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Spring 2012: Educational Effectiveness Review
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Spring 2019: Offsite Review
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Agenda for the Day

• The changing context for accreditation
• 2013 WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review
• Comprehensive review for reaffirmation of accreditation
• The institutional review process
• The institutional self-study and report
• Commission action
• Tools and resources
Changing Context for Accreditation

• Greatly increased expectations for institutional accountability and consumer protection

• Demands for improved academic standards and student performance (as measured by retention, graduation rates and post-graduation job placement)

• New fiscal realities making cost-effectiveness a paramount issue for WSCUC and its constituents
Challenges for Higher Education and Accreditation

- Low graduation rates
- High student debt/high default rates
- Difficulty in transferring credits
- Dissatisfaction with quality of education/low levels of learning
- Rapid growth of online education
- Practices of the for-profit industry
- Increased federal regulation
Challenges for Higher Education and Accreditation (continued)

- Changing demographics, including older, working, more diverse students
- Swirl: majority of students attend more than one institution
- Emergence of open source and Do-It-Yourselfers (DIY)
- Rapid growth of online programs/institutions, MOOCs
- Momentum for competency-based programs
- Shrinking support for public universities and trend to privatization
# How Accreditation is Changing

## Roles of Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Functions of Accreditation</th>
<th>Compliance Centered</th>
<th>Improvement Centered</th>
<th>Accountability/Quality Assurance Centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Review</td>
<td>All standards applied to assure compliance</td>
<td>Key areas selected and approved by accreditor for improvement</td>
<td>Specific areas identified as part of all reviews to address common policy issues—e.g., retention/graduation rates, student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of Effectiveness</td>
<td>Must demonstrate standards are met at least at minimum level</td>
<td>Simplified compliance review and primary emphasis on recommended improvements</td>
<td>Standards of performance set by institutions, and, where appropriate, comparative indicators used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Reporting and Transparency</td>
<td>Public announcement of grant of accreditation</td>
<td>Reports internally circulated for improvement; accrediting action publicly reported</td>
<td>Meaningful and clear public information about institutional performance and commission actions reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Learning Curve

FROM: Expecting programs to describe assessment processes

TO: Asking for the results of these assessments
Another Learning Curve

FROM: WSCUC expecting programs to set standards for student learning

TO: WSCUC asking for evidence that students also *achieve* those standards
FROM:
Evidence that the institution acts on findings and can show improvement

TO:
Also asking “Is this good enough? How do we know? What means do we use to establish standards of performance or proficiency?”
Agenda for the Day

• The changing context for accreditation
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2013 Core Commitments and Standards of Accreditation

Three Core Commitments

Four Standards

• Criteria for Review (CFR)
• Guidelines
2013 Core Commitments

• Student Learning and Success
• Quality and Improvement
• Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability
Core Commitment: Student Learning and Success

“Institutions have clear educational goals and student learning outcomes….Institutions support the success of all students and seek to understand and improve student success.”
Core Commitment:
Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability

“...Institutions engage in sound business practices, demonstrate institutional integrity, operate in a transparent manner, and adapt to changing conditions.”
Core Commitment: Quality and Improvement

“Institutions are committed to high standards of quality in all of their educational activities…. Institutions demonstrate the capacity to fulfill their current commitments and future needs and opportunities.”
2013 Standards of Accreditation

- Standard 1
- Standard 2
- Standard 3
- Standard 4
### Standard 1:
Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

- **Institutional Purpose**
- **Integrity and Transparency**

### Standard 2:
Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

- **Teaching and Learning**
- **Scholarship and Creative Activity**
- **Student Learning and Success**
Standard 3:
Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

- Faculty and Staff
- Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources
- Organizational Structures and Decision-making Processes

Standard 4:
Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

- Quality Assurance Processes
- Institutional Learning and Improvement
Criteria for Review (CFR)

• Provide statements about the meaning of the Standard

• Are cited by institutions in their report, by teams in evaluating institutions, and by the Commission in making decisions
Guidelines

• Show typical ways institutions can put into practice a CFR

• Offer examples of how an institution can address a particular CFR

• Can’t be ignored
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Overview of Comprehensive Review

INSTITUTION: Self-study & Report

TEAM: Offsite Review & Accreditation Visit

COMMISSION: Action
Key Elements of Comprehensive Review

- Institutional self-study and report
  - Nine components
  - “Review under the Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements”
  - “Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators”

- Institutional review process
  - Offsite Review (OSR)
  - Accreditation Visit (AV)
  - Team report (posted on WSCUC website)

- Commission action (posted on WSCUC website)
Schedule for the Review of California State University, Bakersfield

• Institutional report due 10 weeks before the date of the Offsite Review

• Offsite Review: Spring 2019

• Accreditation Visit: Fall 2019
Agenda for the Day

• The changing context for accreditation
• 2013 WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review
• Comprehensive review for reaffirmation of accreditation
• The institutional review process
• The institutional self-study and report
• Commission action
• Tools and resources

- Has the institution responded to previous Commission actions?
- Has the institution responded to the components?
- Has it collected and analyzed data effectively?
- Are its conclusions supported by evidence?
- What are the strengths of the institution?
- Are there problems or potential areas of concern or noncompliance?
- Does the report contain recommendations for further institutional action?
Institutional Review Process: Offsite Review (OSR)

- Takes place on 1 day in WSCUC offices
- Peer evaluation team reviews the institutional report
- Includes a video conference with institutional representatives
- Results in “Lines of Inquiry” document sent to institution by team – to plan the visit
- No Commission Action
Institutional Review Process: Accreditation Visit (AV)

• Takes place the semester after OSR

• Institution responds to Lines of Inquiry eight weeks before the visit

• Team comes to campus for three days

• Team report and recommendation sent toWSCUC Commission for Action
Agenda for the Day
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The Institutional Self-Study and Report

• Reflect and research before you write

• The self-study is the process

• The report is the product
Your story matters

Write your story in a way that you would want to read it
The Institutional Report: Importance of Evidence

AN EVIDENCE-BASED REPORT:

• Report should not just be narrative and descriptive, but reflective and analytical
• Analysis should be evidence-based
• This does NOT mean a data-dump!!!

USE EVIDENCE THAT IS:

• Relevant
• Verifiable - *truthful*
• Representative
• Cumulative
• Actionable

*Evidence helps tell your story – and makes it convincing!*

The Institutional Report: Good Evidence

• Intentional and purposive
• Entails interpretation and reflection
• Integrated and holistic
• Quantitative and qualitative
• Direct and indirect
The Institutional Report:

Tips

• You may reorder and combine components (though I don’t recommend it)

• Prompts are there to help facilitate your thinking; you do not need to answer each prompt

• Define (discuss), measure (assess), analyze, act (plan)

• Be self-reflective
Institutional Report: Nine Report Components

1. Introduction: Institutional context
2. Compliance
3. Meaning, Quality, Integrity of Degrees
4. Educational Quality
5. Student Success
6. Quality Assurance
7. Sustainability
8. Institution-Specific Themes (optional)
9. Conclusion
Institutional Report  Component 1: Introduction: Context, Response to Previous Commission Actions

- Addresses history, mission, core constituencies, recent changes
- Gives reviewers a picture of the institution’s distinctive character
- Responds to issues identified in previous Commission action letters
- Use the prompts as discussion-starters for the institution
Institutional Report
Previous Commission Recommendations

• Graduation and retention rates
• Strategic planning
• Allocation of resources
• Assessment of student learning
One document: “Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements” replaces two: “Self Review Under the Standards” and “Compliance Checklist”

Compliance includes four required Department of Education forms that must be completed by team members:
- Credit hour and program length review
- Marketing and recruitment review
- Student complaints review
- Transfer credit review

Compliance includes two areas for review, as appropriate:
- Off campus locations
- Distance education

“Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators”
Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements

- Institution reviews itself under the Standards and under four federal requirements

- Review worksheet is submitted by the institution as part of its report, with links to documents

- Team verifies the information

- Four required checklists are attached as an appendix to the team report

- Two areas are reviewed, as appropriate, and checklists are attached as an appendix to the team report
Compliance: **Credit Hours**

**Questions for the institution:**

- Does the institution have a policy for assigning credit hours?
- How does the policy address non-standard courses (e.g., labs, studios, internships, individual directed studies)?

**The team:**

- Reviews a sample of syllabi for non-standard courses
- Examines one term’s course schedule
- Completes Credit Hour form as an appendix to team report
Compliance: Marketing and Recruitment

Questions for the institution:

• Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?
• Does the institution provide accurate information about time to degree and overall cost of the degree?
• As applicable, does the institution provide accurate information about careers and employment?

The team:

• Verifies that the institution provides accurate and truthful information in marketing and recruiting materials and in contacts with potential students
• Confirms that the institution follows federal regulations
• Completes Marketing and Recruitment form as an appendix to team report
Compliance: Student Complaints

Questions for the institution:

• Does the institution have a policy for handling student complaints?
• Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?
• Does the institution follow its required policies in handling complaints?

The team:

• Verifies that the student complaint policy is readily accessible and adhered to
• Completes Student Complaint form as an appendix to team report
Compliance:  
Transfer Policy

Questions for the institution:

• Does the institution have a policy or procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credits?
• Is the policy publicly available?
• Has the institution established criteria for transfer of credits?

The team:

• Verifies that the transfer policy is readily accessible, includes criteria, and is adhered to
• Completes Transfer Policy form as an appendix to team report
Compliance: **Off Campus Locations**

(applies to locations 25 miles or more from main campus and 50% or more of a degree program; 25% of locations will be visited)

**The team:**

- Develops plan for review
- Interviews faculty, staff, students
- Evaluates off site facilities
- Observes classes (can be done before institutional visit)
- Documents findings in appendix, using off site form
- Discusses important findings with team for inclusion in report, as appropriate
Compliance: Distance Education

(degree programs with 50% or more of the courses online)

The team:

• Develops plan for review
• Interviews faculty, staff, students
• Evaluates online infrastructure
• Reviews courses (can be done before institutional visit)
• Documents findings in appendix, using distance education form
• Discusses important findings with team for inclusion in report, as appropriate
Compliance: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

- Provides an overview of the institution’s assessment processes
- Requests brief descriptive information for each degree program
- Ensures that every degree program has in place a quality assurance system for assessing, tracking, and improving the learning of its students
Meaning
What outcomes justify the degree, regardless of discipline?

• What does a degree from the institution mean?
• What does it say students are capable of doing?
• What are the distinctive experiences and learning outcomes of an education at the institution?
• What does the degree all add up to?
• Is it more than the sum of its parts?
• What are the parts?
• What’s the overarching goal?
Quality

• How rich are the experiences that the institution offers?

• How challenging? How rigorous?

• What quality assurance processes exist at the institution to guide improvement?
Institutional Report
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees (continued)

Integrity

• To what extent are all the parts of the educational experiences coherent, aligned, and intentional?
• To what extent does the institution deliver what it promises to deliver?
• How well does the institution achieve what it sets out to do?
• How does it know?
• How does it communicate about its degrees to internal and external audiences?
MEANING - A description of degree outcomes from a holistic institutional perspective. Defined in terms of expected student learning outcomes.

QUALITY - Defining the expected level at which graduates will have achieved the expected degree outcomes. Demonstrated through the assessment processes.

INTEGRITY - The cohesion of the degree and its relationship with external expectations of meaning & quality. Demonstrated through:
- Alignment of learning outcomes at various levels.
- Alignment with external requirements.
Institutional Report
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance

Student Learning

• What do students learn?

• How well do students learn?

• How does the institution know?

• What’s “good enough?”
Five Undergraduate Core Competencies

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Quantitative Reasoning
4. Critical Thinking
5. Information Literacy

Questions to pose

• How well do students do at a point near graduation?
• How does the institution know?
• What’s “good enough”?
Institutional Report
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation (continued)

Core Competencies at the Graduate Level

- Mastery of the discipline (scope and nature)
- Methods of the discipline (methodology)
  - Analytical skills
  - Primary sources
- Original research (thesis)
- Contributing to the profession (significance)
  - Community of scholars
  - Publications and presentations
Core Competencies at the Graduate Level
CFR 2.2b

The institution’s graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students’ active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program.

Guidelines: Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.
Institutional Report
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation (continued)

Institution’s Responsibility

- Define each competency or outcome
- Establish an institutional standard of performance at or near graduation: “appropriately ambitious”
- Assess, (dis)aggregate findings
- Show extent to which students’ performance meets the institution’s standard of performance
- If improvement is needed, create a plan, with criteria, timeline, metrics, for judging progress
- Report to WSCUC
WSCUC’s Responsibility

- Provide support, be a partner in the process

- WSCUC will accept . . .
  - Variations within and across institutions
  - Multiple methods and approaches
  - Gradual implementation
  - Innovation, experimentation
Institutional Report
Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation

• Student success is strong retention and degree completion rates AND high quality learning

• Component should address learning and personal development dimensions
Institutional Report
Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation (continued)

• CFR 1.2: Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning.

• WSCUC asks for this webpage link as part of the annual reporting and posts the link on the WSCUC website.
Institutional Report
Component 5: Student Success:
Student Learning, Retention and Graduation (continued)

• How does the institution define student success (accounting for completion and learning) given its mission, values, programs and the students it serves?

• How does the institution promote student success?

• How well are students doing in meeting the institution’s definition of student success?
Examples of Measures of Student Success

Retention rates
Graduation rates
Time-to-degree data
Learning outcomes
Licensing exam pass rates
Board certification
Employment
Student engagement
  • NSSE
  • UCUES
  • Locally developed surveys
Examples of Retention and Graduation Rates

IPEDS
College Navigator
National Student Clearinghouse
College Portraits
Absolute Graduation Rate (Dashboard)
Absolute Graduation Rate (Dashboard)

What is it?
How is it calculated?
How is it interpreted?

Information about the Dashboard is on theWSCUC website: [http://www.wascsenior.org/resources/about-the-graduation-rate-dashboar](http://www.wascsenior.org/resources/about-the-graduation-rate-dashboard)
## Institutional Report

### Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation (continued)

**Graduation Rate Dashboard**

California State University, Bakersfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>8 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Seeking Undergraduate Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td>7211</td>
<td>7806</td>
<td>7852</td>
<td>7954</td>
<td>8037</td>
<td>8352</td>
<td>8295</td>
<td>8671</td>
<td>64094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Institutional Units Completed</td>
<td>20666</td>
<td>21611</td>
<td>229179</td>
<td>238667</td>
<td>243671</td>
<td>250792</td>
<td>256990</td>
<td>261545</td>
<td>1919328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Institutional Units Completed Per Student</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated Headcount</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>10909</td>
<td>1496657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutional Graduation Units Completed</td>
<td>162119</td>
<td>175964</td>
<td>168567</td>
<td>184875</td>
<td>196521</td>
<td>199200</td>
<td>196139</td>
<td>217467</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Institutional Graduation Units Per Student</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/Y Graduation Headcount Change</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio - Grad Headcount/Annual Units</td>
<td>0.1647</td>
<td>0.1607</td>
<td>0.1616</td>
<td>0.1694</td>
<td>0.1785</td>
<td>0.1737</td>
<td>0.1744</td>
<td>0.1769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Redemption Rates (URR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URR 2-year average</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URR 3-year average</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URR 4-year average</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculation for numerator of 'd'</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total institutional units completed by non-continuing students =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76891</td>
<td>69221</td>
<td>81268</td>
<td>75747</td>
<td>69053</td>
<td>76638</td>
<td>54671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount of non-continuing students =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average institutional units for non-continuing students =</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d (ratio of dropout units to graduating units)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Graduation Rates (AGR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR 2-year average</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR 3-year average</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR 4-year average</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR 5-year average</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available IPEDS 6-year graduation rates</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS Graduates</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS Cohort</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of graduating cohort in IPEDS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Report
Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation (continued)

For retention and graduation data

- Does the institution report 3-5 year trends in retention and graduation rates (aggregated and disaggregated)?
- What do the data show?
- Has the institution identified factors that influence the data?
- Has the institution benchmarked its rates against peer institutions or aspirational institutions?
- Does the institution have goals with timelines to make improvements overall or for subgroups, as appropriate?
- Has the institution identified challenges to improving its rates?
- Does the institution judge its retention and graduation rates to be satisfactory?
- How effective are the systems to gather, analyze, interpret and use the data?
Institution may consider and reflect the effect of:

- the way students matriculate (first time; transfer)
- enrollment patterns (part time; stop and return; transfer and return)
- differences in types of programs
- international students
Institutional Report
Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation (continued)

Institutions may describe:

- Trends; changes over time
- Results considered “too low,” or otherwise unacceptable
- Disaggregated results compared with overall
- Comparison of results with similar institutions; aspirational institutions; internal programs
- Effectiveness of data gathering and analysis systems
- Challenges to improving results; factors that influence data
- How data are used to improve student learning
Institutional Report
Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

- Program review
- Assessment of student learning
- Data collection, analysis, and use in decision-making
Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review

- Is there a robust system of cyclical program review (including the co-curricular) in the institution?
- Does it include findings from assessment of student learning?
- Is program review tied to planning and budgeting?
- Will program review promote the sustainability of assessment?
- Has program review resulted in attention to and enhancement of student learning?
Quality Assurance and Improvement: Assessment of Student Learning

Has the institution:

• defined student learning outcomes?
• gathered evidence of student learning?
• analyzed and interpreted the evidence?
• used this information to improve student learning?
Quality Assurance and Improvement: Use of Data and Evidence

- To what extent does the institution use evidence in decision-making, planning, resource allocation and other institutional processes?

- To what extent is use of data and evidence embedded in and characteristic of an institution’s actions and practices?
Institutional Report
Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for Changing Higher Education Environment

• Financial viability

• Changing ecology
Financial viability

- Are resources allocated according to institutional priorities?
- Does the allocation process includes strategic planning, operational execution, institution-wide evaluation, recalibration?
- Is the institution financially viable?
- Financial data collected through the annual report and provided to the team
Changing Ecology

• What changes taking place globally, nationally and locally will affect the institution?
• How is the institution paying attention to and planning for these changes?
• What is the institution’s vision of education for the coming decade?

http://www.wascasenior.org/redesign/conceptpapers
Institutional Report
Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for Changing Higher Education Environment (continued)

Changing Ecology: Top Issues (an unscientific, biased list)

1. “It’s the economy, stupid”
2. Cost and student debt
3. Careerism or education for life?
4. Quality assurance
5. Education for all
6. Student success
7. Changing ecology
   • Rise of for-profits
   • Rise of online education
   • Unbundling of American higher education
8. Seat time or outcomes based?
   • Competency based education
   • Certificates and badges
9. Globalization
10. Values
Optional

Selected theme(s) to advance institutional priorities

(What?!? you really want to do more?)
Institutional Report
Component 8: Institution-Specific Theme(s)

• Optional

• Introduce in Component 1

• Alert WSCUC staff liaison so an appropriate team can be selected
Institutional Report
Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

• What did the institution learn through the self-study process?

• What are the plans for the future based on what was learned?
Institutional Report

Exhibits

• “Review under the WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements”

• “Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators”

• Institution-selected exhibits in support of narrative
The Institutional Report: Format, Length, and Submission

- 50 – 75 pages, double spaced, 12 point font
- Name attachments so they reference text (Not: “Exhibit 1”)
- Will be submitted via the cloud (Box.com)
- More is not better…necessarily
Agenda for the Day

• The changing context for accreditation
• 2013 WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review
• Comprehensive review for reaffirmation of accreditation
• The institutional review process
• The institutional self-study and report
• Commission action
• Tools and resources
WSCUC Commissioners

• 27 volunteer members
• Nominated and voted upon by the CEOs of member institutions
• Represent the region and the general public
• Meet two times a year for actions (and one for a retreat)
Commission Review

- Commission Panel reads report and documentation including institution’s written response, talks with institutional representatives at Commission meeting
- Panel makes recommendation to Commission, and Commission acts
- Staff finalizes draft action letter on behalf of Commission
- Letter and team report are publicly available on WSCUC website
- Link provided on WSCUC website, if desired, to institution’s response to team report
Agenda for the Day

• The changing context for accreditation
• 2013 WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review
• Comprehensive review for reaffirmation of accreditation
• The institutional review process
• The institutional self-study and report
• Commission action
• Tools and resources
Tools: WSCUC Resources

- Materials on Box
- Materials on website (wascsenior.org)
- Resources for institutions https://www.wascsenior.org/resources
- WSCUC Workshops (www.wascsenior.org/events)
- The ARC – Academic Resource Conference
  - April 19–21, 2017 Manchester Grand Hyatt, San Diego, CA
Tools: WSCUC Liaison

- Counselor
- Coach/ Trainer
- Collaborator
- Communicator/Interpreter
- AND lastly
- Compliance Officer

Barbara Gross Davis
Email: bdavis@wascsenior.org
Telephone: 510 748-9798