

**WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES
ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS TO SUPPORT THE PREPARATORY REVIEW
Sample Data Exhibit Formats

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
1. Admissions and Student Preparation	3
1.1 Admissions Activities by Level	3
1.2 Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students	6
1.3 Admissions by Gender	9
1.4 Admissions by Race/Ethnicity	9
2. Student Enrollments	12
2.1 Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective	12
2.2 Headcount Enrollments by Gender	14
2.3 Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity	14
2.4 Students Receiving Financial Aid	17
3. Degrees Awarded	19
3.1 Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program	19
3.2 Cohort Graduation, Retention and Transfer Rates	21
4. Faculty and Staff Composition	23
4.1 Faculty Composition	23
4.2 Faculty Headcount by Department/Program	25
4.3 Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	27
4.4 Full-Time Faculty/Staff Turnover Over the Last 5 Years	29
5. Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources	31
5.1 Information and Computing Resources	31
5.2 Physical Resources—Current Year	33
5.3 Sources of Revenue	35
5.4 Operating Expenditures	38
5.5 Assets and Liabilities	41
5.6 Capital Investments	44
5.7 Endowment Values and Performance	46
6. Institutional and Operating Efficiency	48
6.1 Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios	48
6.2 Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios	50
6.3 Key Financial Ratios	52
7. Assessment Activities	54
7.1 Assessment Activities	54
8. Proposal Table Formats (for updating)	56

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS TO SUPPORT THE PREPARATORY REVIEW: A SUPPLEMENT TO THE *WASC HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION*

As noted in the *WASC Handbook of Accreditation* (p.42), all institutions are required to submit "prescribed exhibits and data displays including lists of institutional policies required by the Commission (stipulated by the CEO and subject to audit on site), together with...detailed breakdowns of student body characteristics; enrollments and degrees granted for the institution's academic programs;...detailed breakdowns on faculty and staff and on fiscal, physical, and information resources; a table listing current assessment activities; and a set of standard statistics on educational operations." By the time of the Preparatory Review, moreover, the institution is expected to have updated and provided to WASC its set of Basic Descriptive Data submitted earlier as part of its Proposal. The purpose of this *Supplement* is to provide guidance to institutions about how to assemble and present this required data as a part of the larger portfolio of evidence that they submit as part of the Preparatory Review.

Background

Both the *Handbook* and *Invitation to Dialogue II* emphasize WASC's intent to move the process of accreditation toward a more visible reliance on concrete evidence. Equally apparent is the Commission's conviction that the process should increasingly center on existing documentation—data and information that the institution has already collected for its own purposes—rather than extensive narrative reporting. Through the accreditation process institutions have an opportunity to systematically assemble and reflect upon existing information, and to use it more intentionally. Finally, the process of review adopted by the Commission with the current *Handbook* will require a more focused use of time by review teams when they visit institutions; this, in turn demands that they know more about the institution before they arrive. All of these changes require a more explicit approach to presenting data about basic institutional characteristics and performance as an integral part of the accreditation process. To meet this requirement, WASC is developing a number of materials including a *Guide to the Use of Evidence in the Accreditation Process*, as well as associated examples and educational materials—including this document.

In developing a set of required data elements to support the Preparatory Review, the Commission was mindful that institutions differ and that there are many legitimate ways to define and display basic institutional data. But it also felt strongly that it must know some specific things about any institution in order to make an informed accreditation decision. Balancing appropriate diversity with the need for some degree of commonality in reporting is always a challenge, and this challenge is at its greatest when quantitative data are involved. To help achieve such a balance, the development of data element requirements for the Preparatory Review was guided by the following principles:

- **Relevance to the Accreditation Process.** In order to be required, a given data element should a) be demonstrably related to a particular Standard or, b) should clearly address a topic that the Commission or a visiting team should legitimately be expected to know about an institution. WASC should thus in each case be able to clearly justify why it needs to know the requested information.
- **Meaningful to Institution.** Required data elements should be seen as an integral part of the larger portfolio of information that the institution assembles for the Preparatory Review. They thus constitute a necessary, but not sufficient, component of this portfolio. As a result, the required data elements, a) should be presented in a manner that is meaningful to the institution and, b) should be explicitly referenced (and, where needed or appropriate, reflected upon or interpreted) in the Institutional Presentation. Furthermore, the data elements required for the Preparatory Review should be seen as a part of a cumulative process of assembling evidence, beginning with the required data tables accompanying the Proposal and culminating with the Educational Effectiveness Review.

- **Diagnostic or Performance-Oriented.** Required data elements should be presented in such a way that they are more than just a collection of numbers. Instead, they should allow visiting teams and the Commission to see the “story” behind the numbers. This means specifically, a) reporting trend data (five years, wherever possible) and, b) reporting appropriate percentages and ratios as well as raw counts.
- **Easily Interpretable.** Required data elements should also be defined and presented in ways that are meaningful and understandable to visiting teams and the Commission. While it is appropriate to allow flexibility in definition to accommodate institutional diversity, this means that they will normally be expected to conform to established definitions (for example, IPEDS, system-reporting requirements for public institutions, or the Common Data Set). It also means that some degree of commonality in data presentation is expected. As a result, this *Supplement* not only lists the required data elements, but also illustrates them with sample displays, which institutions may use for guidance in preparing their own presentations.
- **Minimally Burdensome.** The Commission is aware that while many institutions compile most of the data required, not all do so in a systematic or regular way. For those institutions that possess readily-available data consistent with basic requirements, the principle of minimum burden suggests providing such data in the same manner as institution normally provides it to its various audiences (for example, in the form of regular “Fact Book” displays). For those institutions that do not regularly publish such information, the sample displays provided were designed to assist them in assembling, and deploying the required information. To assist such institutions further, a set of calculational instructions is provided for each sample display, based on existing institutional reporting requirements such as IPEDS.

The Commission believes that these principles allow an appropriate balance to be maintained between institutional diversity and the need to provide reasonably consistent information as part of the accrediting process. Referring to them frequently when questions arise should provide institutions with guidance in assembling the required data elements. The principles should also provide a reasonable foundation for dialogue about each institution’s submission with the Commission.

What’s In This Document?

This *Supplement* reviews required data elements under seven substantive categories of data—for example “student enrollment” or “financial resources.” Each “data element” consists of a basic array of data about some distinct characteristic of the institution within this category, usually involving two or more factors (for instance, “student enrollment by gender” or “institutional revenues by source”). As such, each element corresponds to a distinct data table or display that should be easily understandable to a reviewer.

Data elements are presented in the order in which they are normally portrayed in institutional “Fact Books” or similar data summaries assembled by offices like Institutional Research. But institutions are free to present these required data elements in the order and form which suits them best, so long as all are addressed. As emphasized above, moreover, required data elements should always be considered in the light of the larger portfolio of evidence of which they are a part. In many cases, this may imply a different order of presentation or different forms of presentation than the formats illustrated here. In other cases, the institution may find it more useful or convenient to group all required data elements in one place in the portfolio. Whatever the approach chosen, however, the institution should provide guidance to the review team about where each of the required data elements may be found in the portfolio, perhaps in the form of a concordance table or index.

For each broad category of data, there is first a discussion of why WASC is interested in this topic, with references provided to the Standards where needed. This is intended to help institutions understand the specific questions that the Commission is trying to answer by requiring that the

institution provide this data. Second, follows a discussion of some of the most common definitional or conceptual issues associated with these kinds of data, together with some considerations about how to deal with these issues. After this general discussion of the data category in question, each required data element within the category is listed. For each data element (or, in some cases for a set of related data elements), a brief description is provided, followed by a discussion of specific issues and reporting alternatives that an institution might consider. Finally, a sample data-table format is provided for each data element. In some cases, these will serve simply to illustrate the kinds of displays expected with respect to basic layout, level of detail provided, and types of statistics included—as well as portraying concretely the particular data items that the Commission expects. In other cases, institutions may elect to actually use the formats provided. To aid them in doing so, provides a set of calculational instructions for each sample display, based on standard institutional reporting conventions to IPEDS and other agencies.

Required Data Elements

1. ADMISSIONS AND STUDENT PREPARATION

Why Is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? The Commission is interested in basic data on the admissions function for three main reasons. First, the institution’s continuing ability to attract new students is fundamental to its long-term viability—a central concern of Standards 3 and 4. Changes in overall admissions patterns and yields may signal later changes in maintained enrollments and tuition revenues. They may also indicate changes in the underlying character of the institution’s student body that may bear on its mission. Second, levels of academic preparation or selectivity are related to the institution’s academic mission as noted in Standard 2; changes in these profiles over time may suggest new academic challenges or opportunities in serving students that the institution should be prepared to meet (e.g. CFRs 2.10 and 2.13). Finally, as noted in Standard 1 (CFR 1.5), WASC is concerned with appropriate institutional responses to diversity; therefore, the demographic makeup of an institution’s applicant pool and admissions profiles are of interest.

Issues and Challenges. Admissions procedures may differ not only across institutions, but also across different kinds of academic programs within institutions. This is especially the case for graduate programs, which may be run by individual departments (each with its own record-keeping procedures), and for non-degree programs. Other institutions will be essentially “open-admission” in the sense that they have few or no selection criteria in place. In such cases, some standard admissions yield statistics may not be terribly meaningful, and some kinds of data simply may not be collected for most applicants. In general, the focus of data elements in this category is on undergraduate admissions, and this is where the most complete data will be expected.

Data Element 1.1-- Admissions Activity by Level

Description. Numbers of applicants to the institution, accepted applicants, and admitted applicants actually enrolled by level or type. Examples of levels or type include a) new freshmen, b) undergraduate transfers, c) new masters students, d) new doctoral students, and e) new first professional degree students. Similar entries for non-degree or adult learning programs may be appropriate for some institutions. The table will normally also include appropriate ratios derived from these basic statistics such as admitted applicants /total applicants, enrollees/admitted applicants, and enrollees/total applicants.

Issues and Alternatives. A number of general issues are associated with reporting on admissions activity. Among the most prominent are:

- For many institutions, reporting on traditional fall term admissions activity will be appropriate. Other institutions (especially non-term-based institutions) may wish to adopt a different reporting period—normally a full year.

- Basic information about new freshman and transfers should be supplied for all institutions with undergraduate programs. Graduate programs, however, should be reported in a manner that best suits the institution; in some cases, for instance, all graduate programs might be combined. Similarly, non-degree or adult programs might or might not be included, depending upon the extent to which the institution feels such programs are important.
- Many institutions have separate admissions procedures for individual schools or programs and activity statistics and admissions ratios may differ substantially among them. While there is no requirement to do so, institutions may wish to report on such programs separately.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 1.1

Admissions Activities by Level

These data are for: ____ Fall Terms Only ____ Full Year (Annualized)

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5* N (%)
Freshmen					
Number of applicants					
Number of applicants accepted					
Number of freshmen applicants actually enrolled					
Transfer					
Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission with advanced standing (transfer)					
Number of advanced standing undergraduate applicants accepted					
Number of advanced standing undergraduate applicants actually enrolled					
Masters					
Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to Masters' programs					
Number of applicants accepted for Master's programs					
Number of applicants actually enrolled in Masters' programs					
Doctoral					
Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to Doctoral programs					
Number of applicants accepted for Doctoral programs					
Number of applicants actually enrolled in Doctoral programs					
Professional					
Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to graduate professional programs					
Number of applicants accepted for graduate professional programs					
Number of applicants actually enrolled in graduate professional programs					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 1.2 -- Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students

Description. Test scores and/or other preparation/ability measures for new freshman and entering graduate students (where applicable). The presentation should include a central-tendency measure of some kind for each score or measure reported (e.g. median or mean), together with a range or other variance statistic. It should also include an indication of which students are included in these calculations (e.g. is it limited to regular admission students or include admissions exceptions).

Issues and Alternatives. A number of issues surround the reporting of such measures exist and there will therefore be many ways in which they can be appropriately reported. In general, the institution should use the method that is generally uses in communicating such statistics. Among the most prominent issues here are:

- SAT and ACT scores are the most common admissions tests used by selective institutions. But at the graduate level, many different kinds of tests may be used. Depending upon its admissions policies and program requirements, the institution should report on the most commonly-used measures. Separate entries should be provided for each test or measure used.
- Institutions that have no admissions requirements may or may not find it appropriate to report on test scores, depending on the relevance or availability of such data. In some cases, they may find it best to report high-school performance data such as GPA or the percent in a given high-school performance quartile. In others, they may find it useful to report on the proportion of new students at various preparation levels in key skill areas like reading, writing, and mathematics.
- At some institutions, students may be admitted through alternative procedures in addition to the regular admissions process. And in some cases, preparation/selectivity measure calculations exclude such students. In general, it will be assumed that all entering students are included in any statistics reported, but institutions are free to use their normal approach to compiling and reporting such statistics so long as it is clear that they are doing so.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 1.2

Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students

These data are for: ____ Fall Terms Only ____ Full Year (Annualized)

New Freshmen	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*		Year 5*	
	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range
SAT scores for entering freshmen										
Verbal										
Quantitative										
ACT scores for entering freshmen										
Composite										
Mathematics										
English										
Natural Sciences										
Social Studies										
Other tests used for admission or										
Test 1 name:										
Test 2 name:										
.										
.										
.										
.										
High School GPA										
Percent Requiring Remediation										
Writing										
Reading										
Math										

* Most current year

Entering Graduate Students

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*		Year 5*	
	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range	Median Score	Range
Graduate Record Examination (for total Graduate School excluding professional schools)										
Verbal										
Quantitative										
Analytical										
Other tests used for admission or placement										
Test 1 name:										
Test 2 name:										
.										
.										
.										
.										

* Most current year

Data Element 1.3 – Admissions by Gender**Data Element 1.4 – Admissions by Race/Ethnicity**

Because they are similar, these two data elements are treated together.

Description. Numbers of applicants to the institution, accepted applicants, and admitted applicants actually enrolled by level or type as in 1.1 above, but broken down additionally by gender and by an appropriate array of race/ethnicity descriptors. New freshman and new undergraduate transfer students should be reported separately for all institutions offering undergraduate programs but, unlike 1.1, all other students may be combined. Percentage entries in addition to basic counts should parallel the method used in 1.1.

Issues and Alternatives. In addition to issues basic to admissions activity reporting noted above, the following are important to gender or race/ethnic reporting:

- Race/ethnic categories are currently in flux for IPEDS reporting and the particular categories used may differ from institution to institution. Particular issues may arise in the case of mixed or multiple categories. While current federal categories are assumed as a baseline, institutions should feel free to report race/ethnic breakdowns in the same manner they do so internally.
- International students are currently included in most external reporting requirements and are not treated as a separate category. But if records are available, institutions should feel free to report international students as a separate category.

Sample formats designed to address this requirement follow.

Sample Format 1.3 Admission by Gender

These data are for: ___ Fall Terms Only ___ Full Year (Annualized)

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5* N (%)
New Freshmen					
Total Applicants					
Male					
Female					
Total Admits					
Male					
Female					
Total Enrolled					
Male					
Female					
Undergraduate Transfers					
Total Applicants					
Male					
Female					
Total Admits					
Male					
Female					
Total Enrolled					
Male					
Female					
Graduate Students					
Total Applicants					
Male					
Female					
Total Admits					
Male					
Female					
Total Enrolled					
Male					
Female					

* Most Current Year

Sample Format 1.4 Admissions by Race/Ethnicity

These data are for: _____ Fall Terms Only _____ Full Year (Annualized)

	New Freshmen					Undergraduate Transfers					Graduate Students							
	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian / Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian / Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other	White Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian / Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other
Year 1 N (%)																		
Total Applicants																		
Total Admits																		
Total Enrolled																		
Year 2 N (%)																		
Total Applicants																		
Total Admits																		
Total Enrolled																		
Year 3 N (%)																		
Total Applicants																		
Total Admits																		
Total Enrolled																		
Year 4 N (%)																		
Total Applicants																		
Total Admits																		
Total Enrolled																		
Year 5* N (%)																		
Total Applicants																		
Total Admits																		
Total Enrolled																		

* Most current Year

2. STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? Data on the overall size and character of an institution's student body is critical to understanding any college or university. Accordingly, visiting teams need basic information of this kind in order to prepare for a visit. In addition, the Commission is interested in enrollment data for many of the same reasons it requires information about admissions. Enrollment volume—and especially trends in enrollment—are directly related to institutional sustainability as noted by Standards 3 and 4. Particular aspects of the institution's enrollments—for example, the proportions enrolling in specific types of programs—help determine the institution's actual or "behavioral" mission as suggested in Standard 1. Similarly, statistics on numbers of students help the Commission determine the adequacy of the academic resources in place to serve them, as outlined in Standard 3. Finally, information about the demographics of enrollment are related to diversity concerns as noted in Standard 1, while knowing something about the character of the student body helps inform the appropriateness of an institution's efforts to develop suitable learning support for its students, addressed by Standard 2; changes in these profiles over time, in turn, may suggest emerging issues that the institution should be prepared to meet.

Issues and Challenges. While the issue of student enrollments is theoretically straightforward, producing student counts that are appropriate to a particular institutional context raises a number of common conceptual issues. One is the appropriate time period for reporting. If a single number is needed, most institutions (and most states) follow federal conventions of reporting only fall term statistics. But those institutions enrolling large numbers of students in other terms may wish to report annualized unduplicated headcounts instead. A second common issue is how to handle part-time vs. full-time attendance. Some institutions may have large numbers of students attending on a part-time basis, whose actual impact on the institution is less than a smaller number of full-time-attenders. Convention in this case may demand reporting full-time and part-time students separately, or using a full-time-equivalent (FTE) statistic based on credits enrolled for. For greater clarity, institutions in this situation may choose to report FTE-based as well as headcount-based statistics on enrollments. A final common issue is how to address students participating exclusively in non-degree or non-credit instruction. Normally (and consistent with IPEDS reporting conventions), only degree-seeking students are reported in detail (e.g. broken down by demographic group). But there may be instances in which institutions feel that including breakdowns for non-degree students will allow them to better tell their stories. In all such cases, though, institutions should state explicitly that non-degree students are being included.

Data Element 2.1 -- Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective

Description. Numbers of headcount students enrolled at the institution for the time period indicated broken down by the degree or credential which they are seeking. As indicated above, the table could be prepared using only fall term statistics, or could reflect unduplicated headcount enrollments for a full calendar or academic year (so long as this is noted).

Issues and Alternatives. A number of alternatives might be used to reflect individual institutional circumstances, including:

- Reporting for individual terms as well as a full year as an alternative to supplying an unduplicated headcount.
- Using FTE in addition to headcount statistics (as above).
- Aggregating all graduate programs together (or the reverse) for institutions that do not offer particular levels of instruction.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 2.1 Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5 [*] N (%)
Total Awards					
Less than 2-Year Awards					
Associate Degrees					
Bachelors Degrees					
Masters Degrees					
Doctoral Degrees					
Professional Degrees					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 2.2 -- Headcount Enrollment by Gender

Data Element 2.3 -- Headcount Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Because they are similar, these two data elements are treated together.

Description. Headcount enrollments as defined previously broken down by level of enrollment and by demographic categories. Levels of enrollment include lower-division (normally the first two years of an undergraduate program), upper-division (normally the last two or more years of an undergraduate program), graduate (any graduate), and (optionally) non-degree students.

Issues and Alternatives. In addition to those already noted under 2.1 above, the following alternatives might be considered to better suit specific institutional circumstances:

- other ways to assign students to levels of instruction (bearing in mind the need to at least distinguish undergraduate, graduate, and non-degree students if applicable).
- combining these two displays to provide gender breakdowns within race/ethnic categories.
- employing alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).

Sample formats designed to address these requirements follow.

Sample Format 2.2 Headcount Enrollments by Gender

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5 [*] N (%)
Total Awards					
Male					
Female					
Lower Division					
Male					
Female					
Upper Division					
Male					
Female					
Graduate					
Male					
Female					
Non-Degree					
Male					
Female					

* Most Current Year

Sample Format 2.3 Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity

	White, Non-Hispanic	Black, Non-Hispanic	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian / Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Other
Year 1 N (%)						
Total Enrollment						
Lower Division						
Upper Division						
Graduate						
Non-Degree						
Year 2 N (%)						
Total Enrollment						
Lower Division						
Upper Division						
Graduate						
Non-Degree						
Year 3 N (%)						
Total Enrollment						
Lower Division						
Upper Division						
Graduate						
Non-Degree						
Year 4 N (%)						
Total Enrollment						
Lower Division						
Upper Division						
Graduate						
Non-Degree						
Year 5* N (%)						
Total Enrollment						
Lower Division						
Upper Division						
Graduate						
Non-Degree						

* Most current Year

Data Element 2.4 -- Students Receiving Financial Aid

Description. The total number and percentage of currently-enrolled students receiving some form of financial aid, broken down by undergraduate and graduate levels. For undergraduate students in addition, the total number and percent of students receiving federal Pell grant support.

Issues and Alternatives. These data are included because they broadly indicate the economic circumstances of the institution's students and are useful in gauging the match between enrollment and mission. But there are many ways to define financial aid activity, and institutions should feel free to supply additional information. Among the principal additional alternatives that might be considered are:

- reporting the numbers and percentages of students on loans.
- reporting specific kinds of aid, if available (e.g. need-based, merit-based, etc.).
- reporting the numbers and percentages receiving institutional aid.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 2.4 Students Receiving Financial Aid

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5* N (%)
Undergraduate Students					
Total Headcount	N	N	N	N	N
Total Receiving Some Form of Financial Aid or Assistance					
Total Receiving Federal Pell Grant Support					
Graduate Students					
Total Headcount	N	N	N	N	N
Total Receiving Some Form of Financial Aid or Assistance					

* Most Current Year

3. DEGREES AWARDED

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? Data on the number of degrees granted is important in determining the extent to which colleges and universities are realizing their missions and fulfilling their educational objectives as outlined in Standards 1 and 2. These data also provide descriptive data, which can help visiting teams understand the particular characteristics of this institutions (e.g., a liberal arts college versus a four-year doctoral degree-granting university). As with enrollment data, particular aspects of the institution's degree awards—such as enrolling in specific types of programs—will reflect the institution's enacted mission. Additionally, information on degree completions by gender and race/ethnicity indicate the way in which institutions address diversity as suggested in CFR 1.5. Retention and graduation rates are indicators of an institution's viability, as discussed in CFRs 4.1 and 4.8, and whether the institution has appropriate programs to support it students until graduation.

Issues and Challenges. Several issues emerge when compiling degree completion data, notably degree and program definitions.

- Program definitions vary across institutions. Most institutions have developed their own taxonomy for classifying different disciplinary programs while others use some form of the Classification of Instructional Programs developed by the Department of Education. Institutions should therefore use their own degree or program titles when reporting such data.
- While many institutions use standard IPEDS and CDS definitions for degrees, these definitions do not constitute the universe of degree programs extant in higher education today. For example, non-degree or certificate programs comprise the majority of program offerings at some institutions. In such cases, institutions should report awards in addition to regular degrees if they believe that doing so will better reflect their circumstances.
- For some institutions, the first-time freshman and transfer categories may not be relevant because their student body includes many adult students returning for time- and subject-specific education and training. These institutions should use categories that are the most useful in telling their stories.

Data Element 3.1 -- Degrees Granted by Degree-Level and Program

Description. The total number and percentage degrees granted, broken down by type of degree and program for the last five years.

Issues and Alternatives. As mentioned above a variety of definitional issues emerge when reporting such data.

- Institutions may use definitions for degrees, awards, and programs that best characterize their own situations, but must be explicit when doing so.
- If these data are also available by gender and race/ethnicity, institutions are encouraged to supply this information as well. Institutions may also employ alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above) as long as definitions are provided.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 3.1 Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program*

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5**
All Degrees					
Less than 2-Year					
Associate					
Bachelors					
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Program 1					
Less than 2-Year					
Associate					
Bachelors					
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
Program 2					
Less than 2-Year					
Associate					
Bachelors					
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					
.					
.					
Program N					
Less than 2-Year					
Associate					
Bachelors					
Masters					
Doctoral					
First Professional					

* Use same Program names/titles as listed in *Annual Report*

** Most current year

Data Element 3.2 -- Cohort Graduation, Retention, and Transfer Rates

Description. For the cohort of first-time freshmen and transfer students (where available): 1) size of the cohort; 2) first-year retention rate (number and percent); 3) 6-year graduate rate (number and percent); 3) transfer-out rate (number and percent); and 4) still enrolled at 6 years (number and percent).

Issues and Alternatives. Generating appropriate longitudinal information about student graduation and retention involves many definitional and technical issues. Institutions may vary considerably in the populations they track and may wish to modify basic retention statistics to suit their own circumstances, so long as they adhere to the basic conventions involved in generating and reporting such statistics such as Student Right-to-Know or the IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey. Among the modifications that might be employed are:

- Defining the cohort to be tracked to include more than full-time, first-time, freshman. Many institutions enroll the majority of their students in the par-time or adult categories. Others enroll many students transferring from other institutions. As a result, institutions should use cohort definitions that best suit their own circumstances, so long as the definitions used are clear.
- Providing tracking data by gender and race/ethnicity where available. Institutions may also employ alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).
- Reporting graduation rates for more than a six-year period, to address delayed graduation due to part-time attendance, stop-out, or similar phenomena.
- Tracking students who successfully transfer to other institutions.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 3.2 Cohort Graduation, Retention and Transfer Rates

These data are for: ___ Fall Entering Cohorts ___ Annualized Cohorts

	Size of Cohort	1 st Year Retention Rate (Fall to Fall) N (%)	6-Year Graduation Rate N (%)	Transfer Out Rate N (%)	Still Enrolled at 6 Years N (%)
First-Time Freshmen					
Cohort: _____					
Cohort: _____					
Cohort: _____					
Transfer Students (if available)					
Cohort: _____					
Average Number of Credits Transferred: _____					
Cohort: _____					
Average Number of Credits Transferred: _____					
Cohort: _____					
Average Number of Credits Transferred: _____					

4. FACULTY AND STAFF COMPOSITION

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? Faculty and staff are critical to any institution's effective functioning. Whether there are adequate numbers of faculty with the appropriate credentials and sufficient diversity will determine the extent to which institutions will successfully meet their educational objectives as suggested in CFRs 3.1 and 3.2. For example, a critical mass of faculty is necessary not only to teach the courses institutions offer, but also to create an environment of peers to support effective teaching and significant scholarship (CFR 4.7). But faculty must also possess the appropriate credentials—degree-level as well as field—to teach the courses offered and conduct research. Additionally, how faculty are utilized, whether the majority are full- or part-time, provides information on how institutions deploy their most important resources. Finally, the number and diversity of faculty and staff are related to diversity concerns as discussed in Standard 1 (CFR 1.5).

Issues and Challenges. Many methodological challenges are associated with counting faculty. First, what exactly constitutes faculty status varies considerably from institution to institution. In some cases, institutions have clinical or research-only faculty who do no teaching, or include librarians in faculty numbers. Institutions may also use different definitions for the types of degrees faculty possess as well as their employment status (e.g., full-or part-time, adjunct, lecturer, etc.). Program definitions also vary. As a result, institutions are urged to use those definitions that best characterize their mission and best reflect who they consider “faculty” to be, so long as they remain broadly within the conventions generally used in reporting such numbers (e.g. IPEDS, state reporting requirements, etc.). In all such cases, though, institutions should state explicitly which definitions are being employed.

Data Element 4.1 -- Faculty Composition

Description. The number and percentage of full- and part-time faculty broken down by gender and race/ethnicity for the most current five years.

Issues and Alternatives. Many alternatives may be employed when providing these data:

- Faculty may be defined as the institution generally does so, provided that definitions are clear; but it should be noted that WASC is primarily interested in teaching faculty, so if non-teaching faculty are included in the totals provided, it should be clear that this is the case.
- In addition to full- and part-time status, institutions categorize faculty in other ways, such as tenure status, rank, terminal degree, etc. Institutions are encouraged to use the definitions and categories that best characterize them as long as definitions are provided.
- Institutions may also employ alternative categories for race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 4.1 Faculty Composition

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5* N (%)
Full-Time Faculty					
Male					
Female					
White, Non-Hispanic					
Black, Non-Hispanic					
American Indian / Alaskan Native					
Asian / Pacific Islander					
Hispanic					
Other					
Part-Time Faculty					
Male					
Female					
White, Non-Hispanic					
Black, Non-Hispanic					
American Indian / Alaskan Native					
Asian / Pacific Islander					
Hispanic					
Other					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 4.2 -- Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

Description. The number and percentage of full- and part-time faculty broken down by program or department for the most current five years.

Issues and Alternatives. The issues and alternatives outlined in Data Element 4.1 also apply here.

- As noted under 3.1 above, institutional definitions of departments or programs may vary substantially. Institutions should use definitions that fit their circumstances, but the classification of programs employed in reporting this data element should match that used in 3.1.
- If faculty teach in more than one program, an institution should indicate where these individuals are double-counted. Normally, however, faculty will be reported under a primary program assignment.
- Institutions are encouraged to provide these data by different categories, such as ethnicity and gender within program, if available. If they do so, institutions may employ alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 4.2

Faculty Headcount by Department/Program *

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5** N (%)
Total Faculty					
Full-Time					
Part-Time					
Dept./Program: _____					
Full-Time					
Part-Time					
Dept./Program: _____					
Full-Time					
Part-Time					
.					
.					
.					
Dept./Program: _____					
Full-Time					
Part-Time					

* Use same Department/Program names/titles as listed in *Annual Report*

** Most current year

Data Element 4.3 -- Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Description. The number and percentage of staff broken down by full- and part-time status, gender, and race/ethnicity for the most current five years.

Issues and Alternatives. As with charts 4.1 and 4.2, the categories requested may not be appropriate for some institutions.

- WASC leaves it to the institution to define "staff" and full- and part-time status where appropriate so long as definitions are clear; in general, as in all such reporting, standard conventions for reporting such statistics should be employed (e.g. IPEDS, state reporting requirements, payroll reporting, etc.).
- Staff statistics may also be further broken down to reflect such matters as seniority or job classification (e.g. exempt/non-exempt, professional, managerial, etc.) to better reflect the actual composition of the institution's total workforce.
- Institutions may also employ alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with the institution's own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 4.3 Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

	Year 1 N (%)	Year 2 N (%)	Year 3 N (%)	Year 4 N (%)	Year 5* N (%)
Full-Time					
Male					
Female					
White, Non-Hispanic					
Black, Non-Hispanic					
American Indian / Alaskan Native					
Asian / Pacific Islander					
Hispanic					
Other					
Part-Time					
Male					
Female					
White, Non-Hispanic					
Black, Non-Hispanic					
American Indian / Alaskan Native					
Asian / Pacific Islander					
Hispanic					
Other					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 4.4 -- Full-time Faculty and Staff Turnover

Description. For a given five-year period, the total number of full-time faculty, the number and percentage of faculty and staff new hires, retirements, and departures.

Issues and Alternatives. All the issues already noted for Data Elements in this section apply here. In addition:

- An institution can employ alternative definitions of new hires, retirements, and departures as long as explanations are provided.
- If collected by the institution, data on staff turnover might also be provided by gender and race/ethnicity. Institutions may employ alternative ways to present race/ethnic breakdowns that are more consistent with their own usage (as in the discussion of 1.4 above).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 4.4

Full-Time Faculty/Staff Turnover Over the Last 5 Years

	Faculty	Other Staff
Total Number of Individuals Employed in this Period	N	N
Number of New Hires in this Period	N (%)	N (%)
Number of Retirements in this Period	N (%)	N (%)
Number of Departures in this Period	N (%)	N (%)

5. INFORMATION, PHYSICAL, AND FISCAL RESOURCES

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? An institution's fiscal, physical, and information resources are the foundation for its long-term viability and ability to attain its educational goals as discussed in Standard 3. Information resources must be adequate in scope, quality, currency, and kind support an institution's academic offerings and scholarship capacity (CFR 3.6). An institution's physical resources are an indication of its capability to sustain its program offerings and support its faculty and staff in achieving educational goals. Fiscal resources reveal whether the institution has a history of financial stability, appropriate independent audits, and realistic plans to eliminate accumulated deficits and to build sufficient reserves to support long-term viability (CFR 3.5).

Issues and Challenges. Because the nature of instruction and institutional operations is changing rapidly, many established ways of defining information and physical resources are under challenge. With regard to library, for example, numbers of volumes and journal subscriptions held may not adequately reflect the actual range of an institution's electronic holdings, nor take into account its linkage capabilities to information sources that are available on-line. Similarly, there are no established ways to count computing resources, so institutions should use any statistics beyond those suggested to reflect their own situations. For physical resources, established conventions are available and many institutions maintain these definitions when inventorying space. But interpretations also vary here, and institutions may want to report physical resources in other ways. Finally, because of changes in FASB and GASB accounting rules, fiscal reporting has diverged for public and private institutions. In reporting such data, institutions should use the standard accounting rules that they generally employ.

Data Element 5.1 -- Information and Computing Resources

Description. Numbers of volumes and journals held by the institution's library(s), together with library acquisitions expenditures; numbers of various types of computing resources available to students and staff, together with instructional equipment and computing-related expenditures.

Issues and Alternatives. As noted, standard definitions are not available for many of these categories and, in the case of library resources, those that are established may be obsolescent. As a result, institutions may consider providing:

- Additional statistics about information resources that better reflect electronic media, ability to tap on-line databases, inter-library agreements that provide access to additional materials for students as staff, etc.
- Statistics on library and information usage by students, faculty, staff, and other users.
- Different ways to communicate the range of computing resources available to students and staff, including computing usage statistics, connectivity measures, email volume, etc.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.1 Information and Computing Resources

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5*
Libraries					
Total Library Collections	N	N	N	N	N
Books	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Periodicals	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Non-Print Media	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Total \$ Spent on Library Acquisitions					
Computing and Information Systems					
Number and Percent of Computer-Equipped Classrooms or Labs	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Total Number of Computer Workstations Available to Students	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Total Number of Workstations Available to Faculty/Staff	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Networked	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Not Networked	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Total Book (Inventory) Value of Computing and Instructional Equipment					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 5.2 -- Physical Resources

Description. Space holdings controlled by the institution by type of space, numbers of rooms, net square footage, and numbers of stations, together with statistics on replacement value and maintenance of the physical plant and similar data on major equipment.

Issues and Alternatives. Although standard categories in terms of which to classify physical plant resources are available, not all institutions maintain space inventories in this way nor at this level of detail. In general, the institution should follow its own conventions with respect to reporting these statistics, so long as the general intent of communicating the scale and character of the institution's physical resources is met. As a result, the following alternatives may be employed:

- Differing ways to classify space resources, so long as basic distinctions between instruction-related and administrative space are maintained, and the categories used are understandable and defined.
- Distinguishing space owned by the institution from space leased or made available to the institution in other ways.
- Distinguishing space held at different physical locations.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.2 Physical Resources—Current Year

Physical Space	Size—Net Assignable Area (in square feet)	Number of Rooms	Number of Stations
1. On-Campus			
a. Classroom			
b. Class Laboratory			
c. Special-Class Laboratory			
d. Individual-Study Laboratory			
e. Non-Class (Research) Laboratory			
f. Office			
g. Study (Library)			
h. Special Use			
i. General Use			
j. Support			
k. Healthcare			
- Patient Care Rooms			
- Other			
l. Residential			
2. Other Locations (e.g., clinical sites)			
Describe:			
		Dollars	
3. Total Replacement Cost for Total Physical Plant (or insured value)		\$	
4. Equipment			
a. Book Value		\$	
b. Replacement Cost (or insured value)		\$	

Data Element 5.3 -- Sources of Revenue

Description. This data element requests data on institutional revenues consistent with the institution's financial statements for the five most current years. It is similar to data previously required by WASC in the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation*.

Issues and Alternatives. Definitions should be consistent with GASB and FASB accounting standards depending on whether the institution is private or public. The definitions should also conform with that reported (where applicable) on the IPEDS Finance Survey.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.3 Sources of Revenue

Public Institutions	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4 [*]		Year 5 ^{**}	
	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}
Tuition and Fees ^{***}										
Government Appropriations										
Federal										
State										
Local										
Government Grants and Contracts										
Federal										
Unrestricted										
Restricted										
State										
Unrestricted										
Restricted										
Local										
Unrestricted										
Restricted										
Private Gifts, Grants, and Contracts										
Unrestricted										
Restricted										
Investment & Endowment Income										
Unrestricted										
Restricted										
Sales and Service										
Educational Activities										
Auxiliary Enterprises										
Hospitals										
Other										
Auxiliary Foundations										
Borrowed Funds										
Other (Specify)										
TOTAL CURRENT FUND REVENUES										

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Budget for current year

*** Percentage of Total Current Fund Revenues

Private Institutions	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*		Year 5**	
	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***
Tuition and Fees***										
Less:										
Sponsored Scholarships & Fellowships										
Un-sponsored Scholarships & Fellowships										
Net Tuition and Fees										
Government Appropriations										
Federal										
State										
Local										
Government Grants and Contracts										
Unrestricted										
Temporarily Restricted										
Permanently Restricted										
Private Grants and Contracts										
Unrestricted										
Temporarily Restricted										
Permanently Restricted										
Investment & Endowment Income										
Unrestricted										
Temporarily Restricted										
Permanently Restricted										
Sales and Service										
Educational Activities										
Auxiliary Enterprises										
Hospitals										
Other Foundations										
Gains (losses) on Investments										
TOTAL REVENUES										

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Budget for current year

*** Percentage of Total Revenues

Data Element 5.4 -- Operating Expenditures

Description. This data element requires data on institutional expenditures with the institution's financial statements for the five most current years. It is similar to charts previously required by WASC in the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation*.

Issues and Alternatives. Definitions should be consistent with GASB and FASB accounting standards depending on whether the institution is private or public. The definitions should also conform with that reported (where applicable) on the IPEDS Finance Survey.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.4 Operating Expenditures

Public Institutions	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4 [*]		Year 5 ^{**}	
	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}	Amount	% ^{***}
Education and General										
Instruction										
Research										
Public Service										
Academic Support										
Student Services										
Institutional Support										
Operations & Maintenance of Plant										
Scholarships & Fellowships										
From Unrestricted Funds										
From Restricted Funds										
Mandatory Transfers										
TOTAL EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES AND MANDATORY TRANSFERS										
Educational Activities (including Transfers)										
Auxiliary Enterprises (including Transfers)										
Hospitals (including Transfers)										
Auxiliary Foundations (including Transfers)										
Other (specify)										
TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS EXPENDITURES AND MANDATORY TRANSFERS										
Total Current Fund Transfers										
Less Total Current Funds Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers										
Non-mandatory Transfers										

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Budget for current year

*** Percentage of Total Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers

Private Institutions

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*		Year 5**	
	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***	Amount	%***
Education and General										
Instruction										
Research										
Public Service										
Academic Support										
Student Services										
Institutional Support										
Operation & Maintenance of Plant										
Auxiliary Enterprises										
Other (specify)										
TOTAL EXPENSES										
Change in Net Assets										
Unrestricted										
Temporarily Restricted										
Permanently Restricted										

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Budget for current year

*** Percentage of Total Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers

Data Element 5.5 -- Assets and Liabilities

Description. This data element requests information on institutional assets and liabilities consistent with the institutions financial statements for the five most current years. It is similar to charts previously required by WASC in the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation*.

Issues and Alternatives. Definitions should be consistent with GASB and FASB accounting standards depending on whether the institution is private or public. The definitions should also conform with that reported (where applicable) on the IPEDS Finance Survey.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

If the institution classifies the balance sheet between current and non-current, please do the same here.

Sample Format 5.5 Assets and Liabilities

Public Institutions	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*	
	Amount	%**	Amount	%**	Amount	%**	Amount	%**
Assets								
Cash								
Investments								
Inventories								
Prepaid Expenses								
Notes Receivable								
Plant and Land								
Other (specify)								
TOTAL ASSETS								
Liabilities								
Accounts Payable								
Notes Payable								
Deferred Tuition								
Taxes Payable								
Other (specify)								
Long-Term								
Bonds Payable								
Notes Payable								
Pensions Payable								
Other (specify)								
Deposits Held for Others								
Student Organizations								
Auxiliary Foundations								
Fund Balance								
Restricted Purpose								
Unrestricted								
Investment in Plant								
TOTAL LIABILITIES								

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Percentage of Total Assets/Liabilities as appropriate

Private Institutions	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4*	
	Amount	%**	Amount	%**	Amount	%**	Amount	%**
Assets								
Cash								
Accounts Receivable								
Inventories								
Prepaid Expenses								
Notes Receivable								
Investments								
Plant and Land								
Other (specify)								
TOTAL ASSETS								
Liabilities								
Accounts Payable								
Notes Payable								
Deferred Tuition								
Government Advances for Student Loans								
Other (specify)								
Long-Term								
Bonds Payable								
Notes Payable								
Pensions Payable								
Other (specify)								
Deposits Held for Others								
Student Organizations								
Other								
TOTAL LIABILITIES								
Net Assets								
Unrestricted								
Temporarily Restricted								
Permanently Restricted								
TOTAL NET ASSETS								

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

** Percentage of Total Assets/Liabilities as appropriate

Data Element 5.6 -- Capital Investments

Description. This data element requires data on institutional capital investments consistent with the institution's financial statements for the five most current years. It is similar to charts previously required by WASC in the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation*.

Issues and Alternatives. Definitions should be consistent with GASB and FASB accounting standards depending on whether the institution is private or public. The definitions should also conform with that reported (where applicable) on the IPEDS Finance Survey.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.6 Capital Investments

Public Institutions	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5*
	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount	Amount
Land					
Beginning Book Value					
Additions					
Deductions					
Ending Book Value					
Buildings					
Beginning Book Value					
Additions					
Deductions					
Ending Book Value					
Furniture and Equipment					
Beginning Book Value					
Additions					
Deductions					
Ending Book Value					
Construction in Progress**					
Beginning Book Value					
Additions					
Deductions					
Ending Book Value					

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available.

** Briefly describe the nature of the projects underway and/or anticipated (e.g., dormitories, classroom facilities, auditorium). Also indicate sources of funds for the project (i.e., fundraising programs, debt).

Data Element 5.7 -- Endowment Values and Performance

Description. This data element requests information on the value of the institution's endowment using standard accounting categories defined by GASB and FASB for the five most current years. The definitions should also conform with that reported (where applicable) on the IPEDS Finance Survey.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5.7 Endowment Values and Performance

	Market Value of Endowment	Market Value of Quasi- Endowment	Market Value End of Year	Yield	Current Fund Income from Endowment	Net Transfers In/Out of Endowment	Total Annual Return on Investments
Year 1	\$\$	%	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$
Year 2	\$\$	%	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$
Year 3	\$\$	%	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$
Year 4	\$\$	%	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$
Year 5*	\$\$	%	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$	\$\$

Include the institution's definition of endowment and quasi-endowment, the endowment spending policy, and any changes made to the policy during the 5-year period.

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

6. INSTITUTIONAL OPERATING EFFICIENCY

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? Standard 3 mandates that institutions sustain their operations and support the achievement of their educational objectives by investing in and deploying their human, physical, fiscal, and information resources effectively. The ratios in this section demonstrate how effectively and efficiently an institution maintains fiscal and physical equilibrium through its array of fiscal policies and strategies and through the regular appraisal and renewal of its physical assets (CFR 3.5). They also reveal the ways in which an institution aligns its fiscal, physical, and human resources to fulfill its mission, priorities, and educational objectives .

Issues and Challenges. Measures design to reflect institutional operations are almost always comprised of ratios or statistical manipulations of more basic data. As a result, they raise issues about both the integrity and appropriateness of these base measures themselves, but also about the way calculational routines are developed and defined. Many of the measures contained in this category are constructed from data elements already discussed, and bring these issues with them as a consequence. Others raise questions about the particular denominator chosen to standardize or normalize the measure. In each case, however, the basic intent of the indicator should be clear and institutions are encouraged to choose alternative measures that reflect this intent.

Data Element 6.1 -- Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios

Description. This data element requests ratios in three areas: admissions, retention, and instruction, for the five most current years. In the case of the first two, the data requested essentially parallels that supplied in Data Elements 1.1 and 3.2, and is included for ready reference and comparison.

Issues and Alternatives. Because these statistics represent manipulations of previously-described data elements, all of the issues and caveats that apply to their individual numerical building blocks continue to apply. In addition:

- For “open-admission” institutions the first set of ratios will be meaningless and it should be indicated where this is the case.
- Retention data and ratios may or may not apply to those institutions that offer non-degree programs. Again, this should be noted by an institution.
- When preparing student/faculty ratios and similar statistics, institutions should also provide definitions for faculty if they differ from standard ones used by IPEDS or the Common Data Set. They can also elect to use either a headcount or an FTE-based approach to creating this ratio, depending on circumstances and data availability.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 6.1 Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5*
Admissions					
Admit/Apply					
Enroll/Admit					
Retention					
1 st Year Freshman Retention					
Freshmen 6-year Completion to Graduation					
% Completing Degrees Begun at another Institution (Transfer Retention)					
Instruction (Undergraduate)					
FTE Student / FTE Faculty Ratio					
% Credits Taught by Part-Time Faculty					
% Credits Taught Off-Campus					
% Credits Taught by Distance Education					
Classes with 1-9 Students					
Classes with 10-20 Students					
Classes with 21-35 Students					
Classes with 36-50 Students					
Classes with 50+ Students					
Average Credit Load per Student					
Average GPA					

* Budget for current year

Data Element 6.2 -- Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios

Description. This data element requires information related to the maintenance of key institutional assets including faculty (with an emphasis on the need to replace faculty who are about to retire), proportion of operating expenditures spent on physical plant operations and maintenance, and proportion of equipment replacement expenditures relative to equipment inventories.

Issues and Alternatives. Again, any issues associated with the base measures from which these ratios are constructed continue to apply. In addition:

- Numbers of faculty eligible for retirement might be used as an alternative to those aged 59 and over to provide an estimate of needed faculty replacement. Institutions may also find it useful to examine such statistics by department or other subunit.
- Other ways of expressing how the institution is addressing the challenge of maintaining its physical facilities are encouraged if these enable a more accurate picture of the situation with respect to this issue to be drawn.
- Similarly, other ways of examining the need to maintain major equipment are encouraged--for example, current levels of depreciation in the equipment inventory. Also, institutions may want to break out particular kinds of equipment assets that have widely varying depreciation schedules; for example, computing hardware might be separately reported.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 6.2 Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5*
Total Faculty Headcount					
Faculty 59 and Older					
Faculty >59 / Total Faculty					
O&M Expenditures (\$)					
Total E&G Expenditures (\$)					
O & M / E & G					
Total Equipment Expenditures					
Total Book Value of Equipment (\$)					
Expenditures / Book Value					

* Most Current Year

Data Element 6.3 -- Key Financial Ratios

Description. This table requests information on key financial ratios that may be used to determine an institution's "financial health." The ratios help measure the institution's capacity to continue to provide promised educational services to students who have enrolled.

Issues and alternatives. The following definitions are provided to assist with completing the table.

- Return on Net Assets Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution's resources are growing. A typical way of measuring this is calculating the percentage change in net assets:

$\text{Change in Net Assets} / \text{Total net assets at the beginning of the fiscal year.}$

- Net Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution is operating within available resources. The key question is, 'Did annual revenue-generating activities (including investment income) cover expenses?' This is typically measured as follows:

$\text{Unrestricted Net Assets} / \text{Total Unrestricted Revenues}$

- Operating Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not core operating activities are covering expenses. A common way of calculating this ratio is:

$\text{Operating Income} / \text{Total Education and General Expenses}$

Operating income includes tuition and fees net of scholarships and financial aid; unrestricted grants, contracts and gifts; endowment income per the spending policy; investment and interest income on operating funds; other unrestricted income; auxiliary revenues less auxiliary expenses, and academic extension income. Education and general expenses exclude auxiliary expenses.

- Viability Ratio: This measures whether or not the institution has sufficient net assets to pay off its long-term debt. It is a measure of long-term viability. A typical way of calculating this ratio is:

$\text{Expendable Net Assets} / \text{Long-term Debt}$

Expendable net assets equal unrestricted net assets plus temporarily restricted net assets less net property plant and equipment plus long-term debt. Long-term debt includes the total remaining principal amount for any debt obligation with an original maturity of greater than one year.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 6.3 Key Financial Ratios

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4*
Return on Net Assets Change in Net Assets / Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year				
Net Income Ratio Change in Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Unrestricted Revenues				
Operating Income Ratio Operating Income / Total Expenses				
Viability Ratio Expendable Net Assets / Long Term Debt				
Instructional Expense per Student				
Net Tuition per Student				

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available

7. Assessment Activities

Why is WASC Interested in Data of this Kind? The kinds of activities that the institution engages in to examine student learning provides evidence that it is committed to educational effectiveness (CFR 4.4). At least as important, they indicate the extent to which the institution is already engaging in the kinds of activities that will be required for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Assessment activities, including collecting and using data, help assure the delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded. For an institution to be committed to educational effectiveness it must have in place a system that regularly uses information to improve student learning over time and that uses standards of evidence that prominently feature educational results (CFRs 4.1 and 4.5).

Issues and Challenges. There are as many definitions of assessment as there are different types of institutions. Therefore it is critical for an institution to provide its definition of assessment and the kinds of activities that it undertakes to engage in assessment. Because many assessment approaches are embedded in the curriculum, moreover, they may not be identifiable as distinct "activities" that can be listed distinctly and individually. As a result, institutions may wish to meet the intent of this data element with a brief narrative instead of a chart.

Data Element 7.1 -- Assessment Activities

Description. This data element requests brief narrative information on specific assessment activities undertaken by the institution for the five most current years. The following information is requested for each discrete data-gathering effort: 1) the date of the study; 2) why the assessment was done; 3) the population covered; 4) what was assessed; 5) the type of instrument or data-gathering approach; and 4) response rates. Examples might include "survey of alumni graduating in the period 1995-2000," "senior portfolio assessment in Chemistry," or "ACT CAAP Test Results for Sophomores in 1999."

Issues and Alternatives. Given that an institution will define and describe its assessment activities, this data element will be unique to each institution and may more appropriately be presented in the form of a brief narrative instead of a chart or table (as above).

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 7.1 Assessment Activities*

Date of Study	Why was the Assessment Done?	Population Covered	What was Assessed?	Type of Instrument or Data-Gathering Approach	Response Rates (if Applicable)

* Covers last 5 years

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL & SPECIAL VISITS

(Reprinted here for Updating)

Required Data Elements

As described, the Institutional Proposal and Special Visit Report will be accompanied by a Basic Descriptive Data Profile intended to provide important context for discussing the proposal. Other data relevant to this discussion will be assembled through the institution's previous annual reports. Contents of the Basic Descriptive Data Profile include:

- Institutional Type and Organizational Structure:
 - Mission statement (unless in catalog)
 - Organizational chart
 - Catalog
- Student Body Characteristics:
 - Enrollments by level [Sample Format 1]
 - Enrollments by full-time/part-time status [Sample Format 2]
 - Total degrees granted by level [Sample Format 3]
- Academic Programs:
 - List of academic programs currently offered [from Annual Report form]
- Faculty and Staff:
 - Faculty headcount (full and part-time) [Sample Format 4]
- Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources:
 - Financial Ratios [Sample Format 5]
 - Financial Audits for the last two years

Data Element 1--Headcount Enrolment by Level

Description. This table requests headcount enrollments by level, together with total FTE, as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are based on this Survey and are as follows:

Total Headcount Enrollment	Lines 8+14+22+28
Lower-Division Headcount	Lines 1+2+3+15+16+17
Upper-Division Headcount	Lines 4+5+18+19
Graduate Headcount	Lines 9+10+11+12+23+24+25+26
Post-Baccalaureate (Non-Graduate Headcount	Lines 13+17
Non-Degree Headcount	Lines 7+21
Total FTE Enrollment	Lines 8+9+((22+28)/3)

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 1 Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall Term)

	Total Headcount Enrollment	Lower Division Headcount	Upper Division Headcount	Graduate Headcount	Post- Baccalaureate (Non-Graduate) Headcount	Non-Degree Headcount	Total FTE Enrollment
Year 1	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N
Year 2	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N
Year 3	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N
Year 4	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N
Year 5*	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N

* Latest year

Data Element 2--Headcount Enrolment by Status and Location

Description. This table requests headcount enrollments by full-time/part-time status, as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey. Additional entries request information about enrollments at on-campus and off-campus locations as defined by the institution. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are as follows:

Total Headcount Enrollment	[Line 29 IPEDS as in A-1]
Full-Time Headcount	Lines 8+14
Part-Time Headcount	Lines 22+28
On-Campus Headcount	Attending at the institution's "main campus" as defined locally
Off-Campus Location	Not attending at the institution's "main campus" as defined locally

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 2

Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall Term)

	Total Headcount Enrollment	Full-Time	Part-Time	On-Campus Location	Off-Campus Location
Year 1	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 2	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 3	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 4	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 5*	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)

* Latest year

Data Element 3--Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level

Description. This table represents degrees and certificates granted by level on an academic year basis as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Completions Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are all drawn from entries in the “CIP Code = 99” section of the IPEDS Completions Survey and are defined as follows:

Total Degrees Granted	All Lines
Less than 2-year Awards	Lines 1+2
Associate Degrees	Line 3
Bachelor Degrees	Line 5
Post-Baccalaureate Awards	Line 6
Masters Degrees	Line 7
Doctorate Degrees	Line 8
Other Awards	Lines 4+8+10+11

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 3

Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level (Academic Year)

	Total Degrees Granted	Less than 2-Year	Associate	Bachelor	Post- Baccalaureate	Master	Doctorate	Other
Year 1	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 2	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 3	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 4	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 5*	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)

* Latest year

Data Element 4--Faculty by Employment Status

Description. This table presents information on the institution's faculty as reported on the IPEDS Staff Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Specific columns in the report are defined as follows:

Total Faculty Headcount	Lines 22+77
Full-Time Faculty	Line 22
Part-Time Faculty	Line 77
Total Faculty FTE	Line 22+(Line 77/3)

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 4 Faculty by Employment Status

	Total Faculty Headcount	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Total Faculty FTE
Year 1	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 2	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 3	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 4	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Year 5*	N	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)

* Latest year

Data Element 5-- Key Financial Ratios

Description. This table requests information on key financial ratios that may be used to determine an institution's "financial health." The ratios help measure the institution's capacity to continue to provide promised educational services to students who have enrolled.

Issues and alternatives. The following definitions are provided to assist with completing the table.

- Return on Net Assets Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution's resources are growing. A typical way of measuring this is calculating the percentage change in net assets:

$\text{Change in Net Assets} / \text{Total net assets at the beginning of the fiscal year.}$

- Net Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution is operating within available resources. The key question is, 'Did annual revenue-generating activities (including investment income) cover expenses?' This is typically measured as follows:

$\text{Unrestricted Net Assets} / \text{Total Unrestricted Revenues}$

- Operating Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not core operating activities are covering expenses. A common way of calculating this ratio is:

$\text{Operating Income} / \text{Total Education and General Expenses}$

Operating income includes tuition and fees net of scholarships and financial aid; unrestricted grants, contracts and gifts; endowment income per the spending policy; investment and interest income on operating funds; other unrestricted income; auxiliary revenues less auxiliary expenses, and academic extension income. Education and general expenses exclude auxiliary expenses.

- Viability Ratio: This measures whether or not the institution has sufficient net assets to pay off its long-term debt. It is a measure of long-term viability. A typical way of calculating this ratio is:

$\text{Expendable Net Assets} / \text{Long-term Debt}$

Expendable net assets equal unrestricted net assets plus temporarily restricted net assets less net property plant and equipment plus long-term debt. Long-term debt includes the total remaining principal amount for any debt obligation with an original maturity of greater than one year.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.

Sample Format 5 Key Financial Ratios

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4*
Return on Net Assets Change in Net Assets / Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year				
Net Income Ratio Change in Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Unrestricted Revenues				
Operating Income Ratio Operating Income / Total Expenses				
Viability Ratio Expendable Net Assets / Long Term Debt				
Instructional Expense per Student				
Net Tuition per Student				

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available