

College of Arts and Sciences

Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards (Pilot, Updated 4.9.12)

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WASC Standards. The use of the worksheet is recommended; the institution may choose some other means of reviewing itself under the Standards. The worksheet leads planning groups to identify strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention under each Standard and Criteria for Review. The process may also surface themes or topics for further exploration in the accreditation review.

The WASC Standards and CFRs

The WASC Standards are designed to guide institutions in self-review, to provide a framework for institutional presentations to the Commission and review teams, and to serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories under which the standard is more specifically defined. Within each sub-section are Criteria for Review (CFRs), intended to identify and define key elements of the standard. Guidelines identify expected forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to certain Criteria for Review. By design, the Commission has not developed a Guideline for each Criterion for Review. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines, where applicable. For more detailed information on application of the Standards, see the Handbook of Accreditation.

Strategies for Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is meant to be a heuristic tool for stimulating discussion and exploration rather than a definitive grading scheme or a mechanical checklist for compliance. Through its use, key areas may be identified where more evidence is needed or more development is required. The planning group may modify the worksheet in any way that suits its purposes. One approach is to have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group. Another approach is to divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each Standard.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated into the report as appropriate. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed in your review.

Copies of this worksheet are available on the WASC website at www.wasc senior.org.

Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards

Suggested Rating for Columns in the Worksheet:	
<p><u>Self Review Rating</u></p> <p>1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply or not enough evidence to address</p>	<p><u>Importance to address at this time</u></p> <p>A= High priority B= Lower priority C= Does not need to be addressed at this time</p>

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher educational community and its relationship to society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review Rating	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Institutional Purposes				
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines, or are subject to peer review within the framework of generally recognized academic disciplines or areas of practice.	3	B	CAS has its own mission statement but it has not been vetted by the Senate (though they have seen it).
1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning. The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.		3	A	<p>CAS has a set of comprehensive data on grad rates and # of majors, but the development of data (definitions) are not consistent across reporting sites (i.e. IR vs. Advising Center).</p> <p>CAS lacks comprehensive assessment on graduation competencies at the Departmental level (see WASC letter from 6.30.2008 that cites us for this).</p> <p>Collection of what is already being done by departments has not been aggregated by CAS.</p>

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review Rating	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Institutional Purposes				
1.3 The institution's leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		2	B	No evaluation for Department Chairs and Division Chairs in place
Integrity				
1.4 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world-views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure these conditions are consistent with academic freedom. Due process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	
1.5 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WASC Statement on Diversity.	1	C	
1.6 Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.	The institution has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by political, religious, corporate or other external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements.	0	C	

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Integrity				
1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, and human subjects in research and refunds.	The institution has published or readily-available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. and has no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution has published or readily-available grievance procedures for faculty and staff. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated, and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.	1	B/C	<p>4-year pathways are in progress.</p> <p>VCAA has a policy on student grievances; the Union oversees faculty grievances but we don't keep records. Discussion needed on where those records are to be kept and by whom.</p> <p>IRB has policies on human research.</p>
1.8 The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.	The institution's finances are regularly audited by external agencies.	0	C	
1.9 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.		0	C	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One

1. After completing this analysis, what are the most important issues, if any, that should be emphasized in the accreditation review under this Standard?

CAS lacks comprehensive assessment on graduation competencies at the Departmental level (see WASC letter from 6.30.2008 that cites us for this).

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths**?

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved**?

1. **Regarding mission statement: 1) needs discussion and ratification in the Senate (Randy will re-open the dialogue with the Exec members to begin the process) 2) Once vetted, statement needs to be posted on a publically accessible website (CAS page) 3) Further development of a CAS website: <http://hilo.hawaii.edu/academics/cas>.**
2. **Teaching/Admin release policy needs to be formalized, approved and uploaded to the CAS homepage. 2) Review by-laws of all departments for policies on terms of chairs. 3) VCAA policy on evaluating chairs currently stuck on Congress. Ask Senate Chair to urge movement.**
3. **Upload 4-year pathways to CAS website (or departmental websites) upon completion. 2) Area in blue needs to be taken up in discussions on assessment (primarily in terms of alignment – standardizing numerical grading cut-offs).**

Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution's efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Teaching and Learning				
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	3*	A	<p>Evaluations of lecturers will begin as of Fall 2013.</p> <p>Lecturer pool is "thin."</p> <p>Credit requirements for degrees is variable across the college, as is the reporting of rigor.</p> <p>CAS Hiring plan is based on fulfilling already existent but vacant positions lost to attrition (retirement, relocation, etc.)</p>
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.	Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.	2	B	<p>Review of syllabi in divisions may be needed to see if all syllabi have SLOs.</p>
2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life. These programs also ensure the development of core learning abilities and competencies including, but not limited to, college-level written and oral communication; college-level quantitative skills; information literacy; and the habit of critical analysis of data and argument. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster an understanding of diversity; civic responsibility; the ability to work with others; and the capability to engage in lifelong learning. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in the areas of cultural and aesthetic, social and political, as well as scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons in this society. Finally, students are required to engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study as part of their baccalaureate programs.	The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, consisting of a minimum of 45 semester units (or the equivalent), together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a major).	3*	A	<p>The core competencies are moving towards "graduation" competencies per the 2013 WASC Accreditation Handbook</p> <p>495 is not used by all departments as there is an inadequate number of staff – we need to identify more creative models that are affordable, manageable, and meaningful for departments to use as evidence of programmatic rigor.</p> <p>The problem of the "45 credit" minimum for the major; may need to do a "credit check" of existing majors vis-à-vis an exploration of how majors demonstrate that their majors are achieving core competencies.</p> <p>Can we engage in a discussion in the college to address a more uniform approach to 200/300/400 definitions of courses – are we all on the same page when we define upper versus lower division coursework and expectations? What should the upper vision experience be defined as? How do we document the meaning of these differences (within the major)? How well are we</p>

				doing in comparison to other colleges in defining credit requirements and competencies?
--	--	--	--	---

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Teaching and Learning				
2.2b Graduate programs are consistent with the purpose and character of their institutions; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the several levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. Graduate curricula are visibly structured to include active involvement with the literature of the field and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate high-level professional practice and training experiences. Additionally, admission criteria to graduate programs normally include a baccalaureate degree in an appropriate undergraduate program.	Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ at least one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered, and demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.	2	C	We don't really have a graduate-level student experience defined. We also have an inconsistent policy with regard to resources, namely Graduate Teaching Assistantships which were given to TCBES but Education and Psychology were not included in this allocation.
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. These outcomes and expectations are reflected in academic programs and policies; curriculum; advisement; library and information resources; and learning environment.		3	A	We don't really do this well.

2.4 The institution's expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution's faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.		3	A	<p>SLOs are not necessarily posted online by all majors.</p> <p>Instructors are generally included in the CAS Senate and have voting rights in the Congress; but, adjuncts are not included in curriculum development.</p>
Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Teaching and Learning				
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.		2	B	<p>We have criteria in syllabi and assignments.</p> <p>Some individuals also deploy rubrics in their courses.</p> <p>Mentoring and advising.</p> <p>(Group disagrees with the use of "class discussion policies" identified in the Compliance Audit Checklist)</p>
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.		3	A	<p>What are the levels of attainment in the majors/departments?</p>
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.		2	C	
Scholarship and Creative Activity				

2.8	The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovations as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.	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.	1	C	We have new T&P guidelines
2.9	The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.		1	C	
	Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Support for Student Learning					
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. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences.				
2.11	Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.		2	B	
2.12	The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.	Recruiting and admission practices, academic calendars, publications, and advertising are accurate, current, complete, and are readily available to support student needs.	2	B	

<p>2.13 Student support services—including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information services—are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.</p>				
<p>2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements.</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In-system transfers are done exceptionally well.</p> <p>Articulation agreements are in progress (Susan is working with Laura Brezinski at HAWCC) to develop dual advising.</p> <p>The Dean's Office also provides assistance on a case-by-case basis.</p>

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the most important issues, if any, that should be emphasized in the accreditation review under this Standard?

The move towards Core Competency Assessment

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths**?

New GE certification process and the new Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for CAS.

In-system transfers (HAWCC to UHH) are done well.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved**?
 1. The core competencies are moving towards "graduation" competencies per the 2013 WASC Accreditation Handbook
 2. 495 is not used by all departments as there is an inadequate number of staff—we need to identify more creative models that are affordable, manageable, and meaningful for departments to use as evidence of programmatic rigor.
 3. The problem of the "45 credit" minimum for the major; may need to do a "credit check" of existing majors vis-à-vis an exploration of how majors demonstrate that their majors are achieving core competencies.
 4. Can we engage in a discussion in the college to address a more uniform approach to 200/300/400 definitions of courses—are we all on the same page when we define upper versus lower division coursework and expectations? What should the upper vision experience be defined as? How do we document the meaning of these differences (within the major)?
 5. How well are we doing in comparison to other colleges in defining credit requirements and competencies?

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Faculty and Staff				
3.1 The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.		3	A	Staffing problems remain a high concern (current hiring priorities are only to replace vacant positions and are not comprehensive enough to ensure stability of all programs)
3.2. The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.	The institution has an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty with appropriate backgrounds, by discipline and degree levels. The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	3	A	Instructors have voting rights in Congress and can participate in the CAS Senate. However, adjuncts are not guaranteed voice in departments (some do, some don't), they do not have an official role in CAS, and they are not included in Congress. Due to poor morale, some faculty surveys are showing a possible attrition rate of 44%
3.3. Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.		1	C	
3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its institutional objectives.	The institution provides training and support for faculty members' teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.	2	B	We have ongoing workshops for faculty: Karla Hayashi (Writing Workshops) Phineas Kelly (IT) Candace Wheeler (DL)

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources				
3.5 The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources.		2	B	<p>We do not have financial self-governance within departments.</p> <p>Departments need discretionary funds for educational purposes; too often are operations hampered by fiscal bureaucracy (decisions need to be better aligned with core educational objectives)</p> <p>Funds need to go where the enrollment is highest (there are programs with insufficient staff to uphold the integrity of majors)</p>
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 sources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kinds to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered.		2	B	<p>We do not have access to Manoa's citation indexing.</p> <p>We do not have the same access to the databases Manoa has; lack of access to journals is a problem for some disciplines.</p>
3.7. The institution's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.		2	B	<p>Staffing for the webmaster remains a problem as it can take months for websites to go up.</p> <p>Depending on the issues, response time can be anywhere from 1 day to 6 months.</p> <p>Help desk is swamped – help arbitrarily given?</p>

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Organizational Structures and Decision- Making Processes.				
a. The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining effective academic programs.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority which are reflected in an organization chart.	2	B	The Chart exists but there is a perceived sense of "institutional" creep – student affairs has intruded in areas that ought to be the purview of academic affairs.
3.9. The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.	The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.			NA
3.10. The institution has a full time chief executive 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.		1	C	Yes, we have a very sufficient number of administrators; however, there has been a high turnover rate for VC Admin Affairs and interim positions abound.
3.11. The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character.	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.	1	C	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CAS Senate has been reconstituted and the Chair now sits as a representative on the Faculty Congress 2. Faculty Congress is functioning in providing faculty oversight over assessment, General Education, Program Review, etc.

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the most important issues, if any, that should be emphasized in the accreditation review under this Standard?

Staffing problems remain a high concern (current hiring priorities are only to replace vacant positions and are not comprehensive enough to ensure stability of all programs)

An Organization Chart exists but there is a perceived sense of “institutional” creep—student affairs has intruded in areas that ought to be the purview of academic affairs

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths**?

New Strategic Plan

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved**?

Providing a better budgeting model for CAS and for departments.
Better integration of adjunct faculty in curriculum and governance.
Faculty morale—why are so many leaving?

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Strategic Thinking and Planning				
4.1. The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including faculty, in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of its plans and planning processes and revises them as appropriate.		2	B	<p>We have a new strategic plan in place for 2011-2015, but we don't measure effectiveness.</p> <p>Who monitors progress? What are progress indicators?</p> <p>CAS still follows system indicators: i.e. # of STEM graduates, PELL, etc.</p> <p>There is no linkage between strategic planning and/or implementation with learning objectives (GE).</p> <p>Lack of clear implementation.</p>
4.2. Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.		2	B	
4.3. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.		2	B	

<p>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, and using comparative data from external sources and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</p>		3	A	<p>None of this is place.</p> <p>Currently, Program reviews are none for the sake of getting a new hire – the system doesn't encourage improvement upon existing resources.</p> <p>MOUs are never really revisited (on an annual basis).</p> <p>Program Review does not revolve around improving curricula and pedagogy.</p>
Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Commitment to Learning and Improvement				
<p>4.5. The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purpose 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.</p>				
<p>4.6 Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.</p>		3	A	<p>Underlines areas represent our greatest weaknesses.</p> <p>MOUs (Program Review) are not revisited once completed. There is no feedback loop.</p> <p>There is no faculty buy-in for assessment.</p>

<p>4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.</p>	<p>Periodic analyses of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practice.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review	Importance to address at this time	Evidence: What is there? (Or needed?) Who interprets it? How is it used?
Commitment to Learning and Improvement				
<p>4.8. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of the educational programs.</p>		2	C	<p>Education and Nursing had external advisory boards.</p>

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the most important issues, if any, that should be emphasized in the accreditation review under this Standard?

Ensuring the quality of the degree. How to use assessment to generate data on rigor and quality.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths**?

New IR person applies an objective approach to all data collection.
Secondary accreditation.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved**?

1. We need to start demonstrating how Program Review is useful for programs (including the MOUS).
2. We need to identify peer mentors and we need to start encouraging faculty to think of assessment beyond "grading."
3. We need to de-stigmatize assessment (decouple it from punitive measures/beliefs).
4. Address workload concerns with regard to assessment.
5. We need to align grading practices—are we sure an "A" in a paper at the 400 level is the same across the board within and between departments?

Summative Questions

1. Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?

Randy Hirokawa, Dean
Susan Brown, Associate Dean
Michael Marshall, Art
Thom Curtis, Sociology
Todd Belt, Political Science
Lynn Morrison, Anthropology
Mitch Anderson, Math
Kay Daub, Nursing
April Komenaka, English & Curriculum Officer
Seri Luangphinit, ALO

4 2-hour sessions on answering each question as a group.

2. What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?

Assessment and Program Review

3. What areas emerged as either institutional strengths or topics for further exploration that might be targeted as themes or topics to be explored in the review?

Lack of effective integration with the co-curricular; assessing initiatives and non-academic aspects of the university (how do we know non-academic initiatives are really working?)

