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About

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- Origins back to 1919
- The Mid-Atlantic Region regional accreditor
- Examines institutions as a whole, rather than specific programs
- Higher Ed institutions in DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA, PR, and US Virgin Islands.
- Conducts business in 48 states; 2 U.S. Territories; 94 countries
- Will accept domestic applications beyond current geographic boundaries, effective immediately
- Accepting international applications beginning Jan 1, 2021
Accreditation Activities

• Self-Study Evaluation and On-Site Evaluation Visit
  – A “comprehensive review in the 8th year of the accreditation review cycle”

• Mid-Point Peer Review (MPPR)
  – Midway through the cycle
  – review accumulated financial data, student achievement data, and responses to Commission recommendations (if requested)

• Monitoring Activities
  – Annual Institutional Update (AIU)
    • a mechanism for ongoing monitoring
    • submit and verify key data indicators and upload required documents on an annual basis
  – Recommendations Response
    • Narrative responses to recommendations (if any); reviewed by peer evaluators in MPPR
  – Follow-Up Reports and Visits
Data Collection History

- Annual Institutional Profile (AIP) to Annual Institutional Update (AIU)
- Goal = accurate measurement of institutional health
  - Student Achievement
  - Financial Health

AIP
- Large set of metrics
- Definitions shifted over the years
- Organically grown
- Primary focus was to monitor institutions
- Comparisons: current year to previous year

2017

AIU
- Only metrics that show promise in achieving the goal
- Standardized definitions
- Clear plan to use the data (MPPR)
- Always examine 5-year trend
- Includes update reports on recommendations

Source: MSCHE Town Hall, 2017
MPPR & AIU

- AIU data is used for MPPR (Mid-Point Peer Review)!
- MPPR
  - AIU provides peer reviewers context of the institution
  - Institutions provide comment on the data indicators
  - Institutions receive feedback from reviewers
  - Concern: No/minimal, Moderate, Serious – “in ability to meet the Commission’s standards, requirements,...”
  - Institutional Response
Unduplicated Fall Headcount by Collection Year

Metric Explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Fall Headcount</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>EXAMPLE: The University was aware that a demographic change was occurring throughout the region with a decline in traditional age college bound students. In addition, there is increased competition and discounting for students among numerous colleges and universities in the area. As a result of these external factors the university worked to right-size the faculty and staff through attrition (eliminating 29 faculty positions and 20 staff positions over the last five years). Eliminated academic programs with low enrollment and little demand and added new programs with more demand. Implemented a new CRM system in admissions Contracting with a consulting firm to help with marketing, enrollment planning, and financial aid leveraging opening new markets with associate degree options at the main campus. Marketing to non-traditional, adult students including transfer students and veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Enrollment</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>This is a sample report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] "The above explanations are required only when a significant change occurs (either positive or negative)."
AIU Snapshot Report

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Distance Education

Undergraduate Enrollment by Age
AIU Includes

• **Student Achievement:**
  – Retention, Graduation rates (150/200%; gender/race), Transfer rate, Loan default

• **Financial Health:**
  – Financial ratios
  – Financial uploads

• **Enrollment:**
  – Grad/UG, Full/Part, Fall/12-month, Race, Age, Pell, Distance Ed
  – FTE, %FTFT

• **Additional Metrics (%):**
  – Minority, Non-traditional, Part-time, Pell
  – Developmental, First Generation, Dual Enrollment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Source Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>General Information</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>Most Recent Catalog Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Fall Enrollment Headcounts</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Enrollment Race-Ethnicity Percentages</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Enrollment Age Percentages</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-Month Enrollment</td>
<td>July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education Headcounts¹</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs Offered</td>
<td>July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Retention Rates</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-Time Full-Time Enrollment</td>
<td>Academic year 2018-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rates 150%</td>
<td>Status of student as of August 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rates 200%</td>
<td>Status of student as of August 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rate by Gender</td>
<td>Status of student as of August 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rate by Race / Ethnicity</td>
<td>Status of student as of August 31, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance – IPEDS</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Fiscal year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Year</td>
<td>Financial Results</td>
<td>Fiscal year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and General Expenses</td>
<td>Fiscal year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance – Most Recent</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Most Recent Audited Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Results</td>
<td>Most Recent Audited Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and General Expenses</td>
<td>Most Recent Audited Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance – For Dues</td>
<td>Total Expenses and Deductions</td>
<td>Fiscal year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uploads</td>
<td>Most Recent Financial Audit Metrics</td>
<td>Most Recent Audited Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Documents to Upload</td>
<td>Most Recent Audited Financial Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIU – Items by Source

- IPEDS Finance – 30
- IPEDS Fall Enrollment – 29
- IPEDS Graduation Rates – 20
- IPEDS 200 Grad Rates – 5
- IPEDS IC-Header – 5
- IPEDS 12-month Enrollment – 3
- IPEDS Completions – 2
- IPEDS Financial Aid – 2

- College Scorecard – 1
  - Default Rate
- NSLDS – 1
  - First Generation
- Institution – 10
  - Correspondence, Developmental, Dual, Retirement, Debt Service, Bond Rating, etc.
IPEDS – in future Accreditation

• Sources:
  – Student database (not collected by IPEDS, etc)
  – Survey data (NSSE, Alumni, Withdrawn, COACHE, etc)
  – AASHE, etc.
  – IPEDS
    • Peers and Aspirants
IPEDS – in future Accreditation

Student FTE per Instructional FTE & Non-Instructional FTE (Fall 2018)

- Bowdoin College
- Haverford College
- Middlebury College
- Bard College
- Bates College
- Vassar College
- Dickinson College
- Union College
- Connecticut College
- Colby College
- Skidmore College
- Oberlin College
- Kenyon College
- Marshall College
- Hamilton College
- Gettysburg College
- Colgate University
- St. Lawrence University
- Trinity College
- Wheaton College
- Wesleyan University
- Sarah Lawrence College

Legend:
- Students per Instructional Staff
- Students per Non-Instructional Staff
WSCUC

Deborah Lee

Concordia University Irvine
WASC Senior College and University Commission
WASC = Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Formed in 1962
215 institutions; 10 international
CHEA Recognized Scope Statement
- Institutions of higher education in the US and internationally that offer the baccalaureate degree or above. (2020)
WSCUC Accreditation Processes

• Seeking accreditation
• Reaffirmation of accreditation
• Interim reports
• Annual reports
• Mid-cycle review
• Substantive change proposals
  – New degree program
  – Distance education
  – New locations
  – Change in length of degree program, etc.
WSCUC Annual Report

• Student Enrollment
• Student Demographics*
  – Fall enrollment figures by race, ethnicity, and gender
  – 6 year (150%) first-time, full-time freshman graduation rates by race, ethnicity and gender
• Student Success (Graduation Rate Dashboard)
• Financial Indicators
• Uploads
WSCUC GRD

• Measures retention and graduation rates
• Six data points are collected as part of the annual report
• Used as an element of a comprehensive analysis during the accreditation review process
• Accounts for all graduates
• Provides insight into the unit accumulation, redemption and abandonment patterns
Comparative Tool

- Available on the WSCUC Website
The box and whisker plots show the total range of average values for undergraduate serving institutions. The colored markers indicate the total average rate for the selected institution, based on up to eight years of available data.

**Avg. Unit Redemption Rate (URR)**

**Avg. Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR)**

**Avg. 6-year FTFT Graduation Rate (IPEDS)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Art University</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish University</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Center College of Design</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific University</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biola University</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University-Hawaii</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Baptist University</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California College of the Arts</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Lutheran University</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State University, San L.</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Southern University</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Polytechnic University, Pomo..</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Maritime Academy</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Bakersfield</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Channel Islands</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Art University</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish University</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University of Health Sciences</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Center College of Design</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific University</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biola University</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University-Hawaii</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Baptist University</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California College of the Arts</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Lutheran University</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State University, San L.</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Southern University</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Polytechnic University, Pomo..</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University Maritime Academy</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Bakersfield</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Channel Islands</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards of Accreditation

- **Standard 1:** Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
- **Standard 2:** Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
- **Standard 3:** Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability
- **Standard 4:** Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement
WSCUC x IPEDS

The Institutional Report

• Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

• Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

• Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence
WSCUC x IPEDS

How CUI uses IPEDS in addition to the Annual Report:

• Peer Comparison Reports
  • Cluster analysis based on IPEDS key indicators
  • Identifying institutions that select us as peers

• Data Feedback Report
• Retention and graduation rates
• Degree completions
• Program review
Key Takeaways

• WSCUC looks at student learning outcomes in addition to retention and graduation rates
• WSCUC wants institutions to go beyond demographic characteristics when reporting data
• IPEDS is critical for us to benchmark per CFR 2.10

Thank you, IPEDS!
Reporting IPEDS to SACSCOC

Carolyn Sloane Mata

Oglethorpe University & NCICU
SACSCOC

• The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges is the recognized regional accrediting body in the eleven U.S. Southern states and Latin America:

  Alabama  Louisiana  Tennessee
  Florida   Mississippi Texas
  Georgia  North Carolina Virginia
  Kentucky  South Carolina

• The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges has six core values. They are:

  Integrity  Accountability
  Continuous Quality Improvement  Student Learning
  Peer Review/Self Regulation  Transparency
IPEDS, IPEDS, IPEDS....

- Annual Report Collection
- Student Completion Indicator
- Student Achievement 8.1 (website)

Why such a reliance on IPEDS?
IPEDS in Annual Report Collections
## Financial Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields:</th>
<th>Hint</th>
<th>IPEDS Collection Year: 2019</th>
<th>IPEDS Collection Year: 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total All Revenues (and Investment Return):</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part B, line 01)</td>
<td>$46,850,661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 01, column 1)</td>
<td>$9,576,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 02, column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 03 column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 04, column 1)</td>
<td>$2,399,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 05, column 1)</td>
<td>$6,340,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 06, column 1)</td>
<td>$6,108,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 07, column 1)</td>
<td>$3,392,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Grant Aid to Students:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 08, column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Services:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 09, column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Operations:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 10, column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Expenses And Deductions:</td>
<td>(IPEDs Part E-1, line 12, column 1)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Enrollment Profile

**Headcount**

Using your institution definition, report your enrollment headcount for the 2019 fall term. When tabulating the total, include all non-degree students, wherever instruction occurs. This applies to students enrolled in course work delivered at the main campus, off-campus sites, branch campuses, and course work delivered electronically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Year: 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of Full-Time Undergraduate Students -- Headcount</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total number of Full-Time Post-Baccalaureate Students -- Headcount</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total number of For-Credit, Part-Time Undergraduate Students -- Headcount</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total number of For-Credit, Part-Time Post-Baccalaureate Students -- Headcount</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total number of Students enrolled in non-credit courses -- Headcount</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Headcount (Total of lines 1-5)</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation Rate

The purpose of the Graduation Rate is to track the cohorts of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates, as well as their completion status at 150% of normal time. Please provide the following information based on the most recent data reported to IPEDS (submission made between December 2018 and April 2019) on Completers within 150%:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields:</th>
<th>Year: 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ipeds ID: 140696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSOCIATE'S/TWO-YEAR PROGRAM**

| Total Number of Students in the Cohort | 0          |
| Total Number of Students Completed within 150% of time of degree | 0          |
| Total transfers out | 0          |

**BACCALAUREATE/FOUR-YEAR PROGRAM**

| Total Number of Students in the Cohort | 277        |
| Total Number of Students Completed within 150% of time of degree | 149        |
| Total transfers out | 0          |
Student Completion Indicator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracked Student Cohort</th>
<th>SACSCOC Graduation Rate</th>
<th>IPEDS &quot;Traditional&quot; Overall Graduation Rate (GRRTTOT)</th>
<th>IPEDS &quot;New&quot; Outcomes Measure</th>
<th>National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) Total Completion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracked Student Cohort</strong></td>
<td>First-Time/ Full-Time</td>
<td>First-Time/ Full-Time</td>
<td>First-Time Full-Time <strong>Part-Time</strong> Non-First-Time (Transfer-IN) Full-Time <strong>Part-Time</strong></td>
<td>First-Time Full-Time <strong>Part-Time</strong> + Transfer-<strong>OUTs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tracking &amp; Reporting Timeframe</strong></td>
<td>3 Years = Associate 6 Years = Baccalaureate</td>
<td>3 Years = Associate 6 Years = Baccalaureate</td>
<td>4/6 Years 8 Years</td>
<td>3/4 Years 6 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focal Credentials</strong></td>
<td>UG Degrees</td>
<td>UG Degrees Post-Secondary Certificates</td>
<td>UG Degrees Post-Secondary Certificates</td>
<td>UG Degrees Post-Secondary Diplomas &amp; Certificates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alexei G. Matveev, Ph.D. (amatveev@sacscoc.org)
Selected Key Student Completion Indicator: Fall 2018 (% of Institutions, N=732)

- NSC Total Completion Rate 29%
- SACSCOC Graduation Rate 7%
- IPEDS "New" Outcomes Measure 21%
- IPEDS "Traditional" Overall Graduation Rate 43%

Source: Alexei G. Matveev, Ph.D. (amatveev@sacscoc.org)
IPEDS in Student Achievement
• Standard 6.1 The institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty members to support the mission and goals of the institution. (Full-time faculty) [CR]
  – Data such as number of faculty; number of students; faculty workloads (contractual and actual); proportion of courses taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants; comparisons of peer institutions; student credit hours generated by full-time and part-time faculty.
• Standard 6.2.b For each of its educational programs, the institution employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. (Program faculty)
  – Comparisons with peer institutions or with external benchmarks.
• Standard 9.1 Educational programs (a) embody a coherent course of study, (b) are compatible with the stated mission and goals, and (c) are based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. (Program content) [CR]
  – Comparative data with similar peer institutions.
Standard 9.6 Post-baccalaureate professional degree programs and graduate degree programs are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs, and are structured (a) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (b) to ensure engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training. (Post-baccalaureate rigor and curriculum)

If the institution has no comparable undergraduate programs, are there clear indications of more advanced content in the institution’s graduate and post-baccalaureate programs when compared to peer institutions’ undergraduate programs in similar subjects?

Standard 10.7 The institution publishes and implements policies for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for its courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. These policies require oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments. In educational programs not based on credit hours (e.g., direct assessment programs), the institution has a sound means for determining credit equivalencies.

In developing policies related to the amount and level of credit awarded, how does the institution use the standards of professional organizations or the practices of peer institutions?
The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success. (Student achievement) [CR]

In accord with federal regulations, it is expected that the institution will demonstrate its success with respect to student achievement and indicate the criteria and thresholds of acceptability used to determine that success. The criteria are the items to be measured (and published); the thresholds of acceptability are the minimal expectations set by the institution to define its own acceptable level of achievement (i.e., a minimum target). The institution is responsible for justifying both the criteria it utilizes and the thresholds of acceptability it sets. The items measured and the thresholds of acceptability should be consistent with the institution’s mission and the students it serves.
The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success. (Student achievement) [CR]
The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success. (Student achievement) [CR]
Process for Developing 8.1 Metrics

2. Determine what elements get at institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered.
3. Pull the data for each of the elements for OU and peers.
4. Discuss the data to determine thresholds and targets.
5. Present the findings.
6. Discuss whether changes are warranted.
7. Present final document to Cabinet.
8. Host on website.
Elements

• Enrollment
  – Economic Diversity (Pell)
  – Race/Ethnicity Diversity
  – Age Diversity
• Student Performance
  – Graduation Rate
  – Retention Rate
  – Pell Graduation Rate
• Engagement
  – Experiences with Faculty
  – Learning with Peers
• Post-Graduate Outcomes
  – Employment or Continuing Education
Performance Levels

• The **minimum performance** level is the threshold above which a measure should be maintained.

• The **target performance** level is the established threshold to meet or surpass expectations -- essentially a benchmark.

• The **actual performance** level is the current level of performance in the defined measure.
For Academic Year 2018-2019, 43% of first-time, full-time undergraduates attending Oglethorpe University were awarded Pell grants. Oglethorpe seeks to enroll a diverse population of students each year with regard to economic background. The mean new student Pell population at Oglethorpe’s peers is 41%, and the median is 43%. In order ensure economic diversity, Oglethorpe would like to have an incoming cohort of students who are awarded Pell at a minimum is at the 25th percentile compared to peers, and a target the peer median.

**Minimum:** 25th percentile (currently 36% Pell)

**Target:** Peer median (currently 43% Pell)

**Actual:** 43% Pell

For the latest available data in 2017-2018, Oglethorpe met the minimum and achieved the target.
Student Performance (GR)

The six-year graduation rate represents students who enrolled as first-time, full-time students six years earlier and completed their undergraduate degrees within 150% of the traditional 4-year time frame. Over the last five years, Oglethorpe’s graduation rate has ranged from 47% to 54%. Oglethorpe Peers have ranged from 29% graduation rate to 75% over that same time period. Oglethorpe sets its minimum threshold based on the 25th percentile and its target as being in the 50th percentile of its peers each year.

**Minimum:** 25th Percentile (currently 49%)

**Target:** 50th Percentile (currently 60%)

**Actual:** 54% Graduation Rate

For the latest available data in 2018, Oglethorpe met the minimum but missed the target.
Main Takeaway:

We couldn’t do SACSCOC reporting without IPEDS
Questions and Discussion