

## 4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

### 4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution ensures the quality of its educational offerings.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews and acts upon the findings.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that ensure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It ensures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution ensures that the credentials it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission.

## Argument

### Response to 4.A.1

*The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews and acts upon the findings.*

Program faculty regularly consult with their advisory committees to ensure program learning outcomes remain relevant and aligned with external accrediting bodies and community workforce needs. Changes to PLOs are driven by changes in industry standards, workplace diversity, accreditation or licensure requirements, or as a result of data gathered during program assessment or program review activities. The College's Program Review and planning process discussed in 1P3 also serves to ensure that relevance of Program curricula. (3.B.4)

### Response to 4.A.2

*The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.*

CSCC, in performing its mission to offer high-quality programs, provides opportunities for students to transfer to four-year institutions and prepare for career and technical roles in a variety of fields. The A&S programs, which lead to the transfer-oriented AA and AS, use the ILOs as PLOs designed along the new Guided Pathways model. Guided Pathways is a term for the holistic redesign of a set of community college practices and services in order to help students complete their goals. The intent of guided pathways is to help students choose a clear pathway informed by their career goals, and support them to stay on it to completion. In A&S, Academic Pathways were designed using the ILOs as PLOs for ease in transfer upon earning an AA or AS. These learning outcomes were developed by the GETF (see 1P1).

In AY 2021, the college began a substantial review process for courses that were previously reviewed as OTM/OT 36. These courses are being resubmitted to ODHE to ensure they meet the new statewide learning outcomes for each OT-36 requirement category. The process will continue through AY 2024.

The ILOs/ILGs are maintained and reviewed every four years by the ILG committee, which is a repeated and predictable. Programs in the BET and HHS lead to an AAS, AoTS, or one of many certificates. PLOs are aligned with the College's Mission, external program accreditation and approval standards, and community workforce needs. Program faculty and advisory committee review all PLOs as appropriate. The PLOs in BET and HHS are developed with a focus on skills needed to prepare students for specific careers, but are also aligned with the ILGs. The ILGs/ILOs provide the common outcomes that are interwoven with each program's specific technical skills and knowledge to promote individual student development. (3.E.2)

### **Response to 4.A.3**

*The institution has policies that ensure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.*

Evaluations are conducted on all official transcripts received from regionally accredited colleges and universities, domestic and foreign, after students have applied to CSCC. Transcripts from international colleges or universities must be accompanied by an evaluation from an independent credential evaluation service, such as World Education Services, before credit is awarded. An official report from a credential evaluation company may be required for some students with high school or secondary school education. The College awards credit for prior learning and accepts transfer credit when applicable. Academic Advisors are available to review transferable courses and to assist with other transfer credit questions. Clear and transparent agreements and policies are in place to ensure program requirements are met. Students may receive prior learning credit hours towards their degree through a variety of methods including articulation agreements, advanced placement, Tech Prep, College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), Non-Traditional Credit (N Credit), DSST Credit by Exam, Transferology.com, CCP, Placement Testing, including Accuplacer for English language skills and ALEKS for Math skills, X Credit (Proficiency Credit), and statewide transfer guarantees (OTM, TAG).

#### **Response to 4.A.4**

*The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It ensures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.*

Faculty, with support from OAA leadership, maintain authority over prerequisites, academic rigor, learning expectations, and admissions requirements as described in College Policy 5-01, Academic Council Curriculum Committee Charter, CSEA Agreement, and Faculty Handbook. Lead faculty develop and revise a master course syllabus and outline that defines curriculum, textbooks, resources, participation expectations, and outcomes. This syllabus and outline are used by all faculty teaching the course including, CCP courses delivered in high schools or campus, or distance learning versions of a course. All master course syllabi and outlines are housed in CurricUNET.

The College describes specific admission requirements for all students on the website, and selective admissions programs (primarily in BET and HHS programs) publish requirements in the College Catalog (example: Dental Hygiene AAS Requirements) and on individual program homepages.

Selective admission requirements such as background checks, health requirements, drug testing, etc., are implemented in accordance with professional, program accreditation, and workforce requirements for learning. *(See IP3 for assessment of College readiness).*

The College established minimum faculty credentials in accordance with the HLC guidelines and ODHE criteria. The College requires “Master’s degree in the discipline or appropriate degree, license, and/or certification or credential requirements adopted by the College and in accordance with the ODHE and the College’s accrediting bodies. State Motor Vehicle Operator’s License or demonstrable ability to gain access to work sites(s).” Faculty assigned CCP courses must also meet minimum credential requirements identical to faculty hired to teach other courses.

CSCC uses a variety of tools to assess program rigor across all modalities. One of the primary methods of measuring program rigor concerns how students perform once they are ready to seek employment. Additional measures of program rigor involve student evaluations of instruction as well as peer observations of classroom performance. The multi-measure method of assessing program rigor provides useful data for maintaining teaching standards at the College.

The primary tool to assess program rigor is successful course and program completion based on grading and graduation. Through course, program, department, and College data sources, faculty and administration monitor student success and completion rates. Graduate and employer

surveys are designed and implemented according to Program needs with results reported in Program Reviews.

While there is variety in survey content and implementation, there are often questions regarding preparation, employment, and satisfaction.

After a detailed search for an improved course evaluation measure, Academic Council implemented a new online tool in SP of 2018 called EvaluationKIT. This new instrument was selected through a process led by the Instructional Success Committee in conjunction with Student Support Committee within OAA, and was chosen for its integration with Blackboard and robust method for evaluating teaching and course rigor. EvaluationKIT includes areas related to instructor responsibility, course design, teaching methods, resources, faculty rapport, progress towards goals, and open ended questions for students' specific comments. While specific faculty and course data will not be disseminated beyond the assigned faculty, the tentative plan is to collate areas that may be helpful for the College to develop strategies for student success.

The OAA Instructional Success Committee develops and recommends institutional guidelines to ensure the quality of courses and teaching. For example, in SP 2018, the Committee announced the launch of the new procedure for faculty classroom observations in non-distance learning courses after much research and development. The new process consists of three parts as depicted in [Table 1.18](#).

Faculty receive peer review in seven areas: learning organization and management, knowledge of subject matter, teaching style, fostering critical thinking, Program specific criteria, strengths, and opportunities for development.

Beginning in October 2019, introduced an outcomes based assessment program. Each semester student progress toward ILGs are measured on an on-going basis as described in the Outcomes-Based Assessment handbook. Plans for meeting ILGs and collected data are reported and reviewed at the College, Program and Course level. Distance learning and college credit plus course are included and reported in assessment data. (see pp. 5-6 Outcomes-Based Assessment handbook) Assessment results and student outcomes are scheduled for review on a four year cycle with the next update of ILGs/ILOs began in AY 2023 with updates to the assessment handbook.

The OAA Instructional Success Committee develops and recommends institutional guidelines to ensure the quality of courses and teaching. For example, in SP 2018, the Committee announced the launch of the new procedure for faculty classroom observations in non-distance learning courses after much research and development. The new process consists of three parts as depicted in Table 1.18.

Faculty receive peer review in seven areas: learning organization and management, knowledge of subject matter, teaching style, fostering critical thinking, Program specific criteria, strengths, and opportunities for development.

In 2020, the OAA Instructional Success Committee consulted leading scholar Omid Fotuhi, who is currently Research Associate at the Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC) based at the University of Pittsburgh, and was the Director for Learning and Innovation at WGU Labs. , for

suggestions on improving faculty training offered for the past XX years as the Faculty Idea Exchange (FIX). He advised the committee on coordinating assessments with the ongoing Faculty Idea Exchange annual session. He suggested surveying students on themes they might be struggling with. Suggested coordinating a focus group with students to meet with him and faculty and ISC members while he is on campus. Then tailor a larger scale interest with the broader student community

#### Distance Learning Courses

The College's online course Academic Quality Review (AQR) ensures that the learning experiences and academic rigor in CSCC's online offerings are consistent with College-wide and Departmental quality standards. The AQR is a review of the quality of the course's instructional design, not the individual instructor's performance. The AQR identifies the following criteria under review: course navigation, course content, student to student interaction, student-instructor interaction, student to content interaction, and assessment. Each Academic Department or Program is responsible for performing an AQR on all newly designed online courses as well as continuing to review existing online courses every three years. Additionally, the AQR process often includes the faculty designer of the course during the review. The AQR form is accessed online or on paper. Results of the AQR are discussed with the course designer and may include suggestions for improvement.

#### Dual Credit Courses

Department lead instructors ensure dual credit courses meet the same requirements for rigor and outcomes. Dual credit lead instructors and instructors of record train the High School Facilitator in the use and delivery of course content, textbooks, syllabus, assessments, rubrics, etc. before the semester begins. CSCC faculty observe new High School Facilitators in the classroom at least once during the first semester of delivery of each course they facilitate. Returning High School Facilitators are observed in the classroom at least once per academic year in at least one of the courses they facilitate. Periodically lead faculty review a sampling of assignment grades given to the students by the High School Facilitator and engage in dialogue with the facilitator as needed about any necessary changes. High School Facilitators are asked to make an effort to attend the College Credit Plus Professional Development and Orientation Day, as well as subsequent sessions on professional development, offered by Columbus State and/or the program/department in which they are teaching. High School Facilitators are regularly trained by the Instructor of Record on the use and delivery of course content, textbooks, syllabus, assessments, and rubrics.

#### **Response to 4.A.5**

*The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.*

The College currently supports 30 Programs with specialized external accreditations, certifications, or approvals that are accredited by professional associations and agencies. Maintaining and implementing accreditation statuses are overseen by Chairpersons within each academic unit – and in the case of more specific accreditation statuses required within a specific department – lead faculty are appointed by Chairpersons to ensure accreditation is maintained. The determination of which particular accreditation statuses are maintained is determined by



Chairpersons in conjunction with the corresponding Academic Dean. Support includes allocation of significant personnel and fiscal resources to obtain and maintain accreditations.

Administrative and support staff provide time, expertise, information, and flexibility to accommodate Program accreditation activities. Furthermore, the Assessment FFs work with faculty to synchronize assessment of general education, PLOs, and Program Review with various schedule and workload needs necessary for accreditation.

#### **Response to 4.A.6**

*The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution ensures that the credentials it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission.*

While the College sets the ILGs/ILOs, Departments and Programs set and align Major and Program level goals for degree and certificate programs. Majors and Program assessment processes measure student learning outcomes and these are reported annually on the college-wide Assessment homepage. Faculty, with support and feedback from the Division and Academic Council Assessment Committees, utilize assessment results to plan improvements to curricular design as well as teaching strategies. In addition, students must achieve a minimum grade point average of 2.0 to graduate. The College also collects data on pass rates of graduates on certification and licensure exams to evaluate the success of program graduates.

#### **Sources**

*There are no sources.*

### **4.B - Core Component 4.B**

The institution engages in ongoing assessment of student learning as part of its commitment to the educational outcomes of its students.

1. The institution has effective processes for assessment of student learning and for achievement of learning goals in academic and cocurricular offerings.
2. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
3. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty, instructional and other relevant staff members.

#### **Argument**

##### **Response to 4.B.1**

*The institution has effective processes for assessment of student learning and for achievement of learning goals in academic and cocurricular offerings.*

The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes it claims for all curricular programs and degrees through work completed by students in the classroom or online. Departmental Assessment Committees create their own tools, methods, and instruments of assessment that are relevant to their discipline in order to measure the ILGs/ILOs. This process of selecting instruments is repeated annually and enhances faculty buy-in as well as ensures the relevance and predictability of assessment for student learning. These methods include rubrics, test questions, short writings, and problem sets, among other methods. All methods are identified on the annual assessment reports and are reviewed and discussed by peers on the Departmental, Program, and Division Assessment committees. Based on the feedback from the previous Systems Portfolio Feedback Report, the ILG Committee is in the process of creating college-wide rubrics for each ILG/ILO to further improve consistency and comparability.

The peer review process conducted at the level of the Division Assessment Committees helps to ensure uniformity in standards with respect methods, tools and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes. Once the ILG committee completes creation of the College-wide rubrics, faculty will use the ILG rubrics to maintain an assurance of uniform standards and the rollout of rubrics is planned for SP 2020. As stated previously, some co-curricular activities are assessed with rubrics that are loosely aligned with the ILGs but they are currently not part of the formal assessment process (4.B.2).

The College recognizes the importance of co-curricular activities as part of a well-integrated education in support of achieving the ILGs/ILOs. Faculty working with the OAA, and the Athletics Department, coordinate co-curricular activities. The list of clubs, programming, and athletics can be found on the campus life website (Clubs & Organizations at Columbus State). The College offers 52 clubs, a range of leadership, engagement, and diversity programming, study abroad, three intercollegiate men's sports and four intercollegiate women's sports. (3.E.1).

Student Engagement and Leadership (SEAL) and the Global Diversity and Inclusion Center (GDIC) offer College-sponsored student activities and programs that are aligned with the ILGs/ILOs (see Table 1.1) as well as the College's Strategic Priorities. These co-curricular activities create opportunities to further pursue the ILGs/ILOs while learning more about a particular career field or interest. Student participation is tracked in the "HUB" and a co-curricular transcript can be produced.

Faculty committees also create co-curricular activities for students on campus. The English department sponsors two online journals (Spring Street and Et al.), where student's original work in writing or photography are published. The A&S Lecture Series Committee holds an annual Spring Symposium where faculty present issues in their field. The talks are open to students and faculty. In addition, this committee brings in speakers throughout the year to speak on contemporary issues.

Recently, the Social Sciences faculty worked with GDIC to create an African Celebration Week.

Service-Learning classes include traditional in-class teaching as well as a meaningful community service project. Service-Learning classes provide hands-on learning and also demonstrate CSCC's commitment to its community. Students in Service-Learning classes learn a lot about the community and are encouraged to reflect on their growth throughout the experience. In the SP 2019 semester, the College offered service-learning classes in 5 separate academic areas (Accounting, Business Office Administration, Dental Hygiene, English and Psychology). Co-curricular activities coordinated by faculty, SEAL, and GDIC are aligned with these ILG's/ILOs to support student's learning experiences at the College but are not yet formally assessed (4.B.2).

The college has co-curricular activities delivered through Student Services, with SEAL and GDIC offering the majority of activities. These departments do assess some of their activities but these assessments are not formally aligned with the ILOs. However, many of their programs are aligned with the College's ILGs to support learning (see Table 1.1 in section 1P1). SEAL has the capacity to produce co-curricular transcripts while GDIC has evidence of higher success rates among participants in their initiatives. The College also offers co-curricular activities that are faculty-driven and include the A&S Lecture Series as well as other offerings described in 1P1. (3.E.1, 4.B.2)

#### **Response to 4.B.2**

*The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.*

The College has several committees in place (see Figure 1.4) to oversee the administration of Assessment for Student Learning. The Department/Program Assessment committees determine which outcomes will be measured, collect data, and create the reports while Division Assessment Committees peer review and provide feedback. The ILG Committee reviews and evaluates the ILGs/ILOs every four years to ensure relevancy and is currently in the process of developing college-wide rubrics. Assessment FFs and the OAA Assessment Committee coordinate the assessment work across the College, working with faculty, Deans, the AQIP Steering Committee, Curriculum Management Department and Division Curriculum Committees. The OAA Assessment Committee and FFs also work with Academic Council to provide policy/procedure changes, as well as strategic and budgetary requests to the Senior VP of OAA. This documented communication aimed at "closing the loop" addresses a shortcoming of prior assessment processes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4).

Due in part to previous portfolio feedback, the College was intentional in creating the current assessment processes. In 2013-14, the Assessment FFs along with consultation from the OAA Assessment Committee began to revise the assessment process in an attempt to grow a culture of



assessment. In AY 2014-15, [Procedure No.5-18\(C\)](#) Assessment for Student Learning, in the College's Policy and Procedure manual was revised so that faculty could create and modify a Handbook that defined the Assessment processes relevant to their work.

The new assessment process also includes a four-year cycle where faculty track assessment on a four-year plan form (sample Four-Year Plan Form). Previously, faculty did not have a formal system for tracking patterns of success and failure from year to year. This four-year cycle provides a window of time for faculty to evaluate data, follow up, identify patterns, and determine actionable plans to address any failures to hit benchmarks. The current cycle began in 2015-16 with the pilot and ends in 2018-19.

Faculty are required to identify internal targets on The Annual Assessment Plan and Report Form as identified by Program and Department Assessment committees. Assessment data is compared against those benchmarks to determine proficiency. When internal targets are not met, Departmental Assessment committees are required to engage in follow-up, which entails peer discussion surrounding plans for improvement, as well as strategic and budgetary requests.

The Assessment FFs, in conjunction with their work with all Assessment Committees, have continued to modify and improve the College's Assessment web page to improve the communication of the assessment process to others around the College and to improve the sharing and storing of data (Assessment homepage). The website includes a handbook, a link to a description of all Assessment committees and member contact information, links to master course syllabi, program review, and the accreditation web page. The current use of SharePoint has improved sharing of assessment data among faculty and once granted access, individuals are able to upload, download, and make revisions/comments to others' reports. This transparent and sharing process has enhanced the peer-reviewed element of Assessment for Student Learning.

In AY 2014-15, the College approved eight ILGs/ILOs central to all programs and degrees across the College (see Figure 1.3). The new assessment process has included formal mapping of the ILGs/ILOs across the curriculum with the College's Curriculum Management Department, thereby providing a cross-walk that was not previously available. This new process provides the College with an enhanced ability to ensure that students – regardless of their program of study – take courses that emphasize the full range of ILGs/ILOs.

In 2016-17 CSCC began formal revisions to its Program Review process and wanted to ensure a dynamic and reciprocal relationship between Assessment and Program Review. In 2017-18, Policy 5- 18(C) was revised again and named *Assessment for Student Learning* to reflect the ILG's/ILOs and the newly established Program Review. The college assessment committee started another round of ILG/ILO in AY 23.

### **Response to 4.B.3**

*The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty, instructional and other relevant staff members.*

The Faculty select the methods and instruments of assessment that are relevant to the ILGs/ILOs being assessed. These methods include test questions, written assignments, math solutions, oral presentations, lab skills, and real-world field, clinical and practical learning experiences. The faculty must choose an assignment that aligns not only with their course outcomes, but with their PLOs and ILGs/ILOs as well. This alignment between the assignments and the outcomes are built into the Assessment Plan and Report Form (Figure 1.5). Currently, the Faculty use Program or Departmental tools to assess the assignments. The assessment reports are peer reviewed by the Division Assessment committees and were described in 1P1 and 1P2. (4.B.2)

There is an Assessment Handbook for the A&S faculty and one for HHS and BET faculty (see links in 1P1). The A&S Division aligns outcomes by course and the process begins with a particular course outcome, which is then aligned to the GenEds, and by definition, the ILGs/ILOs. In contrast, HHS and BET programs begin by identifying PLOs to assess and then align those PLOs with the Course Outcomes and ILGs. When programs work with an external accrediting body, the PLOs are aligned with accrediting criteria and the ILGs. Data for assessment is collected from test questions, written assignments, math solutions, oral presentations, lab skills, and real-world field, clinical, and practical learning experiences.

The faculty members in the Department or Program compile yearly reports and collect data on a pre-determined schedule. The reports are then uploaded, reviewed, and shared by the Division Assessment committees. Data is compiled from the Division Committee Summary Reports and shared with other College committees, Academic Council, and the OAA VP to inform student success initiatives and ensure all stakeholders understand results of the yearly Assessment data. This process is explained in 1P1. (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

## **Sources**

*There are no sources.*

## **4.C - Core Component 4.C**

The institution pursues educational improvement through goals and strategies that improve retention, persistence and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence and completion that are ambitious, attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

## **Argument**

### **Response to 4.C.1**

*The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence and completion that are ambitious, attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations and educational offerings.*

The College has established a more deliberate campus-wide approach to determining targets for student retention, persistence, and completion rates based on both internal and external data. Over several months the Cabinet worked with stakeholders from Academic and Student Affairs and reviewed data provided by OIE related to student and other stakeholder needs. The College compared such internal data on retention, persistence, and completion rates with other in-state, peer institutions. At the completion of this process, the College approved five institutional student success goals-link this which will guide its work over the next five years (2018-2023). The Director of OIE regularly shares data with the President, the Board of Trustees (BOT), and Cabinet in efforts to review goal attainment. (4.C.1, 4.C.4)

### **Response to 4.C.2**

*The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence and completion of its programs.*

The College collects student retention, persistence, and completion data aligned with State of Ohio and IPEDS reporting requirements. In addition, the College regularly monitors retention, persistence, and completion related to various academic and non-academic programs to measure their effectiveness. Examples include gateway courses, developmental education, TRIO, and honors courses. Currently, the college has 58 student success strategies in place that are measured for retention, persistence, and completion. As an AtD college, the College regularly collects student retention, persistence, and completion data. This information is distributed to departments, Cabinet members and Board members, and is also available online ([Retention Rate Disclosures](#)). (4.C.2, 4.C.4)

Information on student retention, persistence, and completion is analyzed at all levels of the institution, led by the OIE which serves as the hub for gathering and processing all data and reports information to

various audiences on student retention, persistence, and completion, enabling departments to implement programs and projects to improve outcomes.

### **Response to 4.C.3**

*The institution uses information on student retention, persistence and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.*

In order to meet retention, persistence, and completion targets, the College has become involved in initiatives including the Guided Pathways program, an advising services redesign, and a College Completion Plan, as required in State law, (CSCC College Completion Plan 2018). These comprehensive, integrated student-support system projects are proven nationally to increase retention, persistence, and completion. In its efforts to support the College Completion Plan initiative, it has recently hired a Director of Completion Programs and put into place a Completion Team that will be working to improve retention, persistence, and completion targets. This investment will help ensure a continuous and consistent focus on the targeted goals.

(4.C.1)

### **Response to 4.C.4**

*The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)*

The College uses a variety of tools and methods to assess retention, persistence, and completion that are aligned with state and IPEDS reporting. These include Achievement Analytics and recognized data models. As new tools and technologies emerge, members of the Institutional Effectiveness team assess their usefulness and make future recommendations for adding or eliminating them. These tools and technologies allow the College to compare retention, persistence, and completion rates with peer institutions and national best practices. (4.C.4)

### **Sources**

*There are no sources.*

## **4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary**

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

## **Summary**

*Steering Committee member*

*There is no argument.*

## **Sources**

*There are no sources.*