I. ALIGNMENT OF MISSION HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES (HIPs):

a. Predicated on similar desiderata for the institution’s mission as articulated in CR2.4, departmental mission statements should be a well-articulated statement that is clearly defined, comprehensively outlines a department’s philosophy and aspirations, and emphasizes its unique characteristics while appropriately addressing major functions.

b. Departmental mission’s should demonstrably align with and cross-validate the institution’s mission. Generally, the institutional mission is broadly written which allows for pedagogical “wiggle room” for development of more specific department-to-institution mission statements.

c. Consequently, departments should demonstrate department-to-institution mission alignment in the most effective and intuitive way possible.

d. Departments subject to secondary accrediting criteria may wish to reflect this accreditation nexus in their mission statement. Keep in mind, that any mandated secondary accrediting outcomes should likewise be addressed in the departmental mission statement.

e. Do not include mission statement elements over which your department exercises no control and, therefore, for which departmental accountability is not warranted.

f. Since departmental outcomes devolve directly from the department’s mission, they should be specifically articulated in their totality in formulation of departmental missions. NOTE: If outcomes do not align with departmental mission statements, either the derivative outcomes OR the mission statement, itself, should be rewritten in order to achieve the requisite alignment.

g. Any compliance component listed in the mission statement should be measurable. If any quality-based compliance components (confer the examples below) are included in departmental missions statements, they will need to qualitatively measured.

g. Any compliance component listed in the mission statement should be measurable. If any quality-based compliance components (confer the examples below) are included in departmental missions statements, they will need to qualitatively measured.

h. NOTE: SACSCOC defines “compliance components” as: “Embedded in the wording of the Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements (and frequently signaled by numbers, commas, and the use of compound modifiers), the compliance components are the multiple discrete issues that must be addressed for each requirement and standard” (SACSCOC Resource Manual, p. 109).

i. Similarly, any extraneous statements in the mission that are not included as a measurable outcome in the department’s downstream assessment may be perceived as non-compliant.
II. OUTCOMES HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES (HIPs):

a. As noted in the ALIGNMENT OF MISSION IE HIPs: since departmental outcomes
devolve directly from the department’s mission, they should be specifically articulated in
their totality in formulation of departmental missions. NOTE: If outcomes do not align
with departmental mission statements, either the derivative outcomes OR the mission
statement, itself, should be rewritten in order to achieve the requisite alignment.

b. The most important question to ask when articulating learning goals is, “Why?” (Suskie,
2009, p. 115)

c. Be a comparative outcomes generator by examining outcomes from similar departments
at other schools, such as those on the National Institute for Learning Outcomes
Assessment (NILOA) Transparency Framework web page:
http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/TFComponentSLOS.htm

d. Any compliance component listed in the mission statement should be measurable. If any
qualitative compliance components are included in outcomes, they should be
qualitatively measured. NOTE: Once outcomes ARE determined, the Resource Manual
reminds us that “expected outcomes [need to be] clearly defined in measurable terms for
each unit” (pp. 50-51). Moreover, SACSCOC defines “compliance components” as:
“Embedded in the wording of the Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards,
and Federal Requirements (and frequently signaled by numbers, commas, and the
use of compound modifiers), the compliance components are the multiple discrete
issues that must be addressed for each requirement and standard” (SACSCOC

e. Outcomes are results – not desired student learning results or outputs, but gilt-edge,
rubber-hits-the-road results of student learning, which are meaningful and measurable.

f. Outcomes should be written as outcomes, not as one- or two-word phrases, so that
everyone understands them. This is in contradistinction to Suskie who avers: “It is okay
to have goals that are a bit broad and nebulous, as long as everyone has a common
understanding of what they mean;” and, ironically, that, Well-expressed learning goals
minimize fuzzy terms. (Suskie, 2009, p. 115) Use the appropriate outcome rhetorical
guides as needed, such as those on NILOA’s Resources web page:
http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/SLOSresources.html

g. Where applicable, outcomes should adopt, or “norm on,” programmatic accreditors’
outcomes; and, utilize any concomitant benchmarks signaling success.

h. Do not try to generate outcomes for everything, for as Thomas Aquinas states: “any agent
inclined to several effects will produce none of them, unless it is determined to a
particular one by some other cause” (Summa Theologica).

i. Any extraneous outcome statements that are not measured may be perceived as non-
compliant.

j. While Bloom’s taxonomy is the best-known framework for articulating learning goals,
other taxonomies fill in some voids. (Suskie, 2009, p. 115)

k. Outcomes evolve amenable to regular department-specific updating as well as PECC
feedback.

l. Any single measure of student learning should be a part of a larger holistic assessment
plan (http://highered.ssrc.org/projects/measuring-college-learning-project/, p. 8)
m. Measures of student learning should be rigorous and high quality and should yield data that allow for comparisons over time and across institutions (http://highered.ssrc.org/projects/measuring-college-learning-project/, p. 10)

n. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values. (Astin, 1992, n. p.)

o. Many of the 800+ SACSCOC member universities have Offices of Institutional Effectiveness web pages which provide additional helpful perspectives on outcomes. Additionally, SACSCOC members’ compliance reports typically list unit (AKA departmental) assessment under 3.3.1. Those assessment reports are replete with outcomes which may provide useful comparative input for SU departments’ formulation of their own outcomes.

III. CULTURE OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES (IE/HIPs) MAPPED TO THE CIC STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIC STEPs</th>
<th>CIC ACTION</th>
<th>CIC HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES (HIPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1         | Identify programmatic/departmental outcome(s): | 1. adhere to the SU Alignment of Mission (http://libguides.sullivan.edu/c.php?g=558679&p=5398800) and Outcomes (http://libguides.sullivan.edu/c.php?g=558679&p=5398801) IE/HIPs listed in the prior Academic Illuminator articles and on the accompanying LibGuide;
2. consult the internet for sample programmatic outcomes (but ensure they accord with the SU Outcomes IE/HIPs), such as these from Georgia State University: http://oie.gsu.edu/files/2014/07/GSU-Program-SLOs.pdf |
| 2         | Identify Measurement Instrument(s) | 4. prefer use of direct measures* versus indirect measures;
5. do not use grades; **
6. rubrics may aid measurement;
7. measurement instrument(s) should be outcome-directed in order to measure the requisite learning-outcome-specific results. If it does not, find one that will (consult: MENTAL MEASUREMENT YEARBOOK, or other such compilations);
8. use multiple measurement instruments for interrater reliability and cross-validation of data;
9. use multiple measures, thereby maximizing reliability and validity;¹
10. triangulate data from any multiple instruments to outcomes; |
11. be aware of the distinction between formative and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Data Gathered/ Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>be specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>provide longitudinal data (preferably for the most recent three-year evaluation cycle;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>in order to demonstrate continuity, provide data for all pedagogical modalities and for all campus locations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>provide evidence that the campus’s measures of student learning are direct, valid, and reliable and that representative sampling of students and courses will take place in the assessments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>student performance can be compared, including how the campus will define student performance that “exceeds,” “meets,” “approaches,” or “fails to meet” standards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>map data to course instrument: “a course map is essentially a representation of how you intend to approach and assess each of the student learning outcomes you identified for your course;”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>identify potentially misleading or flawed test questions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>small data samples may be inconclusive;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>advanced (logical, linear regression) analysis techniques may be useful for many programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>be specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>Implement Data-driven Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>develop concrete plans for implementation of changes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>demonstrate evidence of data-driven directionality to modifications and areas needing improvement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Summarize assessment findings in ways that make them meaningful and understandable. In particular, make clear how student performance compares with the targets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Share assessment findings with interested/relevant program faculty and other stakeholders. These might include an assessment committee or all program faculty;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Provide structured opportunities for discussion of the assessment results. For example, you might make assessment a regular agenda item at meetings of program faculty;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Develop ideas and proposals for revising learning goals and objectives, the program curriculum, teaching methods, assessment methods, etc. Clear assessment results can be used to support request for resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>be specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Evaluate resultant Improvement(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>during the subsequent assessment cycle, use the prior methodology to assess the efficacy of improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>be specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>