team initially approves the plan and later analyzes the results that would lead to reaffirmation. Over time NWCCU would have a bounty of best practice examples to show how quality continuous improvement is implemented. Such a process could inform authentic institutional change and train people who migrate in and out of positions across institutions over time.
10. Student Learning Outcomes Rubric – Standardizing Flexibility & Reducing Ambiguity

Participants spent the final hour of the symposium in small group discussions reviewing the Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress rubric provided by NWCCU at the September Mid-Cycle Evaluation training. Each group was assigned one of the categories in the rubric to discuss and modify if desired. The results were placed on poster paper and groups rotated from one to the next to discuss.

Given the complexity and important nature of this evaluation tool, it was clear there was not sufficient time to thoroughly review all the categories. As a result, the altered rubric is not suggested as a final work product that necessarily improves the current version, but rather, one that expresses some of the thinking of the participants at the time. We are hopeful there will be future opportunities to more rigorously discuss this document as we believe it to be a cornerstone to “standardizing flexibility while reducing ambiguity.”

PNLC participants applaud the direction of the commission in providing flexibility for institutions to define for themselves what they consider to be success in the context of their mission. It is refreshing for an accrediting body to be so aware of the intricacies of higher education. At the same time, there is frustration inside institutions with the frequent recommendations given regarding the lack student learning outcomes processes and evidence in evaluation visits. PNLC participants see improvement in this category to be two-fold.

First, institutions must create cultures that meaningfully use student evidence of defined learning objectives across the curriculum and co-curriculum in consistent and well communicated ways to enhance student learning towards espoused missions. While never a destination and always a pursuit, the attainment of a highly developed culture of assessment is something the commission is justifiably and correctly persuading institutions to take seriously. PNLC participants express a great deal of appreciation for the flexibility the commission has given institutions in the region. At the same time, flexibility has, at times, led to ambiguity in expectations; a tenuous balancing act to be sure. Institutions are a bit schizophrenic given the horizontal governing authority structures in place; we desire flexibility but then despair at not understanding the target. This is the issue for institutions to grapple with.

Second, with the large number of recommendations given to institutions in the region regarding student outcomes assessment, additional guidance describing a culture of assessment appears warranted. What does this look like? What process should be in place to predict successful implementation? Such guidance and description may appear to fly in the face of institutional autonomy but we believe specifications on the target for learning outcomes must be more concrete. The rubric is an excellent first step in achieving this difficult balancing act and we are hopeful further dialogue will occur in which the rubric is thoughtfully revised and implemented across the region.

The two processes above, while highly iterative in nature can lead to the most beneficial process of all; a conversation among institutions about how to create such a culture. Without a target the conversation of “how to do it” is somewhat erratic. How do institutions with varying external and internal pressures and historical governance structures navigate this terrain? What are institutions doing that seems to
move the needle amidst the existing political, financial and governing fray of the higher education environment?

This is a long and on-going national conversation; one that can be better informed through regional dialogue among colleagues – faculty, staff and the leadership of institutions and the commission. Left to the faculty, learning outcomes processes can become highly individual to institutions and lose meaning outside the campus walls. Left to administrators, the process becomes a reporting and compliance exercise that does not cut to the heart of an institutional mission. Left to institutional leadership, the process becomes a performance metric. Left to the accrediting body it becomes big brother.

Instead, PNLC is hopeful there will be a process in which institutions can gather to discuss strategies employed and lessons learned; lessons about student learning, assessment rubrics, shared governance, leadership and accreditation standards and guidelines.

One part of the discussion described the difficulty in finding a sweet spot for assessment. At one extreme a goal is seemingly too broad and vague to assess. At the other, the goal becomes narrowed to such a specific outcome as to trivialize the goal. Finding that middle ground that truly speaks to the hearts and minds of the faculty and the core of the mission is difficult work. A possible framework at the level of accreditation might be from Trudy Banta, one of the most respected assessment leaders in the country. In her book *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (2002), she outlines the characteristics of effective outcomes assessment cultures.

Planning

1. Involves stakeholders to incorporate needs and interests and solicit later support
2. Begins where the need is recognized; allows sufficient time for development.
3. Has a written plan with clear purposes that relate to goals people value and to conditions that promote change – assessment is a vehicle for improvement, not an end in itself.
4. Bases assessment approaches on clear, explicitly stated program objectives

Implementation

5. Knowledgeable, effective leadership.
6. Acknowledges assessment is essential to learning and is everyone’s responsibility.
7. Includes faculty and staff development to prepare individuals to assess and use findings.
8. Devolves responsibility to the unit level.
9. Recognizes learning is multidimensional; thus uses multiple measures, maximizing reliability and validity.
10. Assesses processes in addition to outcomes.
11. Occurs in an environment that is receptive, supportive and enabling on a continuous basis.
12. Incorporates continuous communication with constituents about activities and findings to guide continuing improvement.
Improving and Sustaining

13. Produces credible evidence of learning and organizational effectiveness
14. Ensures assessment data are used continuously to improve programs and services
15. Provides a vehicle for demonstrating accountability to stakeholders inside and outside the institution.
16. Has an expectation that outcomes assessment will be ongoing, not episodic.
17. Incorporates ongoing evaluation and improvement of the assessment process itself.

These are concepts that might assist in providing a framework at the appropriate level of analysis to make an accreditation evaluation visit meaningful, purposeful, directed and understood.

Below we provide two modified versions of the outcomes assessment rubric we hope will be useful in future conversation.

Summary of Conversation:

Regularly convene institutions in a dialogue about quality student learning outcomes processes and achievements in alignment with accreditation standards. It is through an iterative conversation that institutions can continually learn from each other and improve student learning and outcomes processes. In addition, it is a way for accreditation guidelines and standards to align with institutional practices while modeling the very nature of continuous improvement at all levels of higher education in the region.
**Rubric for Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress**

*NWCCU rubric modified at PNLC Accreditation Symposium – November 25, 2014*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Planning</td>
<td>No documented plan</td>
<td>Episodic planning in some courses and programs</td>
<td>Clear multi-year plan</td>
<td>Clear multi-year plan with several years of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessable Outcomes</td>
<td>Non-specific outcomes and or not assessable.</td>
<td>Some outcomes indicate how students demonstrate learning</td>
<td>Most outcomes describe how students demonstrate learning</td>
<td>All outcomes describe how students demonstrate learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Implementation</td>
<td>Assessment data is not collected</td>
<td>Evidence collected for some programs. Faculty / staff use criteria for reviewing.</td>
<td>Evidence is collected and faculty / staff use relevant criteria for most programs</td>
<td>Evidence is collected from multiple data sources and over time from all programs Faculty / staff use and discuss criteria regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>No clear relationship between outcomes, curriculum, grading or support services</td>
<td>Some alignment between outcomes, curriculum, grading or support services</td>
<td>Significant alignment between outcomes, curriculum, grading and support services</td>
<td>Outcomes, curriculum, grading and support services are fully aligned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Results**</td>
<td>Little to no evidence that measures are valid</td>
<td>Majority of measures are valid</td>
<td>Valid measures in regular use</td>
<td>Multi-year use of valid measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Results**</td>
<td>No process to check for inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Faculty preparing inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Faculty check for inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Multi-year use of process and evidence of good inter-rater reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</td>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td>Irregular and inconsistent feedback or limited extent of communication across unit.</td>
<td>Regular but inconsistent feedback is communicated across unit</td>
<td>Regular and consistent feedback is communicated to unit with institutional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are Used</td>
<td>Results for outcomes are not collected</td>
<td>Results for outcomes are collected with little or no discussion.</td>
<td>Results for outcomes are collected and discussed but not always used.</td>
<td>Results for outcomes are collected, discussed, and used to analyze effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td>Outcomes not integrated into planning and budget</td>
<td>Alignment of outcomes and planning and budget occurs informally</td>
<td>Process for alignment in place but mixed evidence of use</td>
<td>Consistent evidence of a systematic and intentional process to align.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These categories were not discussed at the symposium.
Accreditation Symposium
Nov. 25, 2014
9am – 4 pm

Goals:
- Learn through exchange of information regarding experiences in accreditation
- Gain insight on campus strategies in assessment and accreditation
- Document the conversation for future reflection and learning

8 AM  Light Buffet & Coffee

9 AM  Mid-Cycle Evaluation Planning & Experiences
Year 7 Planning & Experiences

12:30 PM  Lunch

1:15 PM  Prompts for Dialogue:
- What are the most beneficial aspects of accreditation (preparation and visits)?
- What accreditation processes could use improvement? Why and how?
- How do we know student learning is occurring at our campus?
- Might the Accreditation Logic Model be modified? Why?
- Are the “necessary institutional conditions” a helpful framework for Mid Cycle Evaluation?
- Is the Rubric for evaluation of outcomes assessment plans useful? How would you suggest it be used / modified for use internally and by evaluation teams?

4 PM  Adjourn