

## **THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

### **GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND RESOURCES FOR WRITING THE REPORT**

Purpose of the Team Report: The Capacity and Preparatory Review (C&PR) Team Report conveys to the Commission the team's findings and recommendations about the institution's overall demonstration of fulfillment of the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity, and the level of institutional preparedness to undertake the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Team Chair's Responsibility for the Report: The Chair sends the draft team report to the team and staff liaison for any revisions, then sends the draft report to the institution for correction of errors of fact. Following the institution's response with any errors of fact, the Chair makes any revisions to the Team Report deemed necessary (revisions beyond correction of errors of fact are at the discretion of the Team Chair). The Team Chair then sends the following to the WASC office:

1. Title page (see attachment for sample)
2. Table of Contents that indicates the location of each of the sections of the Team Report
3. Final Capacity and Preparatory Review Team Report
4. The *Chair's Confidential Team Recommendation* form (it is important that this form go only to the WASC office and not to the institution)

WASC Office responsibility for the Report: WASC staff will include the following with the C&PR Team Report before it goes to the Commission:

1. Team roster for the C&PR Review
2. Summary data form for the institution
3. Institutional accrediting history
4. Institutional Proposal
5. Last Commission Action Letter

Report Length and Page Format: The Report should be double-spaced, using 12 font, and include page headers and page numbers. Team Reports are generally 25-30 pages in length.

Resources: *Handbook of Accreditation*; the consensus Team Conference Call Worksheet; *Applying the Standards of Accreditation: One Set of Standards, Two Reviews/Two Lenses*; *Guide to the Use of Evidence in the WASC Process*.

## **FORMAT FOR THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

### **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT (approx. 10-15% of entire report)**

#### **IA - Description of Institution and Visit**

Briefly describe the nature of the institution and its recent accreditation history.

#### **IB - Quality of the Capacity and Preparatory Report and Alignment with the Proposal**

In this section, the team should describe briefly the design of the C&PR Report in the institution's Proposal and how the institution implemented the design in its C&PR Report. The way in which the institution implements the Proposal should be considered an indicator of its capacity and commitment to engage in serious self-review and improvement.

The team should comment on the overall quality of the C&PR Institutional Presentation: the kind and quality of data and exhibits, the clarity of the report organization, and whether the Institutional Presentation reflected accurately the condition of the institution at the time of the team visit.

*Questions the team may wish to consider:*

- Was the Institutional Presentation consistent with the model of review accepted by the Proposal Review Committee, or, if the institution departed from the approved design, to what extent were the departures explained, appropriate, and contributive to the review?
- What was the extent of institutional involvement in the C&PR Report? How were faculty included in discussion of the issues addressed and recommendations reached?
- Did the institution design the review as a rigorous inquiry with searching questions, appropriate methodology, and effective use of evidence?
- In what ways did the data and evidence support the claims made by the institution in addressing the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity?
- Did the institution's self-review lead to a deeper understanding of its capacity and of its infrastructure for data collection and analysis?

#### **IC - Response to Previous Commission Issues**

The Team Report should comment on how effectively the institution responded to issues highlighted by the Commission in its previous action letter as well as the major recommendations of the last evaluation team.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS (approx. 60 -70% of entire report)**

The Standards of Accreditation provide the warrant and framework for the team’s review and Commission action. For established institutions, the Standards are not intended to be applied mechanically or slavishly, and it is not necessary to comment on each Criterion for Review (CFR). The Commission has found it helpful, however, for teams to identify, where appropriate, the Standards and CFRs as references for their analyses, making clear where the CFR is a useful guide to a comment or suggestion, and where the team has found that the institution has not met specific CFRs or Standards at the level of minimum compliance.

Normally, the Team Report is organized around the four Standards. For each issue cited by the team for institutional attention, there should be a response to each of the following:

1. A statement of the evidence reviewed by the team in addressing each issue
2. Team analysis and commentary on the effectiveness of institutional practice or actions and how the institution has acted on the evidence it has gathered
3. The findings of the team with respect to the issue
4. Recommendations/suggestions for improvement including steps or actions that need to be taken to address specific issues
5. Areas where the institution exemplifies good practice

If the institution has selected an approach to its report other than the comprehensive model, e.g., strategic planning, audit, or themes, the Team Report should be organized in the same manner as the institution’s report. As the review still needs to take place under the framework of the Standards of Accreditation, the team would then address and reference the Standards and CFRs, where appropriate, in the context of the approach used by the institution.

Problems or concerns found under Commission Standards should be identified, but summary judgments of compliance or non-compliance with the Standards should be avoided in the body of the report. The Confidential Team Recommendation assists the Commission in determining whether an institution complies with the Standards.

*Questions the team may wish to consider:*

- Are there adequate resources for the institution to fulfill its mission effectively and continue to operate?
- How has the institution identified for itself its major challenges, and are there processes and plans underway to address them?
- Has the institution moved beyond its mission statement to an operationalized sense of its purpose and its place in the higher education community?
- Is there effective planning that takes into account human, physical, technological and financial needs, and sets clear priorities?
- Is there effective institutional alignment in its actions and resource allocations with the institution’s priorities, educational mission and educational goals?
- What is the quality of the analysis of graduation and retention rates, in what ways has the institution disaggregated data, and has the institution been clear about the steps it is taking to improve retention?

### **SECTION III – MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (approx. 10-15% of entire report)**

This concluding section identifies for the Commission and the institution the team's major findings and summarizes its major recommendations. Major recommendations should be supported by commentary in the body of the team report. While a number of team recommendations and suggestions may be made in the body of the report, Section III should highlight only those considered most significant for the institution to address. Where appropriate, the Commission has found it helpful for teams to identify Standards and CFRs when recommendations for improvement are made.

The Team Chair should complete and append the Confidential Recommendation Form (*submitted ONLY to the WASC office*) to reflect the team's recommended accrediting action.

### **SECTION IV - PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW (5% of entire report)**

This final section of the Report provides observations and advisements to assist the institution to refine and improve its preparation for Educational Effectiveness Review.

*Questions the team may wish to consider:*

- To what extent is the institution currently engaged in implementing the design for the forthcoming Educational Effectiveness Review as committed to in the Institutional Proposal?
- What refinements does the team recommend for the Institutional Presentation, data being gathered, or the design of the review?
- Are there infrastructure and capacity issues relating to the Educational Effectiveness review?

The possible team recommendations are listed in the Confidential Team Recommendation Form. Please note that if the team does not believe that the normal one-year period between the C&PR and EE Reviews provides sufficient time for the institution to demonstrate in a meaningful way its commitment to Educational Effectiveness, or to address recommendations made from the C&PR, it may recommend to the Commission that the period between reviews be extended to 18 months (or even longer), with clear expectations for institutional performance by the time of the EE Review.

(Sample Title Page Format)

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

To \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Institution)

Date

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Reaffirmation of Accreditation, Initial Accreditation, or Candidacy)

Team Roster  
List Names of Chair, Assistant Chair and Team Members

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.