

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

**Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part I: Program Review**

(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

<b>Levels of Implementation</b>	<b>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review</b> <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i>
<b>Awareness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review.</li> <li>• There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research.</li> <li>• There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals.</li> <li>• The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.</li> </ul>
<b>Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness.</li> <li>• Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness.</li> <li>• Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.)</li> <li>• Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality.</li> <li>• Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement.</li> <li>• Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.</li> </ul>
<b>Proficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly.</li> <li>• Results of all program review are integrated into institution- wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making.</li> <li>• The program review framework is established and implemented.</li> <li>• Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness.</li> <li>• Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples.</li> <li>• The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.</li> <li>• The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness.</li> <li>• The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.</li> </ul>

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

**Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part II: Planning**

(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

<b>Levels of Implementation</b>	<b>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning</b> <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i>
<b>Awareness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes.</li> <li>• There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning.</li> <li>• The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g. in human or physical resources).</li> <li>• Planning found in only some areas of college operations.</li> <li>• There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning.</li> <li>• There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money"</li> <li>• The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it.</li> <li>• The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it.</li> <li>• Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals.</li> <li>• The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation.</li> <li>• Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement.</li> <li>• Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.</li> </ul>
<b>Proficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements.</li> <li>• The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes, and improve institutional effectiveness.</li> <li>• The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes.</li> <li>• The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission).</li> <li>• The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses).</li> <li>• The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources.</li> <li>• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning.</li> <li>• There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution.</li> <li>• There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes.</li> <li>• There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.</li> </ul>

**Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges**  
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

**Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness – Part III: Student Learning Outcomes**

(See attached instructions on how to use this rubric.)

<b>Levels of Implementation</b>	<b>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes</b> <i>(Sample institutional behaviors)</i>
<b>Awareness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes.</li> <li>• There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes.</li> <li>• There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people.</li> <li>• Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress.</li> <li>• The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.</li> </ul>
<b>Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline.</li> <li>• College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes.</li> <li>• Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment.</li> <li>• Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation.</li> <li>• Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment.</li> <li>• Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcomes development.</li> </ul>
<b>Proficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees.</li> <li>• Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices.</li> <li>• There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results.</li> <li>• Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning.</li> <li>• Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned.</li> <li>• Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis.</li> <li>• Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes.</li> <li>• Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement.</li> <li>• Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust.</li> <li>• Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing.</li> <li>• Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college.</li> <li>• Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.</li> </ul>

JP;DB: cg 8/2007