

## **THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

### **DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THE REPORT**

Purpose of the Team Report: The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team report conveys to the Commission and the institution the team's findings and recommendations about the institution's fulfillment of the Core Committee to Educational Effectiveness. It also provides the team's summative judgment about the institution's overall capacity and educational effectiveness.

Team Chair and Assistant Chair's Responsibility for the Report: The Chair and Assistant Chair work together to prepare and finalize the team report as follows.

- The Assistant Chair compiles and edits the team members' drafts into one coherent report and forwards the report to the Chair for review.
- The Chair sends the draft team report to the team and WASC staff liaison for comment and incorporates, as appropriate, any suggested revisions.
- The Chair sends the resulting draft report to the CEO of the institution for correction of errors of fact, requesting a letter setting forth any desired changes.
- The Chair makes any revisions that are deemed necessary for the factual accuracy of the report. (Note that revisions beyond correction of factual errors are not required and are made at the discretion of the Team Chair).
- The Team Chair sends the final report to the WASC Visit Process Manager.

The report should contain:

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents with page numbers
3. Final Educational Effectiveness Review team report
4. Relevant appendices concerning off-campus, distance education, compliance audit, and other follow-up matters related to previous substantive change actions.

The Chair also sends the *Confidential Team Recommendation* form to the WASC Visit Process Manager. The Chair must be sure to send this form only to WASC and not to the institution, as the recommendation is confidential and intended only for the WASC team, staff and Commission.

Report Length and Page Format: The report should be double-spaced, using 12-point font, and should include page headers and page numbers. EER team reports are generally 30-40 pages in length.

(Sample Title Page Format)

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

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

Date of visit

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

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

Team Roster

List names of Chair, Assistant Chair, team members, and WASC staff liaison

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

### SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and Visit 1
- B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report:
  - Alignment with the Proposal
  - Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report
- C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

### SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

[Options: See instructions on page 6 about organizing this section of the report, which should be organized by Standards or Themes with citations to CFRs as relevant.]

Standard 1  
Standard 2  
Standard 3  
Standard 4

OR

Theme 1: [fill in title]  
Theme 2: [fill in title]  
Theme 3: [fill in title]

Student Success [required, unless covered in one of the institution's themes]

### SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

#### APPENDICES [if applicable]

Report on off-campus and distance education programs  
Report on substantive change-related issues  
Compliance audit

## **FORMAT FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

**SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT** (approximately 10-20% of entire report/3-8 pages)

### **A. Description of Institution and Visit**

- Provide **background information** on the mission and nature of the institution, including brief history, location(s), size, levels and kinds of degrees awarded.
- Provide information on the institution's **recent accreditation history**, including the Capacity and Preparatory Review that preceded this visit.
- Indicate whether the institution has **off-campus sites or distance education** programs and, if so, which ones were reviewed on this visit. (A report on any such matters should be included as an appendix and should be discussed, as appropriate, within the body of the report.)
- Indicate whether a **special follow-up visit**, such as the initial visit to a new program or a follow-up review of a new doctoral program, was conducted in connection with this EER visit. (A report on any such matters should be included as an appendix.)
- If applicable, indicate whether a compliance audit was conducted for Candidacy, Initial Accreditation or pursuant to a Commission action letter.

### **B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report**

1. Describe briefly the intended outcomes for the EER as set forth in the institution's Proposal, and the approach that the institution adopted for the review. Cite the selected themes, if any, and indicate how effectively the institution implemented the plans outlined in the Proposal in its Educational Effectiveness Review and related Report. The way in which the institution implements the Proposal should be considered an indicator of its commitment to engage in serious self-review and improvement.
  - Was the EER Report consistent with the Proposal, as approved by the Proposal Review Committee? If not, in what ways did it deviate?
  - If the institution departed from the approved design or content, were the changes approved in advance by WASC staff? If not, why?
  - To what extent were the departures from the original Proposal explained, appropriate, and useful to the review?
2. Describe the overall quality of the EER Report and its value in the review process.
  - Was the report well organized and clearly written and presented?
  - Did the report accurately portray the condition of the institution?
  - What was the extent of institutional involvement in the review and report preparation? How were faculty included in discussion of issues and recommendations?

- Did the institution implement the review as a rigorous inquiry with searching questions, appropriate methodology, and effective use of evidence?
- Did the data and evidence support the claims made by the institution in addressing the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness?
- Did the institution’s self-review lead to a greater understanding of its effectiveness, systems of quality improvement, and student learning?

### C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

Set forth each major recommendation of the CPR team report and the Commission action letter following the CPR, and provide a brief description and analysis of evidence showing how the institution has responded. If an issue remains a concern and is discussed in Section II or III of the team report, this section may refer to content in those sections.

If there are other issues trailing from previous visits other than the CPR visit, adjust the heading accordingly and note those issues here, along with a summary of how the institution has addressed these issues.

Also set forth any other major changes that have occurred since the CPR visit that may affect the Commission’s evaluation of institutional capacity.

## SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS (approx. 65-75% of entire report/19-30 pages)

### ➤ Organizing the EER Team Report

The purpose of Section II is to help the Commission understand how the institution has met the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness. EER team reports, whether for Candidacy, Initial Accreditation, or Reaffirmation of Accreditation, should contain an evaluation of the institution’s inquiry about educational effectiveness and of the institution’s systems for enhancing effectiveness of student learning, including the sustainability of systems and plans.

Further, each report should address student success and program review. Each of these subsections are set forth below, with questions designed to guide the team’s inquiry and report development.

For institutions seeking Candidacy or Initial Accreditation, and institutions that have selected the **comprehensive approach** to the CPR, the team report is organized around the four **Standards**.

If the institution’s report follows the **themes** approach, the team report should be organized around those themes. CFRs or issues not included in the institution's report can be addressed in the team report either within the themes or in a separate section covering “Other Matters Raised on the Visit.”

Whether in four sections addressing Standards (as in a comprehensive report) or within sections addressing themes, all reports must address and reference the Standards and CFRs, where appropriate.

➤ **Evaluation of the Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry**

This subsection should set forth the themes of the institution’s report and provide an analysis of how effectively the institution addressed these themes. For each theme, the report should:

- Identify and briefly describe the theme and related intended outcomes.
- Describe the evidence reviewed by the team in addressing the theme.
- Evaluate the appropriateness, quality, and effectiveness of the evidence and methods used to undertake the inquiry.
- Verify and assess the institution’s analysis and conclusions about the issue.
- Describe and evaluate plans resulting from the inquiry that will address the issue, and actions taken to date to implement the plans.
- State the team findings and recommendations about the theme.
- Identify any good practices, such as innovations in pedagogy, curriculum or services, linking them to specific learning results.

The team may address the following questions as it prepares the report:

- To what extent did the institution work directly with the results of student learning?
- What was the quality of evidence of student learning and other evidence used?
- Has the institution enhanced its understanding of student learning?
- Has the institution improved its ability to evaluate the results of student learning assessment and to make use of data derived from this work?
- Has the institution set targets and benchmarks for improvement?
- How representative is this inquiry of the institution’s overall and ongoing practices of quality assurance? How consistently are such approaches being applied across the institution?
- Did the review process lead to specific recommendations and improvement efforts?
- Can the team identify exemplary or emerging practices that should be shared with the region?

**Institution’s Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning**

The team should describe and evaluate the institution’s overall system of quality assurance and improvement, and plans going forward to address issues raised in the EER, including systems for improving teaching and learning. The 2008 revisions to the Institutional Review Process place emphasis on the sustainability of effectiveness plans and ask the institution to present a plan, methods, and schedule for assessment of learning outcomes beyond the Educational Effectiveness Review.

The team may wish to consider:

- What are the institution's systems for improving teaching and learning?
- Does the quality assurance process provide for review of actual student work and the findings of assessment?
- In the quality assurance processes, what evidence is routinely collected and analyzed? How is it used in decision making and for improvement?
- How does the institution assure itself that the work of its graduates consistently reflects the level and quality identified in its educational objectives?
- Do student affairs and academic support units have goals and outcomes? Are they aligned with the educational purposes and goals of the institution? Do these units undergo periodic review for their effectiveness? Do they align with and support academic student learning outcomes?
- Has a plan been developed that will assure attention to issues raised in the EER over the next seven to ten years?
- What next steps should be taken to ensure that systems and processes for evaluating effectiveness will be sustained and are embedded into the culture and practices of the institution?
- Are the effectiveness plans integrated into the institution's strategic and operational plans and budgets?
- How will the systems for evaluating educational effectiveness be funded into the future?
- What areas have been identified as needing improvement or change? Have targets, goals or milestones been set?
- What is the timeline for activities and progress? When and how often will results be reviewed and by whom?

➤ **Student Success** [required, unless covered in one of the institution's themes]

Effective fall 2007, teams have been asked to address student success using both data from the data tables and any analysis of data that was provided in the institution's report. Starting in fall 2009, every CPR and EER report also should address student success in terms of retention and graduation rates. In preparing this section of the team report, the team may wish to consider how the institution has addressed the following questions, which were provided to all institutions in July 2008 for use in addressing student success in CPR reports:

- How does the institution's mission affect its goals for student success?
- How are goals for student success established and reviewed?
- What do data on student attrition and retention show for various groups of students, including different demographic groups, degree levels, and majors?
- What do data show about graduation rates and time to completion?
- Are the data collected complete and accurate enough to make an informed analysis?
- Have goals for student success been established?
- Are benchmark data for comparable institutions available?
- How is the institution doing in meeting its own expectations and in comparison to like institutions?
- Are retention and graduation rates "good enough"? If not, what next steps will be taken to develop plans to address student success?

For EER visits starting in fall 2009, the institution is expected to report further about student success, deepening its analysis of internal and comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate surveys, etc. The team should address the following questions:

- What plans have been developed since the CPR analysis?
  - Have these plans been implemented and assessed?
  - What progress has been made in achieving a deeper understanding of student success? Promoting student success?
  - Have there been any changes in performance data on retention and completion? What do these changes mean?
- **Program Review** [required as of fall 2009, unless covered in one of the institution's themes]

The 2008 revisions to the Institutional Review Process require institutions to present an analysis of the effectiveness of the program review process in the EER, with special emphasis on the achievement of programs' learning outcomes. The team should sample current program review reports (self-studies and external review reports) to assess the impact of the program review process and alignment with the institution's quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting.

The team should consider the following in preparing this subsection:

- Does the program review process meet the expectations in the WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews?
  - Are all academic and co-curricular programs subject to program review?
  - Is program review conducted in a timely manner and in keeping with good practice?
  - Is program review used to assess program effectiveness and student learning at the program level?
  - Is it used to improve program effectiveness?
  - Is it used to align resources with needs?
  - How is program review articulated with the budgeting process?
  - Is the program review process itself reviewed on a systematic basis?
  - What did the team learn from examining recent program reviews? What has the institution done to address any needs that were identified in the program reviews?
- **Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs [if needed]**

In this subsection, the team should identify other issues relating to either capacity or educational effectiveness that are not otherwise covered in Sections I and II.

- **Drafting the Body of the Report**

- ✓ **Using the Standards of Accreditation and Core Commitments.** The Standards of Accreditation provide the warrant and framework for the team’s review and Commission action. For established institutions using either the comprehensive or thematic approach, the Standards are not intended to be applied mechanically. It is not necessary to describe how the institution meets each Criterion for Review (CFR).
- ✓ **Citing the CFRs.** Teams should identify, where appropriate, the Standards and CFRs that apply to the issue the team is addressing, e.g., cite CFR 1.4 in discussing academic freedom.
- ✓ **Applying the Standards and CFRs.** If the team believes that the institution is not in compliance with a Standard or CFR, evidence and analysis supporting this finding should be included. However, the team should not utilize language concluding that the institution is “not in compliance,” as this determination is made by the Commission. Likewise, reports should not state that the institution is “in compliance.”
- ✓ **Presenting Issues, Analyzing Evidence and Formulating Conclusions.** Each issue identified by the team for discussion in the report should include an analysis with the following elements:
  - Statement of the issue
  - Description of the evidence the team reviewed in evaluating this matter
  - Analysis of the evidence, i.e., what does the evidence show about this issue? What did the institution conclude from this evidence?
  - The team’s conclusions and recommendations flowing from the analysis of the evidence.

**SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**  
(approximately 5-10% of entire report/2-4 pages)

The Commission takes action on the institution’s accreditation status following the Educational Effectiveness Review. To provide the Commission with the information it needs to make this important decision, the team is expected to address the following matters in this final section of the report:

- Address briefly the extent to which the institution fulfilled the intended outcomes for the complete comprehensive review, as stated in its Proposal, and the impact of the entire review process on the institution.
- Set forth the team’s findings, commendations, and recommendations on major areas for both the Capacity and the Educational Effectiveness Reviews. Recommendations should address overarching and important areas and should encompass issues that should be addressed before the next comprehensive review. All recommendations should be supported by evidence and analysis set forth in the body of the report in

- Section II. Each recommendation should cite one or more relevant Standards and CFRs.
- Other suggestions and observations that do not rise to the level of recommendations may be made in the report but should not be included in this section.

Note that the team will also submit its Confidential Team Recommendation concerning the term of accreditation to the Visit Process Manager. Teams should consult two related documents for guidance about the length of the term of accreditation: *Commission Decisions on Institutions* and *Commission and Team Decision Indicators*.