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Mission Statement

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation will serve students and their families, colleges and universities, sponsoring bodies, governments and employers by promoting academic quality through formal recognition of higher education accrediting bodies and will coordinate and work to advance self-regulation through accreditation.

—1996

A national advocate and institutional voice for self-regulation of academic quality through accreditation, CHEA is an association of 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities and recognizes 60 institutional and programmatic accrediting organizations.
December 2006

Dear Colleagues:

A good deal of national attention has been paid to accreditation and issues of accountability during the past year. The dominant topics have been student learning outcomes, institutional performance and information to the public. From the Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education to reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we in the accreditation community are being challenged to alter our practices to accommodate greater attention in these areas.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) has published 13 papers, advisories, and commentaries on outcomes, performance and public information during the past five years. This document is a distillation of CHEA’s work, summarizing key recommendations, ideas and effective practices for accrediting organizations working with institutions and programs.

We hope that these ideas and suggestions are helpful as the accrediting community provides leadership in addressing current accountability challenges.

Thank you.

Judith Eaton
President
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Section 1.
Developing and Using Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes

A. Audiences: To Whom Is Additional Attention to Student Learning Outcomes Important?

Key external constituents (government, students, public) want information about student learning outcomes.

Information about student learning outcomes is important to government, students and the public because these constituents increasingly tie judgments about the quality of an institution or program to evidence of student academic achievement.

- Governments want evidence about the quality of student learning outcomes to make judgments about federal and state support of higher education.
- Students and prospective students want evidence of student learning outcomes to make decisions about which institutions or programs to attend and what tuition they are willing to pay.
- The public wants evidence of student learning outcomes to continue its support of higher education as a public good.

Accrediting organizations need information about student learning outcomes.

The legitimacy of accreditation as a protector of academic quality in higher education is increasingly challenged in the absence of quality review that pays significant attention to outcomes. Information about student learning outcomes is important to accrediting organizations because the expectation that accreditors will provide this information is growing among important constituents, including those who recognize these organizations.

- Each accrediting organization needs to state clearly its position with respect to how it addresses the matter of evidence of student learning outcomes in its standards, policies and review processes.
- The accrediting community needs a shared language on the topic of student learning outcomes—both to encourage communication within the community and to clearly articulate accreditation’s position and commitment to constituencies outside the community.

Institutions, programs and faculty need information about student learning outcomes.

For institutions and programs, information about student learning outcomes is central to any claim of intellectual authority that they may offer. For faculty, the primary value of evidence of student learning outcomes is to aid in the improvement of teaching and learning. Such a commitment to improvement is not only a key aspect of scholarship and intellectual responsibility, it is essential to claims of academic quality as well. Part of the task of accreditation is to help institutions, programs and faculty substantiate their claims to quality.


B. Key Questions: What Needs to be Asked and Answered When Addressing Student Learning Outcomes?

What is a “student learning outcome?”

An “outcome” is something that happens to an individual student as a result of his or her attendance at a higher education institution or participation in a particular course of study. But there are many types of outcomes other than student learning. A “student learning outcome,” in contrast, is properly defined in terms of the particular levels of knowledge, skills and abilities that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of collegiate experiences.

What counts as evidence of student learning?

Evidence of student learning can take many forms but must involve a direct examination of student levels of attainment—either for individual students or for representative samples of students. Examples of the types of evidence that might be used include (but are not limited to):

- faculty-designed comprehensive or capstone examinations and assignments;
- performance on external or licensure examinations;
- authentic performances or demonstrations;
• portfolios of student work over time; or
• samples of representative student work generated
  in response to typical course assignments.

Evidence such as survey self-reports about learning,
focus groups, interviews and student satisfaction
studies are certainly useful in the accreditation
process, but do not constitute direct evidence of
student learning outcomes.

At what level (or for what unit of analysis) should evi-
dence of student learning outcomes be sought?

Different accreditors may choose different levels of
aggregation when seeking evidence of student
learning outcomes, depending upon their purposes.
Options include:
• individual student;
• specified groups or aggregations of students;
• courses or groups of courses;
• programs or schools within an institution;
• institutions;
• combinations of the above.

To what extent should particular student learning
outcomes be specified by accreditors?

This choice must be made explicitly by individual
accreditors, depending upon their circumstances.
Options range from:
• complete prescription of outcomes by accreditor
  (for example, specific professional skills required
  for practice);
• accreditor expects institution (or program) to
  choose and define outcomes;
• both (for example, core set of outcomes on which
  accreditor and institution agree).

What models are available to accreditors when choos-
ing an approach?

Different combinations of policy choices determine
the approach to addressing student learning outcomes
that any particular accreditor develops. Among the
most prevalent and useful points of departure are:

Program review, in which outcomes are determined
largely by the institution or program, the effectiveness
of program or institution as a whole is the focus
of interest, and direct evidence of student learning is
collected. [Note: Care should be taken here that there
really is direct evidence of student learning available.]

Academic audit, in which the effectiveness of student
learning outcomes is examined indirectly by looking
at the adequacy of institutional (or program)
processes for assuring quality. [Note: This is useful for
determining the effectiveness of quality practices, but
does not involve direct evidence of student learning outcomes.]

Academic standards audit, in which the adequacy of
academic standards for grading and awarding credit is
checked by direct reference to actual assignments,
requirements and student work. [Note: This follows
the audit methodology above but incorporates direct
evidence of student academic achievement into the
audit process.]

Third-party certification, in which student compen-
tency is examined directly by an external body. [Note:
This is not typically undertaken by accreditors but is
useful to the accreditation process as a solid form of
evidence.]

What issues should be anticipated?

A number of important issues arise when any accred-
ditor addresses the topic of student learning outcomes
as part of the accreditation process. Among them are:
• What standards of evidence will be used?
• How will evidence be used in determining quali-
ty (and in making an accreditation decision)?
• How will faculty be involved?
• How will the interests and concerns of external
  stakeholders be addressed?

Source: CHEA Occasional Paper, Accreditation and Student Learning Outcomes: A
Proposed Point of Departure. September 2001. Retrieved 10/02/06 from

C. What Can Accrediting Organizations Do to
Establish Effective Policy and Practice to Address
Student Learning Outcomes?

Accrediting organizations need to establish standards
and review processes that visibly and clearly expect
accredited institutions and programs to:
• Regularly gather and report concrete evidence
  about what students know and can do as a result
  of their respective courses of study, framed in
terms of established learning outcomes and
supplied at an appropriate level of aggregation
(e.g., at the institutional or program level).
• Supplement this evidence with information about
  other dimensions of effective institutional or pro-
gram performance with respect to student out-
comes (e.g., graduation, retention, transfer, job
placement or admission to graduate school) that
do not constitute direct evidence of student learning.
• Prominently feature relevant evidence of student
learning outcomes—along with other dimensions
of effective institutional performance, as appropriate—in demonstrating institutional or program effectiveness.

**Institutions and programs need to establish clear statements of student learning outcomes and of their approach to collecting, interpreting and using evidence of student achievement.**

Institutions and programs need to:

- Determine and publicly commit to the particular learning outcomes associated with various courses of study.
- Determine and communicate clearly to constituents:
  - what counts as evidence that these outcomes have been achieved and
  - what level of attainment of these outcomes is required to assure the quality of institutional or program offerings.
- Develop recognizable processes for regularly collecting and interpreting evidence of student learning outcomes.
- Use the results of this process to identify strengths and weaknesses or gaps between expected and actual performance and to identify and overcome barriers to learning.

**Accrediting organizations need to use evidence of student learning outcomes in making judgments about academic quality and accredited status.**

Accreditors need to:

- Establish and apply standards, policies and review processes that examine how institutions and programs develop and use evidence of student learning outcomes for internal quality assurance and program improvement.
- Working with an institution or program, examine:
  - whether expectations of student learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the mission, student population and resources of the institution or program;
  - whether the actual achievement levels of students against these standards are acceptable given the mission, student population and resources of an institution or program and, in the case of the professions, the professional community served; and
  - whether the institution or program makes effective use of evidence of student learning outcomes to assure and improve quality.
- Ensure that using evidence of student learning outcomes plays a central role in determining the accredited status of an institution or program.

**Institutions and programs share responsibility with accrediting organizations to provide clear and credible information to constituents about what students learn.**

Institutions and programs need to:

- Routinely provide students and prospective students with information about student learning outcomes and institutional and program performance in terms of these outcomes;
- Regularly report aggregate information about student learning outcomes to external constituents; and
- Supplement this information with additional evidence about the soundness of institutional and program operations and overall effectiveness with respect to mission fulfillment, as well as concrete evidence of how they benefit students in other ways.

Accrediting organizations need to:

- Establish standards, policies and review processes that visibly and clearly expect institutions and programs to discharge the above responsibilities with respect to public communication about student learning outcomes;
- Clearly communicate to accreditation’s constituents the fact that accredited status signifies that student achievement levels are appropriate and acceptable; and
- Provide information about specific proficiencies or deficiencies in aggregate student academic performance, if these played a role in an accreditation action or decision about an institution or program.

Section 2.
Providing Additional Information to the Public

A. What Kinds of Information About Quality Are Accrediting Organizations Uniquely Positioned to Provide to the Public?

**Academic quality of institutions and programs.**
Accreditors are uniquely positioned to provide information about academic quality, e.g., the academic background and training of faculty, academic freedom and resources to support scholarly activity. In addition, potential students typically care about meaningful access to and contact with their instructors and whether they will be exposed to high-quality teaching and learning situations. Students are also interested in access to instructional resources, especially with respect to technology.

**Responsiveness and service to students.**
The public is interested in how students and clients are treated by an institution or program, together with the particular kinds of support that the institution will provide to help students succeed, embracing advising, tutoring and study-skills development; and attributes of an instructional environment that make it easier for students to participate, such as parking or day care.


B. Current Accreditation Practice With Regard to Information to the Public

**Information about the accrediting process.**
All accrediting organizations provide information to the public about how the accreditation process works. This is done either in print (90 percent) or on organizational Websites (95 percent) or both. Ten percent of accreditors distribute this information upon request.

**Information about current accredited status of institutions and programs.**
All accrediting organizations provide information to the public about the current accredited status of the institutions and programs they review. This is done either in print (80 percent) or on an organizational Website (95 percent) or both. Ninety-five percent of accreditors distribute this information upon request. Twenty-seven percent of accreditors provide an accreditation history.

**Information about accreditation operations and activities.**
Two-thirds of accrediting organizations prepare an annual report or similar document that describes their activities for a given year. Fifty percent place this report on their Websites, and 50 percent provide this in print form. These reports include information on the types of actions that are taken.

**Summary information about institutions and programs that are accredited.**
One-third of accrediting organizations provide descriptive information about the institutions and programs they accredit. Data in these reports include enrollments, faculty size, degrees earned and descriptions of degrees or program offerings. Eighty percent of those providing the information make it available on Websites and include contact information or Web links to the institutions or programs.

In response to a 2005 CHEA survey on accreditation practices with regard to informing the public, 66 recognized accreditors indicated that they provide a range of information to the public. Specifically:
- 44 accreditors provide an annual report or other operations summary.
- 31 accreditors provide descriptive summaries of institutions or programs.
- 12 accreditors provide information on results of individual reviews beyond accredited status.
- 11 accreditors provide information about institution or program performance or student academic achievement.
- 15 accreditors require institutions or programs to make public the information they compile about the institutional and program performance or student academic achievement.
Use of public members.

At almost all accrediting organizations, public commission members participate fully in decisions about the accredited status of institutions or programs (98 percent) and help make policies about matters like the public disclosure of information (95 percent). Public members serve on review teams at about half (56 percent) of all accrediting organizations. Public member participation on review teams varies considerably by type of accrediting organization.


C. Weighing Costs and Benefits of a Broader Role With Respect to Information to the Public

Who is asking for what kinds of information about quality?

The most common demand for “consumer information” in higher education is likely to be from potential students and their parents who are looking for specific attributes that will help them discriminate among a variety of institutions or programs. This might include data on academic quality or outcomes that clearly indicate areas of competitive strength or weakness, and information about distinctive features of an institution or program.

What particular stance should the accrediting organization adopt?

The stance may be primarily one of “student protection,” which concentrates on providing only the information needed to help students avoid programs or institutions where they are likely to waste their time and money. It may include academic quality, student responsiveness or both.

Who else is doing this?

Depending upon the field or type of institution, there may already be dozens of competing information providers advanced through the regular media, state higher education organizations or special-purpose advocacy organizations. There are already multiple detailed and competing sources of “quality” information about selective colleges.

What distinctive informational contributions can the accrediting organization make?

The accreditation process generates a great deal of qualitative information through the on-site mechanism of peer review—information that most government or commercial providers of information cannot match. A lot of this information will address the topics of academic experiences and service responsiveness in which external constituents are especially interested.

How will adopting this posture affect the accrediting organization’s relationship with its primary constituencies.

An accrediting organization’s primary mission of assuring academic quality within the academic community will always take precedence. The organization needs to address whether becoming more assertive in the public-information role may actively damage an accrediting organization’s capacity to continue serving its primary constituents in its traditional role.

How will adopting this posture affect the accrediting organization’s internal workload and capacities?

A parallel question is the impact that adopting a broader public information role may have on the ways an accrediting organization spends its time and resources. Most accreditors have extremely limited resources with respect to personnel, communications, and information processing capacity. Redirecting these resources to address a new line of work—especially if it is not a core function and may have little potential for cost-recovery—is not a decision to undertake lightly.


D. Suggestions for Future Practice

Accrediting organizations seeking to provide information to the public may consider the following:

• Explore whether the students and the public would benefit from accrediting organizations developing similar formats or common approaches when providing information about institutions and programs.

• Continue to develop current plans to expand information to the public in the future, especially information about the results of institutional and programmatic review.

• Continue the dialogue about effective information to the public within and among accrediting organizations: what works and what may be effective in the future, especially as this relates to institutional performance and student achievement.

Section 3. Additional Reporting to the Public: Examples for Accreditors, Institutions and Programs

There are various ways in which accrediting organizations, institutions and programs might present additional information to the public. Three examples are presented here.

Example 1

The “Accreditation Summary” describes the formal action taken by an accrediting organization as well as a description of strengths and areas of improvement.

ACCREDITATION SUMMARY
REVIEW AND ACTION

Institution or Program: ________________________________________________________________________
Accrediting Organization: ______________________________________________________________________
Date of Review: ______________________________________________________________________________
What formal action was taken by the accrediting organization as a result of the review? ________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
What institutional or programmatic strengths were identified? _________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
In what areas might the institution or program improve? ____________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
When will the next formal review take place? ______________________________________________________
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Example 2

The “Accreditation Management Letter” is a formal notice that a review has been completed, that specific standards have been met, that areas of institutional or programmatic operation are to be addressed, accompanied by an overview of the institution or program.

ACCREDITATION MANAGEMENT LETTER

The __(accrediting organization)__ reviewed ____(institution or program)__ during ____(time period)__. The purpose of the review is to assure that ____(institution or program)__ meets the standards of the accrediting organization.

The review was conducted according to the established practices of U.S. accrediting organizations, based on the expectations of the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, the two authorities in the United States that set standards for the conduct of institutional or programmatic accreditation.

The ____(institution or program)__ meets the standards of the ____(accrediting organization)__ as follows:

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

The ____(institution or program)__ is asked to address the following areas:

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

Other comments and recommendations:

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

Overview of Institution or Program

Mission: ____________________________________________________________________________________
Control and Governance: ______________________________________________________________________
Notable Programs: ____________________________________________________________________________
Faculty: ____________________________________________________________________________________
Students: ____________________________________________________________________________________
Finances: ____________________________________________________________________________________
Facilities: ____________________________________________________________________________________
Significant Changes in the Past Academic Year: ______________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
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Example 3

The "Information Profile" describes key features of an institution or program as well as key performance indicators.

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION PROFILE*

**Name of Institution**

Accreditations
- Institutional Accréditor: ____________________________________________________________
- Programmatic Accréditor(s): _______________________________________________________

Date of Next Institutional Review: ________________________________________________
(If used electronically, can include: To learn more about the accredited status of the institution or a program, click on the accrediting organization’s name.)

**Institutional Context and Mission**

Institutional Mission: ______________________________________________________________
Institutional Goals: ________________________________________________________________
Institutional Type: ________________________________________________________________
Brief Description of Student Population: _____________________________________________
Admissions Requirements:
Areas of Special Focus (e.g., liberal arts, vocational education):

**Options for Institutional Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates**

(Indicators must be determined and defined by the institution. These are examples only.)

1. Graduates Entering Graduate School
   Year: _____ # of Graduates: _____ # Entering Graduate School: _____

2. Job Placement
   Year: _____ # of Graduates: _____ # Employed: _____

3. Annual Transfer Activity
   Year: _____ # of Transfers: _____ Transfer Rate: _____

4. Persistence and Average Time to Certificate or Degree
   1-Yr. Certificate: _____ 2-Yr. Degree: _____ 4-Yr. Degree: _____

5. Graduation
   Year: _____ # of Graduates: _____ Graduation Rate: _____

6. Completion of Educational Goal (other than certificate or degree – if data collected)
   # of Students Surveyed: _____ # Completing Goal: _____

7. Other (describe)
   - Success in General Education: ________________________________________________
   - Success in Major Field: ______________________________________________________
   - Success in Career Learning Outcomes: _________________________________________
   - Success in Licensure/Certification Exams: _____________________________________
   - Additional Indicators: _________________________________________________________

*May also be modified for use by programs.
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