

HLC Assurance Argument

University of Cincinnati - 2018

Criterion 4

Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

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

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
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 assure 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 assures 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 assures that the degree or certificate programs 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, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).

Argument

4.A.1.

Prompt: The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

Response: UC has maintained regular program and discipline/area reviews since 1990. While the procedures have been modified with the change from quarters to semesters, the faculty's close review of curriculum, quality of instruction, assessment of student learning, and planning for the future remain at the core of the process. These reviews provide data for program improvement including enhanced faculty resources and recommendations for improved instructional practices, upgraded technology and facilities, expanded student support services for improved teaching and learning, and rationales for budgetary requests.

Prior to the University of Cincinnati's conversion from the quarter to the semester system, all programs and general education areas were reviewed annually. As part of semester conversion, each academic program was required to develop an assessment plan prior to meeting the fall 2012 deadline. The process of assessment plan development was supported centrally through a robust, multi-stage program that centered around program assessment training and design sessions and workshops hosted by CET&L for academic programs to work within and across disciplines while creating their plans. Following an initial orientation, program leaders brought plans back to their respective programs to review and revise program outcomes, work to develop detailed curriculum maps, and build program assessment plans. These were then then submitted for review both at the collegiate and institutional level, which often involved iterative processes between the Academic Committee and the faculty leading the academic programs. Throughout this process, and partly owing to the sheer volume of this effort—roughly 100 plans were created and approved in a concentrated period—we placed focus on the developmental nature and process of assessment as a form of continuous improvement. Because of this focus, we have been able to attend to shortcomings in assessment plan review, plan implementation, and necessary revisions in ways specific to program and institutional need. For instance, to address issues of

consistency during AC reviews of assessment plans, we ratcheted up training for the AC approvers and modified the standard review template.

Furthermore, units that made curricular changes introduced new programs or otherwise needed to change their assessment plans, were afforded individual guidance. This process took place in 2013-2015. In the spring of 2016, the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning implemented an assessment survey for all programs. The following year introduced, in addition to the survey, an Assessment of Student Learning Report for unaccredited programs with the support of faculty senate, the academic committee, the associate deans, and the provost's office. In the 2017 academic year the university began an annual reporting cycle for student achievement of program outcomes due at the end of each spring semester. Formative feedback regarding the continuous improvement processes of academic program efforts is provided during the summer courtesy of CETL. The survey and report template are provided as sources below, as well as the reports drawn from these instruments

4.A.2.

Prompt: 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.

Response: The University of Cincinnati's Credit Evaluation Center evaluates both Ohio and Non-Ohio credit from all regionally-accredited colleges and universities. Students, prospectively and currently enrolled, may compare course work from other institutions with UC's equivalent course using Transferology, a national database. In addition, UC adheres to the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy, set by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). UC awards transfer credit applicable to our General Education program for any courses approved in Ohio's Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG), Ohio Transfer Module (OTM), or Military Transfer Assurance Guide (MTAG). Similarly, Career Technical Assurance Guide (CTAG) courses allow for vocational school credits to be transferred seamlessly to degree programs at UC, and all other Ohio public institutions.

Activity for non-traditional education support program provide a mechanism for the transfer of credit earned through active duty. Because TAGs, MTAGs and CTAGs are rigorously examined and have agreed upon learning outcomes approved by faculty peers for the Department of Higher Education, UC is comfortable accepting courses with these designations. We also accept credit earned through CLEP, IB, A-Levels and AP test results in compliance with ODHE. With exception of the TAGS, UC determines the way in which transfer credit applies to graduation requirements in specific programs and also allows students to earn college credit for knowledge obtained outside of the traditional college classroom setting through the process of Prior Learning Assessment (PLA).

4.A.3.

Prompt: The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

Response: UC has policies that assure the quality of transfer credit. The institution accepts transfer credit from colleges and universities accredited by regional associations; credit consistent with state policies governing the Ohio Transfer Module and Transfer Assurance Guides, credit through programs such as Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and International Baccalaureate (IB). High school students who have participated in dual credit programs in Ohio have either attended accredited Ohio public universities or taken dual credit courses in their high schools, which are treated as identical to courses at the offering college. In particular, the state recently introduced college credit plus (CCP) as a statewide initiative to give all college-ready high school students access to dual enrollment credit. In addition, colleges have made determinations regarding which courses may consider Prior Learning Assessment Standards as a way of meeting course criteria for credit.

4.A.4.

Prompt: 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 assures 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.

Response: The prerequisites and student learning outcomes for all UC courses are enumerated in several places. Prerequisites are imbedded in course descriptions visible to students browsing course offerings. All courses, degree programs and certificates are required to have learning outcomes, which are housed in their entirety and maintained by the faculty using eCurriculum, an electronic database for all courses and programs for faculty and staff use. Furthermore, all program and certificate learning outcomes must be approved by the Academic Committee (AC). Prerequisites are systemically enforced during the class registration process in the SIS. Course and program learning outcomes within eCurriculum are visible as part of each program's assessment plan. As evidence of continuous refinement, the most frequently modified field in eCurriculum continues to be learning outcomes at the program and course level. Course learning outcomes are generally listed on course syllabi. A faculty senate resolution recommends that all syllabi be posted in the LMS. The compliance rate in any given semester is near 90%. Additionally, the faculty senate has also provided a template of recommended best practices for syllabi. Furthermore, we continue to work with contingent and graduate faculty to increase posting of syllabi.

The rigor of courses is assured through a multi-step process. Teaching faculty may submit, build or modify a course in eCurriculum (see below); this form is then routed to the program director, unit head, college curriculum committee, college dean's office, and the provost office for review and approval. For graduate courses, the process also includes review by the graduate school prior to provostal review.

The quality of teaching is also reviewed through multiple methods including in all cases teaching evaluations. Additionally, reviews of student success data, peer observation, peer mentoring, teaching portfolios, and faculty development are frequently used to support and assess quality teaching. Most academic departments require regular, sustained peer observation and student evaluation data as part of the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process. Generally, tenure track faculty undergo comprehensive

review a minimum of three times—twice in the pre-tenure period for reappointment and for tenure in the sixth year. Tenured faculty are again reviewed as part of the promotion to full professor and when university contracts have included merit pay. Furthermore, Educator and contingent faculty also face regular review as part of the appointment and merit process. This review relies heavily on an evaluation of teaching effectiveness as described above. All combined courses taught are subject to the same processes described above. Faculty development around teaching is well supported in the university contract and is in the order of half-a-million dollars annually.

Please refer to Criterion 3A for a detailed account of how the university ensures appropriate qualifications for faculty hiring, including for contractual and consortial faculty.

4.A.5.

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

Response: All University programs that require accreditation for professional licensure or certification remain fully accredited and in compliance. Additional programs are accredited because faculty and leadership perceive benefits to accreditation, including alignment with disciplinary standards and measures of quality. The institution has accredited programs in each college or school at UC. Examples of recent reaccreditation visits from external agencies include:

- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
- National Association of Schools of Art and Design
- American Bar Association
- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
- American Psychological Association
- American Chemical Society

The university maintains a complete list of accredited programs, which is included in the sources below.

4.A.6.

Prompt: The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs 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, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).

Response: The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) collaborates with the Division of Experience-Based Learning and Career Education (ELCE), the Lindner College of Business (LCB) to collect data assuring that degrees and certificates are preparing students to meet their academic and career goals. According to the National Association of Colleges and Employers' (NACE) standards, student outcomes are collected six months after graduation.

The Office of Institutional Research uses data from the National Student Clearinghouse to determine if students are enrolled in graduate school or other continuing education and collaborates with the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family services to obtain tax records verifying students' employment within Ohio. Student outcomes not available in either of these two sources were supplemented with surveys conducted by Experience-Based Learning and Career Education and Lindner College of Business.

OIR was able to obtain outcomes for 90.8% of undergraduate students and 50.0% of graduate and professional students completing degrees in the 2015-2016 fiscal year. Of undergraduate students with known outcomes, 60.8% were employed, 30.2% were enrolled in continuing education and 8.8% were seeking employment. ELCE reached out to the students who were seeking employment to offer further support. Of graduate and professional students with known outcomes, 82.6% were employed and 17.4% were enrolled in continuing education. Since less information was available about graduate and professional students' post-secondary outcomes, we are unable to determine how many students from graduate and professional programs are unemployed. Institutional Research is

researching consortia that would allow access to tax records from multiple states, which would allow for a higher overall knowledge rate of post-graduation outcomes.

Sources

- Post-Graduation Outcomes Dashboard:
<https://dataanalytics.uc.edu/#/site/Provost/views/Post-GraduationOutcomesfor2015-2016UCGraduates/UCPost-GraduationOutcomes2015-2016?:iid=1>
- PDF copies uploaded to Box: [https://uc.app.box.com/files/0/f/11808226932/4.A.6 -
_Kettil_Decercreutz%3B_Susana_Luzuriaga](https://uc.app.box.com/files/0/f/11808226932/4.A.6_-_Kettil_Decercreutz%3B_Susana_Luzuriaga)
- <http://www.uc.edu/about/accreditation.html>

4.B. – Core Component

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co- curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Argument

4.B.1.

Prompt: The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

Response: Assessment is part of the regular business of the University of Cincinnati. At the time of this writing, the University has four Undergraduate Baccalaureate Competencies, or learning outcomes (please see criterion 3.C for references to proposed changes to general education). These competencies include:

- Critical Thinking: Analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of information and ideas from multiple perspectives
- Knowledge Integration: Fusion of information and concepts from multiple disciplines
- Effective Communication: Competence in oral, visual, and written language; use of resources and technology for communication
- Social Responsibility: Application of knowledge and skills gained from the undergraduate experience for the advancement of a diverse society

In addition, the university has identified Information Literacy as an essential skill that supports each of the competencies and which must permeate every component of the General Education Core.

All academic degree programs have learning outcomes defined by the faculty that correspond to the undergraduate competencies in ways specific to the measures and requirements of the discipline and that are housed and updated, as noted above, which is our primary repository for learning outcomes, documentation of course contribution to general education competencies, and a log of continuous curricular improvement. As a way to ensure full utilization of the eCurriculum 2.0 system (see criterion 3.A.1. and 3.A.2.), we have designed our workflow so that the only way to add courses to Catalyst is through the automated approval process housed within eCurriculum 2.0.

Furthermore, assessment plans and curriculum matrixes outlining student attainment of the general education competencies for all baccalaureate programs were created and approved through an iterative process via the Academic Committee for every degree program following the University's conversion to semesters in 2012.

Annual assessment reports are submitted via an annual check-in survey. Since 1997 all undergraduate programs annually collect and report student achievement data via the general education assessment survey. In addition, the University regularly collects program assessment plan updates, findings, and actions; analyzes and reports on DFW rates university-wide and targets key courses for strategic support through the Great Gateways program; collects and reports on pass rates for national exams; and reviews employer data and feedback for coops and internships. Graduate programs report on a 7-year cycle as part of an internal and external program review process. In addition, units comply with required assessment for professional accreditation on a regular basis. Our Center for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning, in partnership with the Academic Committee and Institutional Research, provide documents, workshops, and consultations to guide in the collection, analysis, and refinement of student learning measures and data.

In addition to the processes and supports described above, the Office of Institutional Research regularly administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and data from these survey are shared across campus as described in 4.B.2.

4.B.2.

Prompt: The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

Response: Data from each process referenced above is collected through regular assessment and shared through governance processes and bodies, which include regular college meetings, the annual budget process, the Academic Committee, Associate Deans Council, the General Education Council, and Faculty Senate. It should be noted that undergraduate and graduate students sit on many of these bodies.

As a result of this continuous improvement process we have made numerous curricular and programmatic changes to benefit greater achievement of student learning outcomes. Recent examples include the following:

- The Provost Office and CET&L partnering with STEM faculty to further support active learning models in foundational science courses such as General Chemistry, Calculus, Applied Calculus, and Anatomy and Physiology, along with providing professional development support and strategic funding for instructor support through the process of course refinement.
- The allocation of central funding to support the analysis of post-semester conversion data to create a predictive model for individual student success and resource-building for foundational, high-DFW courses.
- The piloting of a peer-supported recitation model in Econ1001.
- The College of Allied Health Sciences combined first-year learning communities and academic course content to facilitate shared discussions between courses and learning communities to ensure stronger retention
- The university committed to create a set of pathways in mathematics

attached to meta-majors, health, social and STEM, which included determining discipline-specific and program-based Quantitative Reasoning needs rather than send all students through a shared track. As of today, there are 50 programs requiring various quantitative reasoning competencies.

- The 2018 merger of the Learning Assistance Center and the Center for First Year Experience and Learning Communities along with an investment of new permanent funding to create the Learning Commons. This Commons provides centralized academic support for University of Cincinnati students by bringing together faculty, best-practices in teaching and learning, and hundreds of outstanding peer educators to create flexible academic-success programming. This year more than 6,000 students will take advantage of Learning Commons programs to build confidence, integrate on campus, and master challenging course content.
- The ongoing refinement of our general education program and processes are the result of assessment for continuous program improvement. The most recent modifications include: new student learning outcomes for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and for Career Education (see 3.B.2), an enhanced review process for new general education courses, and the increased use of VALUE rubrics for the assessment of Effective communication and critical thinking.

The culture of assessment is of course strongest in those colleges that maintain specialized accreditation. Therefore, recent efforts have been concentrated in the College of Arts and Sciences and other non-accredited programs. Supports include: establishing a position within the Provost's Office for a Faculty Assessment Fellow from Arts & Sciences to provide faculty leadership in assessment practices and serve as a bridge between administrative and faculty efforts at improving processes—the creation of this position has led to a serious discussion regarding the inclusion of assessment roles and responsibilities in the annual review processes for chairs and program directors; instituting a formal assessment plan revision cycle for unaccredited Arts & Sciences programs to better support implementation efforts and recognize ongoing excellence in assessment; and the adoption of the Assessment of Student Learning Report as an annual document to centrally house discipline-specific efforts as well as

provide context and continuity to local and university-wide assessment practices.

Co-curricular assessment is annually conducted by the Office of Student Affairs, with concentrated program reviews occurring on a three-year cycle. All assessment plans utilize guidelines for continuous improvement as defined by the National Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. Collected data is shared in aggregate via an annual report. Unit-specific data is also shared via key academic partnerships. For example, there is a regular sharing of data between the Learning Commons with Great Gateways faculty and programs for the purposes of continuous program improvement and stronger student success. In addition to unit-based partnerships, Student Affairs also sponsors an annual assessment conference and maintains a Student Affairs Assessment Council as a central resource and forum for continuous improvement efforts.

Minutes from the annual assessment meetings, as well as survey data, student satisfaction survey data, NSSE data, student success data, employment data, graduation rates, retention, and data from experiential learning can be found on the university's assessment website. Some of this information requires log-in credentials.

4.B.3.

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

Response: University findings are made public in aggregate by college via an assessment web portal, which includes college-based reports, NSSE, and general education assessment results and other college-specific data. In addition, regular meetings are held at the college level to present central data and identify target areas for improvement and follow-up. As of Spring 2017, we have committed to and begun the process of integrating college-based assessment data into the annual budget process.

As part of the regular collegiate assessment meetings, colleges identify areas for improvement. In some colleges, these plans are developed at the school or unit level. For example, the Lindner College of Business curricular

mapping indicated inadequate attention to social responsibility when the college converted their programs to semesters. These data were then reviewed at the college level and courses were modified to increase attention to this learning outcome. Specifically, the Professionalism Academics Communication and Engagement (PACE) program was put in place as part of this process. Likewise, analysis has shown that the participation in experiential learning during the first-year increases retention

4.B.4.

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

Response: Faculty participation is central to UC's culture of assessment and continuous improvement. All programs are expected to participate in the assessment process and are held accountable to this expectation through the annual survey and report, the results of which are shared with their Dean. In addition, UC maintains a standing, university-wide Academic Committee, which is instrumental in the oversight of the development and implementation of current assessment plans at the program and college-level. The Academic Committee's membership was modified in 2016 to be inclusive of all colleges. The Institution has also begun piloting the use of VALUE rubrics in effective communication and critical thinking and is supporting this effort through a series of workshops and consultations. In our most recent assessment cycle more than 70% of the senior class was assessed and approximately 1/3 of the rubrics were derived from the VALUE tool set.

In addition, the Academic Committee, in partnership with CET&L, sponsors regular professional development activities in support of assessment, including: college or unit-specific workshops, course design institutes, and consultations. In addition, the committee recently was instrumental in sponsoring an Assessment Day, for which they invited Dr. Tom Angelo, a nationally renowned expert on academic assessment, to give several seminars on best practices in assessment.

Sources

- Student Affairs Annual Report AACU VALUE Rubrics
- Alumni survey Destination report
- NSSE
- Student Satisfaction Survey
- Learning Assistance Center report to Great Gateways
- Assessment Toolkit
- Academic Committee
- Associate Deans Meeting Minutes
- Student Affairs Assessment Council
- Template for SA assessment reporting
- Template of check-in survey
- Template of Gen-ed survey
- Graduate exit survey
- Sample assessment plans Sample assessment reports Sample gen-ed reports
- College assessment reports/feedback for FY budgeting Workshops
- eCurriculum Blackboard training
- Link to ODHE OTM:
<https://www.ohiohighered.org/transfer/policy/overview>

4.C. – Core Component

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to 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 but 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

4.C.1.

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

Response: The University of Cincinnati has and works against as a guiding document a fully vetted and Board of Trustees approved Completion Plan. This plan aligns with the Academic Strategic Plan to attain First-time Full-time Baccalaureate Retention and Graduation rates of 90% and 75% respectively. The university continues to make steady progress toward these goals. And we are mindful of these targets as we craft our class and plan and extend support services for our students. The success metrics of

the university are managed through UC's Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) structure and assessed annually. Our plan is disaggregated to take into account student preparation, familiarity with the college process, and financial considerations. SEM works through standing committees and ad hoc task forces to focus on specific population needs such as transfer and transition students, first generation students, under-represented students and First Years.

4.C.2.

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

Response: The Office of Institutional Research analyzes retention, persistence, and completion data on an annual basis. Institutional-level data are published on the university's website, in accordance with the federal "Student Right-to-Know" act. Program-level retention and graduation rates are available on the university's Tableau server website for internal users with appropriate credentials. The internal versions of the retention and graduation rates also include filters for bio-demographic variables such as first-generation and Learning Communities status. The Provost's Office and Enrollment Management use college-level and program-level retention and graduation rates in concert with academic preparation measures of incoming students to project retention and graduation rate goals for each college. Degree completions are compiled and reported to the Ohio Department of Higher Education as well as to IPEDS. Completions are a critical and dominant part of the State Share of Instruction formula for distribution of funding from the state of Ohio.

4.C.3.

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

Response: The Academic Strategic Plan to achieve first-time, full-time baccalaureate retention and graduation rates of 90% and 75%, respectively, are assessed annually through UC's Strategic Enrollment Management structure and through annual Deans' performance reviews.

In 2015, as part of a state initiative, the University of Cincinnati initiated a Complete College Ohio plan that recognizes these targets. This data-driven, detailed plan remains a priority. Annual updates are made to the state. It is also important to note that the University is incentivized to bring students to successful course and degree completion, as both successful grades and degrees awarded are reported to the Ohio Department of Higher Education every year. These completion metrics are important factors in the State Share of Instruction formula utilized in the distribution of funding among Ohio public institutions.

These institutional goals and incentives, as well as the ease with which colleges and student service offices can analyze their outcomes, have created a virtuous culture involving the regular tracking of outcomes. This focused practice has in turn created further analysis. As a result, the internal versions of the retention and graduation rates dashboards now include filters for bio-demographic variables such as first-generation and Learning Communities participation. Other dashboards that have been developed to promote student success and that receive significant use are the DFW reports and the "15 to Finish" dashboard. Both of these have revealed new evidence that has in turn helped in the creation of new policies and practices that have already shown successful results. For example, DFW rates for courses have declined from 13.8% in 2013 to 9.1% in 2017 (see attached evidence in Appendix V in Federal Compliance report). The "15-to-Finish" dashboard demonstrated that students who took 15 or more credit hours in their first semester were more likely to be retained than students who took 14 or less credit hours, regardless of ACT/SAT scores. This information, which confirms trends in higher education findings, is already changing the way UC advises students, so that advisors strongly recommend their students to focus on their studies, as students who are potentially working and studying are more likely to struggle and leave (see attached snapshots in Appendix V)

In terms of planning, the office of the provost and enrollment management use college-level and program-level retention and graduation rates in concert with academic preparation measures of incoming students to project retention and graduation rate goals for each college. These conversations provide significant help for Business Administrators in each

college, who utilize these projections in creating their budget projections.

At the graduate level, the Graduate School performs program reviews on a specific seven-year cycle schedule. The program review process includes external reviewers, who are provided with program review reports. These reports rely on the dashboards created for this purpose, and these dashboards include outcome metrics such as time-to-degree, completions, etc.

In terms of Post-Graduation Outcomes, the University has devoted significant resources in order to obtain better and faster employment information for our graduates. Since 2016, the University has partnered with the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services to obtain these data in an efficient format. The Office of Institutional Research combined these data with continuing education data from National Student Clearinghouse, and those dashboards enabled the reporting of 91% of post-graduation outcome statuses for the graduating class of 2015-16. This information is now publicly available on the University's website, and internally it has been shared with greater detail to key constituents, such as provost's senior staff, college advisors, etc. We are optimistic that this research and information, especially when coupled with continuous annual updates, will continue to provide opportunities for improvement.

Additionally, analysis of UC data on a range of student engagement factors known to impact student retention, persistence, and completion has resulted in specific investments and strategy implementation to advance our culture of student success. Examples include: the Great Gateways initiative to focus on success of faculty leading courses for large-enrollment first year courses; the Early Alert initiative to facilitate student/faculty/advisor insight, contact, and intervention for early- and mid-term student success; significant investment in primary role academic advisor positions to meet national practice standards and support intrusive advising; design of learning community structures to support effective degree pathways; and Student Affairs support programming.

4.C.4.

Prompt: 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.)

Response: The University of Cincinnati uses IPEDS definitions to identify the cohort tracked for retention and graduation rates. This cohort includes all first-time, full-time baccalaureate degree-seeking undergraduate students. There are very few associate degree programs on the Clifton campus, but these students are grouped together in a cohort for tracking purposes. Since 2015, the university has conducted a National Student Clearinghouse audit prior to the beginning of each semester to identify freshman applicants who had postsecondary enrollment between their high school graduation date and application to UC. The Office of Enrollment Management examines these students and if necessary, reclassifies them as transfer students. This practice ensures that the cohort used for graduation rates is truly comprised of first-time students.

Sources

- Ohio

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

Sources

- <http://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/aas/docs/AdvStrPln/UC%20Campus%20Completion%20Plan%202>