

THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT

GENERAL DIRECTIONS AND RESOURCES FOR WRITING THE REPORT

Purpose of the Report: The Educational Effectiveness (EE) Team Report conveys to the Commission the team's findings and recommendations following each of the two visits (Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review) and provides the team's summative judgment about the institution's overall Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness.

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 Educational Effectiveness 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 Educational Effectiveness Team Report before it goes to the Commission:

1. Team rosters for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C-PR) and EE Reviews
2. Summary data form for the institution
3. Institutional accrediting history
4. Institutional Proposal
5. Preparatory Review Team Report
6. Commission Action Letter following the Preparatory Review

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 30-40 pages in length.

Resources: *Handbook of Accreditation*; the consensus Team Conference Call Worksheet; *Guide to the Use of Evidence in the WASC Process*; *Applying the Standards of Accreditation*; *Supplemental Guide to Educational Effectiveness*.

FORMAT FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT

SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT (approx. 10-20% of entire report)

IA - Description of Institution and Visit

Briefly describe the institution, its recent accrediting history, and provide a limited chronology of both visits to help the Commission understand the sequence of visits and reports.

IB - Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Presentation and Alignment with the Proposal

In this section, the team should describe briefly the design of the Proposal and how the institution carried out the Educational Effectiveness Review. The way in which the institution implements the Proposal is itself a demonstration of its commitment to engage in serious self-review and improvement. The team should comment on the quality of the EE Institutional Presentation: the accompanying evidence; 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 include:

- 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 EE 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 evidence support the claims made by the institution in addressing the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness?

IC - Preparatory Review Update

In this section, the team should provide a brief update on any issues identified in the Capacity and Preparatory Review (C-PR) for consideration in the Educational Effectiveness Review and any other major changes that occurred since the EE Review.

SECTION II - EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (approx. 65-75% of entire report)

Core Commitment: The purpose of Section II is to help the Commission understand how the institution has met the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness. The team should address two major topics, in whichever order is appropriate: the team's evaluation of the particular model or approach the institution has taken in the EE Review, and the team's evaluation of the institution's ongoing and intentional systems for enhancing teaching effectiveness and learning results. (see *Handbook of Accreditation*, p. 46-47).

Citing the Standards: Whichever way the team decides to approach its organization of Section II, it should consult and cite the WASC Standards of Accreditation and Criteria for Review wherever appropriate, especially Standards II and IV. The Standards 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.

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.

Review of Evidence: Team findings should be based on demonstrated institutional performance and should include consideration of actual learning results. Promises of future performance should be evaluated on the basis of a sufficient existing track record of past performance, institutional commitment, and a realistic plan of implementation that is well underway. The Commission expects all institutions to be well along in developing and applying key quality indicators, and to have developed learning outcomes for its programs, and where appropriate, schools and the institution as a whole. The identification of learning outcomes is, in itself, not intended to be an end point, but the beginning of engagement leading to inquiry and assessment, and faculty dialogue, about such areas as the alignment of courses to program outcomes, what assessment data reveal (or do not reveal), and how program reviews are linked to assessment of student learning and program effectiveness.

IIA - Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

This section should receive the greatest part of the team's attention. The Institutional Presentation should demonstrate to the Commission the institution's ability to work with self-identified issues related to the improvement of student learning. The organization of this section should parallel the structure of the institution's Educational Effectiveness Report (approach, issues, or themes). Whatever model the institution has used, the team's analyses and recommendations should be framed by the team's professional judgment and the Commission's Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines. For each approach/issue/ theme:

- (1) Identify the evidence reviewed by the team in addressing each issue
- (2) Evaluate the appropriateness, quality, and effectiveness of the evidence in relation to the inquiry undertaken by the institution
- (3) Evaluate the appropriateness, quality, and effectiveness of the *methodologies* used to undertake the inquiry
- (4) Verify, validate, and assess the institution's *analysis* of the issues
- (5) Comment on how the institution engaged in and evaluated the *results of student learning*
- (6) Evaluate the institution's *conclusions, recommendations, and improvement plans*
- (7) Evaluate any *actions* taken to implement the plans
- (8) Identify any *areas of good practice*, such as innovative practices in pedagogy or curriculum, including linkage to specific learning results and how the institution is using the data for improvement
- (9) State the *team findings and recommendations* with regard to each issue, topic, or theme.

Questions the team may wish to consider include:

- To what extent did the institution work directly with the results of student learning and what was the quality of the evidence used?
- As a consequence of the review, has the institution been able to deepen its understanding of student learning for these topics, including evaluation of the results of student learning and setting targets and benchmarks for improvement?
- Is there an alignment of the study with the core processes of the institution discussed in Section IIB?
- How representative is this inquiry of the institution's overall and ongoing practices of quality assurance and how consistently are such approaches and improvement efforts applied across the institution?
- Did the review process lead to specific recommendations and improvement efforts?
- What evidence is there that the institution has shared promising or emerging practices with others at the institution?
- Can the team identify exemplary or emerging practices that should be shared with the region?

IIB - Evaluation of the Institution's Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Results

Whatever approach the institution may use for its EE Presentation, the team should describe and evaluate its overall system of quality assurance and improvement. The team should briefly review and then evaluate the institution's design and the approaches it takes to assure quality in teaching and learning; how it provides support for teaching and learning; the kinds of evidence it routinely collects; and the way in which such evidence is used to support further inquiry and ongoing improvement.

Questions the team may wish to consider include:

- To what extent are there intentional systems of quality assurance to improve teaching and learning?

- What is the alignment between the institution's quality assurance processes and the mission and educational purposes and objectives of the institution?
- Does the quality assurance process provide for review of actual student work and learning results?
- How does the institution assure itself that the work of its graduates consistently reflects the level and quality identified in its educational objectives?
- Is there evidence that the institution uses disaggregated data to regularly discuss and formulate action plans for retention to graduation? (May have been discussed in the C-PR Report)
- Do student affairs and academic support units have goals and outcomes and are they aligned with the educational purposes and goals of the institution? Do these units undergo periodic review for their effectiveness?

IIC – Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs

In this section, the EE Team Report should identify any gaps in presentation as articulated in the Institutional Proposal, and the data and analysis provided in the C-PR and EE Reports, with the institution's demonstration that it meets and/or exceeds the Standards and CFRs.

SECTION III - INTEGRATIVE CHAPTER AND SUMMARY OF TEAM CONCLUSIONS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW (approx. 5-10% of entire report)

Since the Commission will be taking culminating action following the Educational Effectiveness review, in this final section of the Report, the team is expected to:

1. Comment on how well the institution has fulfilled the outcomes for the review that it stated in its Proposal for the Review.
2. Summarize briefly the major conclusions from both reviews to highlight for the Commission those issues that are most salient for this institution
3. Comment briefly on the effectiveness of the entire review cycle and the impact it had on the institution
4. List those major recommendations from both reviews needing follow-up before the next accreditation review cycle. With each major recommendation cited by the team, there should be supporting text in the body of the Report that provides the underlying evidence to support the recommendation. In Section II of the Report, the team may make suggestions and recommendations that the institution may wish to consider. In this section, however, the team should separate out the limited number of major recommendations that are of the type that the institution would be expected to address before its next review. The team should reiterate specific references to the Standards and Criteria for Review, wherever appropriate. Summary judgments of the institution's compliance or non-compliance are to be avoided.
5. Complete the Confidential Recommendation Form (*submitted ONLY to the WASC office*) to reflect the team's confidential recommended accrediting action.

(Sample Title Page Format)

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS 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 Core Commitments 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.