



Addressing the 2008 Revisions to the CFRs and Institutional Review Process

In 2008, the Commission adopted changes to several of the Criteria for Review (CFRs) in the Standards of Accreditation and to the Institutional Review Process. The changes became effective July 1, 2008 and are being phased in over the next year to allow institutions adequate time to address them during their next interactions with WASC.

Starting with fall 2009 visits, institutions that are in the process of a comprehensive review with visits already scheduled should address the revised requirements in their reports as follows.

1. Addressing the Revised CFRs

Table A (attached) identifies the CFRs and related Guidelines to which substantive revisions were made in 2008. Please review these changes and assess your institution's status with regard to the new requirements. In a brief supplemental report to your CPR or EER report, please provide a summary of your analysis and evidence, as appropriate. You may provide this summary in whatever form is most effective or efficient for you, e.g., a narrative report or a table or chart.

Particular attention should be given to any revision that will require a change in your institutional policies or practices. For example, if your institution is not already publishing data about student performance for the public, you will need to develop a plan for doing so under the new provisions of CFR 1.2.

If your Proposal has been approved and you are scheduled for a CPR visit during or after fall 2009, you should submit your analysis of the revised CFRs in a supplement to your CPR report and follow up as needed in your EER report. If you have only an EER visit scheduled during or after fall 2009, you should submit this supplemental report with your EER report.

2. Addressing New Topics in the Institutional Review Process

Table B (attached) identifies three topical areas that must now be addressed in the comprehensive review process and serves as a tool for institutions to use in discussing the topics, developing an outline, and identifying related supporting documents.

The topics are:

- Student Success (to be addressed in both CPR and EER)
- Program Review (to be addressed in EER)
- Sustainability of Effectiveness Plans (to be addressed in EER)

If your Proposal has been approved and you are scheduled for a CPR visit during or after fall 2009, you should follow the prescribed outline for the content of the CPR and EER reports, as set forth in the Institutional Review Process. The primary change for CPR report is the inclusion of an analysis of student success. If you have only an EER visit scheduled during or after fall 2009, you are required to address all three topics shown above, as set forth in the revised Institutional Review Process.

Finally, if any of these areas are covered extensively in your report because you chose to emphasize that topic as part of your review, feel free to refer to that section of the report in your supplement instead of preparing a separate report or document.

7/17/08

**Table A:
Preparing a Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs**

The following table is designed to assist institutions in understanding changes to the CFRs, assessing how their policies and practices align with the revised areas, and identifying any areas that may require attention by the institution. Each of the substantive revisions to the CFRs is listed below along with questions that may help the institution to conduct this self-assessment and prepare a report.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR¹ (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/ action plan
1.2	The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels.	Does the institution have educational objectives at all three levels indicated in the CFR (institution, program, and course)? Have goals or expectations for achievement of these objectives been established? Where are these objectives and indicators published?			
1.2	The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning.	Does the institution have a systematic process for measuring student achievement? Does this system or process include analysis of data on retention and completion? Does it include processes for summative assessment of student learning?			
1.2	The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.	Does the institution publish data on retention and graduation rates? Student learning outcomes? Where?			
1.9	The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution	Does the institution keep WASC informed about important changes? Is there a process and assigned responsibility for ensuring that this reporting is done?			
2.2b	GUIDELINE: Institutions offering graduate-level programs demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.	If applicable: Are master's and doctoral programs adequately supported with the full array of resources expected for graduate-level study, including qualified faculty with appropriate workload levels, support for advising and theses/ dissertations, library and research? Is there a "culture" that is expected for graduate study, e.g., scholarly and intellectual engagement among faculty and students?			

¹ See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR² (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/ action plan
2.3	The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level.	Have student learning outcomes been established for courses and programs? Have standards been established for the attainment of these SLOs? If appropriate to the institution, have institution-wide outcomes been established, e.g., for all undergraduate degrees? Where are outcomes and expectations for attainment found?			
2.7	All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.	Is there a regular cycle of program review that includes assessment of student learning and analyses of retention and completion? Is program review conducted on schedule and as intended? Does it also include, where relevant to the discipline, results of licensing and placement? Where are completed program reviews maintained? (Also note new requirements on reporting on the effectiveness of program review in the EER report. See Table B.)			
2.8	GUIDELINE: Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	How do policies and practices on promotion and tenure address scholarship that relates to teaching and learning? Is this kind of scholarship valued and encouraged by the institution?			

² See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR³ (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/ action plan
2.10	The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success.	Does the institution have a system for collecting and analyzing data about students? Are data on retention, graduation, time to completion, and other measures of student achievement, analyzed in disaggregated form by various categories so that the institution can understand how different groups of students are performing and are experiencing their education? Is the institution surveying students and analyzing the resulting data on satisfaction and climate? What are the results? How are they used?			
2.11	Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.	Does the institution have student support services that are appropriate to its mission, its programs, and the needs of the students it serves? Are these programs regularly assessed to determine their effectiveness? By whom and how often? How are results of assessment used.			
3.2	GUIDELINE: The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	Does the institution include adjunct, part-time, and non-tenure-track full-time faculty members in academic processes that affect student learning? What are the relevant institutional policies and practices that address their roles in the academic life of the institution? How are they involved in assessing student work? In carrying out program-level assessment? In conducting program review? Are they provided professional development to improve teaching and learning?			

³ See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR⁴ (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/action plan
3.3	Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation , workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives.	Are new faculty members provided with appropriate orientation?			
3.4	GUIDELINE: The institution provides training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.	If online or other modes of distance education are used to deliver programs and courses or to enhance or replace face-to-face instruction, are faculty members provided with training? Are they provided with technology support? How? When? How often? What does this consist of? Is it effective?			
3.5	The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability.... If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit.	Is the institution operating within its operating revenues and budgets? Is there an accumulated deficit or a pattern of operating deficits? If so, what are plans to address deficits? What are the trends? How soon will any accumulated deficits be eliminated? Are annual independent financial audits conducted? Have the audits and related management letters identified any practices or patterns that need to be addressed? If so, how and when are these areas being addressed? Is the institution financially sustainable now and for the future?			
3.6	The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.	Are information resources and related support and facilities aligned with the educational objectives? Aligned with student learning outcomes? Do they support and enhance student learning? How? Are they adequate to meet the needs of the faculty and students?			

⁴ See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR⁵ (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/action plan
3.8	GUIDELINE: The institution establishes clear roles , responsibilities, and lines of authority, which are reflected in an organization chart .	Does the institution have clear job descriptions? Lines of reporting and responsibility? Is there an organizational chart that reflects the structure of the organization? Is this structure well understood within the institution?			
3.9	GUIDELINE: The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	Does the governing board engage in orientation, self-assessment, and development? Is this work designed to enhance the functioning of the board? When and how is it done? Is there any evidence of its value or impact?			
3.10	The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management	Does the institution have a full-time CEO/president/chancellor? Does the institution have a full-time CFO? How is the administration of the institution organized? Are there a sufficient number of qualified administrators to ensure that the institution is operated effectively? Is the leadership effective? Is the institution well managed? How do you know?			
3.11	GUIDELINE: The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.	Does the institution have a charter or other document that sets forth the roles, rights and responsibilities of the faculty? Is the faculty role clear? Is the faculty vested with sufficient authority over academic programs and policies?			

⁵ See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR⁶ (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Self-Assessment Questions	We do this well	Evidence for this finding	Needs attention or development/ action plan
4.4	The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.	What are the institution’s quality assurance processes? Do they exist at the institutional level and at other administrative levels? Does the institution have clear, published policies in the areas designated? Are they understood and followed? Do quality assurance processes assess not only capacity but effectiveness? If so, how? Are data, findings and results tracked over time to ascertain trends? Has the institution and units within it established benchmarks based on comparable institutions’ performance? Are the results of the quality assurance processes used to make improvements? How does this work?			
4.5	The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.	What is the capacity of the institution to conduct institutional research? How is IR conducted and by whom? Is there a description of this function that is published or widely understood at the institution? Is the IR function adequately resourced to meet the needs of the institution? What data are collected and analyzed? To whom are they disseminated and how often? Is there a “culture of evidence,” i.e., is evidence used in making decisions and improvements? How is the IR function used to support the assessment of student learning assessment processes? Is the IR function evaluated periodically? Are new data collected and analyzed when needed?			

7/17/08

⁶ See the Handbook of Accreditation for definitions of CFRs and Guidelines.

**Table B:
Addressing New 2008 Requirements of the Institutional Review Process**

The following table is designed to assist institutions in preparing essays on new required topics in the Institutional Review Process. The three new substantive areas to be covered in all comprehensive reviews are set forth below along with questions that may help the institution to analyze the topics and prepare the required essays. Please refer to revised Institutional Review Process on the WASC website for the complete explanation of report requirements under the revised Process.

New Required Coverage	When	Questions for Discussion and Analysis	Evidence to be Analyzed or Drawn Upon
STUDENT SUCCESS	CPR		
<p>A study and analysis of student success, drawing from, but not limited to, [the institution's] data on retention and graduation rates, disaggregated by student type and by program. To the extent possible, the study should include comparisons with similar institutions and, where appropriate, recommendations for improvement.</p>		<p>How do our mission and the characteristics of our students affect our definitions and measurements of student success?</p>	
		<p>What data do we collect? Do we collect a complete range of accurate data sufficient to support informed analysis? How do we disaggregate the data by student type and program? What do the data show about the graduation rates and time to degree for different demographic groups and programs compared with those for the whole student body and the institution as a whole?</p>	
		<p>What are our stated goals or expectations for student success? In what areas do we want to realize improvement in retention and graduation rates? What plans have we made to those areas? Who was involved in developing the goals and plans?</p>	
		<p>What are comparable institutions against which we can benchmark results?</p>	
<p>Further development of student success efforts. Based on the findings of the institution and the team at the CPR review, the institution will be expected to further its analysis of student success, deepening its analysis of its own and comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate surveys, etc.</p>	EER	<p>How have we deepened our analysis and understanding of retention and graduation since the CPR? Did we act on plans that arose from the CPR? What is our assessment of our progress in promoting student success?</p>	
		<p>What does our analysis of year-to-year retention and graduation data show? How do these data compare with other institutions? What do results from campus climate surveys or other inquiries into its educational effectiveness tell us?</p>	
		<p>What more should we be doing to improve retention and graduation rates, time to graduation, and other indicators?</p>	

New Required Coverage	When	Questions for Discussion and Analysis	Evidence to be Analyzed or Drawn Upon
PROGRAM REVIEW	EER		
<p>An analysis of the effectiveness of the Program Review Process. Institutions should analyze the effectiveness of the program review process, including its emphasis on the achievement of the program's learning outcomes. It is expected that the process will be sufficiently embedded for the institution and the team to sample current program review reports (self-studies, 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.</p>		<p>Does the program review process meet the expectations reflected 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? Are recent program reviews available to the WASC visit team?</p>	
SUSTAINABILITY OF EFFECTIVENESS PLANS	EER		
<p>A plan, methods, and schedule for assessment of learning outcomes beyond the Educational Effectiveness Review.</p>		<p>What is the plan for ongoing attention to educational effectiveness at the institution? Has a plan been developed that will cover the next seven to ten years? What next steps should be taken to ensure that systems and processes for evaluating effectiveness are sustained into the future and 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?</p> <p>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?</p>	