# THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

**Name of Institution:**

| Key Descriptive Terms ➔ ⬇ ELEMENT & DEFINITION | INITIAL | EMERGING | DEVELOPED | HIGHLY DEVELOPED |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Learning** **A.** Student learning outcomes established; communicated in syllabi and publications; cited and used by faculty, student affairs, advisors, others (CFRs 2.2, 2.4): | For only a few programs and units; only vaguely (if at all) for GE; not communicated in syllabi, or publications such as catalogues, view books, guides to the major; only a few faculty know and use for designing curriculum, assignments, or assessment | For many programs and units, most aspects of GE; beginning to be communi-cated in basic documents; beginning to be used by some faculty for design of curriculum, assignments, assessments | For all units (academic & co-curricular), and for all aspects of GE; cited often but not in all appropriate places; most faculty cite; used in most programs for design of curriculum, assignments, and assessment | For all units (academic and co-curricular), and for all aspects of GE; cited widely by faculty and advisors; used routinely by faculty, student affairs, other staff in design of curricula, assignments, co-curriculum, and assessment |
| **B.** Expectations are established for how *well* (i.e., proficiency or level) students achieve outcomes (CFRs 2.1, 2.4, 2.5): | Expectations for student learning have not been set beyond course completion and GPA; level of learning expected relative to outcomes unclear | Expectations for level of learning explicit in a few programs; heavy reliance on course completion and GPA | Expectations for student learning explicit in most programs | Expectations for student learning are explicit in all programs, widely known and embraced by faculty, staff, and students |
| **C.** Assessment plans are in place; curricular and co-curricular outcomes are systematically assessed, improvements documented (CFRs 2.4, 2.7): | No comprehensive assessment plans. Outcomes assessed occasionally using surveys and self reports, seldom using direct assessment; rarely lead to revision of curriculum, pedagogy, co-curriculum, or other aspects of educational experience | Some planning in place. Outcomes assessed occasionally, principally using surveys; beginning to move toward some direct assessment; occasionally leads to improvements in educational experience; improvements sporadically documented, e.g., in units' annual reports. | Plans mostly in place. Assessment occurs periodically, using direct methods supplemented by indirect methods and descriptive data; educational experience is frequently improved based on evidence and findings; improvements are routinely documented, e.g. in units' annual reports | Assessment plans throughout institution. Assessment occurs on regular schedule using multiple methods; strong reliance on direct methods, performance-based; educational experience systematically reviewed and improved based on evidence and findings; documentation widespread and easy to locate. |
| **D**. Desired kind and level of learning is achieved (CFR 2.6): | Possible that learning is not up to expectations, and/or expectations set by institution are too low for degree(s) offered by the institution | Most students appear to achieve at levels set by the institution; faculty and other educators beginning to discuss expectations and assessment findings | Nearly all students achieve at or above levels set by institution; assessment findings discussed periodically by most faculty and other campus educators | All students achieve at or above levels set by institution; findings are discussed regularly and acted upon by all or nearly all faculty and other campus educators |
| **Teaching/Learning Environment** **A.** Curricula, pedagogy, co-curriculum, other aspects of educational experience are aligned with outcomes (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 4.6): | Conceived exclusively or largely in terms of inputs (e.g. library holdings, lab space), curricular requirements (e.g., for majors, GE) and availability of co-curricular programs; not visibly aligned with outcomes or expectations for level of student achievement; evidence of alignment processes lacking | Educational experience beginning to be aligned with learning outcomes and expectations for student achievement; evidence of alignment efforts available in some academic and co-curricular programs | Educational experience generally aligned with learning outcomes, expectations for student achievement; alignment becoming intentional, systematic, supported by tools (e.g. curriculum maps) and processes. Evidence of alignment efforts generally available | Educational experience fully aligned with learning outcomes, expectations; alignment is systematic, supported by tools and processes as well as broader institutional infrastructure. Evidence of alignment efforts readily available |
| **B.** Curricular and co-curricular processes (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.11, 2.13) are: | Rarely informed by good learning practices as defined by the wider higher education community; few curricular or co-curricular activities reviewed, mostly without reference to outcomes or evidence of student learning | Informed in some instances by good learning practices; curricula and co-curricular activities occasionally reviewed and improved but with little reference to outcomes or assessment findings | Informed in many cases by good learning practices; reviewed and improved by relevant faculty and other campus educators; often based on outcomes and assessment findings | Regularly informed by good learning practices; improvements consistently result from scholarly reflection on outcomes and assessment findings by relevant faculty and other campus educators |

# THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS FRAMEWORK: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **C.** Professional development, rewards (CFRs 2.8, 2.9): | Little or no support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; work to assess, improve student learning plays no positive role in reward system, may be viewed as a negative | Some support for faculty, other educators on campus to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; modest, implicit positive role in reward system | Some support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; explicit, positive role in reward structure | Significant support for faculty, other campus educators to develop expertise in assessment of student learning, related practices; explicit, prominent role in reward structure |
| **Organizational Learning** <br> **A.** Indicators of educational effectiveness are (CFRs 1.2, 4.3, 4.4): | Notable by their absence or considered only sporadically in decision-making | Found in some areas; dissemination of performance results just beginning; no reference to comparative data | Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated, collectively analyzed; some comparative data used. Some indicators used to inform planning, budgeting, other decision making on occasional basis | Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated widely, collectively analyzed; comparative data used, as appropriate, in all programs. Indicators consistently used to inform planning, budgeting, other decision making at all levels of the institution |
| **B.** Formal program review  (CFRs 2.7, 4.4) is: | Rare, if it occurs at all, with little or no useful data generated. Assessment findings on student learning not available and/or not used | Occasional, in some departments or units; heavy reliance on traditional inputs as indicators of quality; findings occasion-ally used to suggest improvements in educational effectiveness; weak linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting | Frequent, affecting most academic and co-curricular units, with growing inclusion of findings about student learning; unit uses findings to collectively reflect on, improve effectiveness; some linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting | Systematic and institution-wide, with learning assessment findings a major component; units use findings to improve student learning, program effectiveness, and supporting processes; close linkage to institution-level planning, budgeting |
| **C.** Performance data, evidence, and analyses (CFRs 4.3, 4.5, 4.6) are: | Not collected, disseminated, disaggregated, or accessible for wide use. Not evident in decision-making processes; do not appear to be used for improvement in any programs | Limited collection, dissemination, disaggregation, or access. Campus at beginning stages of use for decisions to improve educational effectiveness at program, unit, and/or institutional level | Systematic collection and dissemination, wide access; sometimes disaggregated; usually considered by decision-making bodies at all levels, but documentation and/or linkage to educational effectiveness may be weak | Systematic collection and dissemination, and access, purposeful disaggregation; consistently used by decision-making bodies for program improvement at all levels, with processes fully documented |
| **D.** Culture of inquiry and evidence (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, 4.7): | Faculty, other educators, staff, institutional leaders, governing board not visibly committed to a culture of inquiry and evidence except in isolated cases; not knowledgeable about learner-centeredness, assessment, etc. | Campus knowledge is minimal; support – at top levels and/or grass roots – for development of a culture of inquiry and evidence is sporadic and uneven | Campus knowledge and support for a culture of inquiry and evidence fairly consistent across administration, faculty, professional staff but may not be uniformly deep | Consistent, knowledgeable, deep commitment to creating and sustaining a culture of inquiry and evidence in all appropriate functions at all levels |
| **E.** Communication and transparency (CFR 1.2, 1.7): | Little or no data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning available within the institution or to external audiences | Some data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning available but may be incomplete, difficult to access or understand for internal or external audiences | Data, findings, analyses from assessment of student learning generally available, easily accessible; chosen for relevance to multiple audiences | Data, findings, analyses from learning assessment are widely available and skillfully framed to be understandable, useful to multiple audiences |
| **Overall:** The institution can best be described as: | Committed to isolated aspects of educational effectiveness; if other areas are not addressed, continuing reaffirmation of accreditation is threatened | Committed to educational effectiveness in some areas; significant number of areas require attention, improvement | Mostly well-established commitment to educational effectiveness; a few areas require attention, improvement | Fully committed to and going beyond WASC recommendations; operates at an exemplary level in addressing its Core Commitments to capacity as it relates to learning and to educational effectiveness |