

## WASC FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

| Key Descriptive Terms →<br>↓ ELEMENT & DEFINITION   | INITIAL  | EMERGING   | DEVELOPED   | HIGHLY DEVELOPED  |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Learning Outcomes:</b><br><b>A.</b> Are established, referenced in publications, cited and used by faculty and advisors: | For only a few programs and units; only vaguely (if at all) for GE; not referenced in publications; only a few faculty know and use for designing curriculum, assignments, or assessment | For many programs and units, and most GE aspects; beginning to be referenced in basic documents; beginning to be used by some faculty as reference for design of curriculum, assignments, and assessment | For all units (academic & co-curricular), and for GE; cited often but not in all appropriate places; most faculty cite; used in most programs for design of curriculum, assignments, and assessment | For all units (academic and co-curricular), and for GE; cited widely by faculty and advisors; used by all faculty to design curricula, assignments, and assessment                                  |
| <b>B.</b> Outcomes are assessed:  | Occasionally, using surveys and self reports; seldom using direct assessment; rarely leading to revision of pedagogy   | Occasionally, principally using surveys; beginning to move beyond self reports toward some direct assessment; seldom leading to revision of pedagogy   | Periodically, sometimes using authentic and performance-based methods; may lack documentation; pedagogy is occasionally reviewed and revised  | Regularly; using multiple methods, including authentic and performance-based; pedagogy systematically reviewed and revised based on assessment data   |
| <b>C.</b> Learning is demonstrably achieved:  | At levels that may not be up to standards; concerns that standards set by institution are too low for a baccalaureate-level institution  | For most students at levels set by the institution; faculty are beginning to discuss results   | For all students at or above levels set by institution; results discussed periodically by most faculty  | For all students at or above levels set by institution; results are discussed regularly and deliberately by all faculty   |
| <b>Teaching and Learning Processes:</b><br><b>A.</b> Curricula & pedagogy are:  | Not visibly aligned with outcomes; few programs have evidences of achievement beyond mere completion of designated courses   | Beginning to be aligned with established learning outcomes, with achievement demonstrated in some areas beyond mere completion of designated courses   | Broadly aligned with learning out-comes; in most programs, student achievement beyond the mere completion of designated courses is demonstrated in most areas                                       | Highly visible, fully aligned with learning outcomes; in all programs, achievement beyond mere completion of designated courses is demonstrated at both the program (comprehensive) & course levels |
| <b>B.</b> Curricular processes are:   | Rarely informed by good learning practices; few curricula reviewed, mostly without reference to evidences of student learning  | Informed in a few instances by good learning practices; some curricula reviewed and improved but with little reference to evidences of student learning  | Informed in many cases by good learning practice; reviewed and improved by relevant faculty; often based on evidences of student learning   | Regularly informed by good learning practice (such as employing assessment-as-learning), consistently the result of scholarly reflection by relevant faculty based on evidences of student learning |
| <b>Organizational Learning:</b><br><b>A.</b> Indicators of educational effectiveness are:                                   | Not effectively in place   | Found in some areas; dissemination of performance results is beginning; no reference to benchmarks   | Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated; some performance benchmarks set and used for comparison  | Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated widely, compared to program benchmarks in all programs  |
| <b>B.</b> Program Review is:  | Rare, if at all, with little or no useful data being generated   | Occasional, in some departments or units, with the results being infrequently used to suggest process improvements   | Frequent, in most divisions or units, with results being used at the departmental level to reflect on effectiveness   | Deliberate, systematic, and institution-wide, with results being broadly disseminated and used to improve the processes   |
| <b>C.</b> Faculty, staff, and institutional leaders are:  | Not visibly committed to a culture of evidence except in isolated cases  | Supportive at top levels only, or sporadically and unevenly, for the development of a culture of evidence  | Supportive of a culture of evidence at top levels, by most mid-level personnel, and some faculty and staff  | Visibly committed to creating and sustaining a "culture of evidence" in planning at all levels  |
| <b>D.</b> Performance data are:   | Not in evidence in any decision processes or used for improvement in any programs  | Beginning to be considered in making improvement decisions at institutional level and in some program levels   | Frequently considered by decision-making bodies at all levels, but with few documents of data use or outcomes   | Consistently obtained, used and documented by decision-making bodies for program improvement at all levels  |
| <b>E.</b> In reference to accreditation processes, the institution is:  | Apparent indifference to Commission actions or expectations and/or failure of leadership to resource and expect such implementation; little, if any, momentum                            | Hesitant or partial implementation of prior Commission actions, some concerns whether momentum can be sustained after Commission review  | Has taken formal actions and/or begun processes to implement prior Commission actions in most programs; momentum and impact need to be verified   | Promptly and fully incorporates prior Commission actions, showing forward momentum and a positive trajectory in virtually all programs and units  |
| <b>Overall:</b> The institution can best be described as follows:   | Committed to some aspects of Educational Effectiveness; if other areas are not addressed, continuing reaffirmation of accreditation is threatened  | Promising commitments to Educational Effectiveness in most areas; significant number of areas noted for improvement  | Mostly well-established commitments to Educational Effectiveness; some areas for improvement  | Operates at an exemplary level in addressing its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness   |