Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Step 3: Educational Effectiveness Review

March 19, 2013

Agenda

- Review of Reaffirmation Process
- Review of Themes
- Expectations for Two Reviews. How are they different?
- Review of Recommendations of WASC Site Visit Team (2012)
- Where does AUA Stand Today
- Next Steps

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Three-Step Process

- Institutional Proposal (2010)

- Capacity and Preparatory Review - CPR (2011/2012)

- Educational Effectiveness Review - EER (2014)

Themes for this Process

* Chosen by AUA

* Presented in the Institutional Proposal (2010)

* Approved by WASC

Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning

Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars

Institutional Proposal set forth three goals:

- **Recalibration** of AUA's institutional mission and goals
- Focus on **student learning across the institution** and the development of more diverse and effective methods of assessment
- **Alignment of research and scholarship** with teaching at a graduate institution focused on impacting the development of a nation

How is the EER different from the CPR

CPR: Capacity

vs

EER: Effectiveness

	Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Primary Focus of **Each Review:**	*Capacity:* Institutional purposes, integrity, stability, resources, structures, processes, and policies including **capacity to assess student learning** *Preparatory:* Focus on issues in preparation for a successful Educational Effectiveness Review	*Student Learning:* **Evidence of educational achievement** *Institutional Learning:* **Evidence** and **actions for improving performance;** results of review processes

How is the EER different from the CPR?

	Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives	• Clear sense of institutional purpose • Integrity and good business policies and practices • Institutional and program objectives • Public accountability and transparency • Diversity plans and policies	• **Achievement** of, or **tangible progress toward meeting, institutional goals** • **Multiple indicators** of effectiveness • **Evidence** of integrity • **Analysis of data on diversity**; use of analysis for assessment and improvement
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions	Infrastructure to support learning*: • Stated learning outcomes • Defined levels of achievement • Program review process • Support for faculty scholarship • Support for academic and co-curricular learning	Educational results*: • **Completed program reviews** • **Assessment results** at the course, program and institutional levels • **Results of assessment of student services and support** • **Use of these results** to plan for and make improvements

How is the EER different from the CPR?

	Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Assure Sustainability	• Adequate resources including: √ faculty and staff √ policies and practices re: faculty and staff √ financial sustainability √ library and information technology • Sound organizational structures and decision-making processes • Qualified and adequate administration, board and faculty governance	• **Appropriate alignment**, commitment, and **use of resources** to support learning • **Evidence-based decision making** • **Effective governance** and decision making
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	• Planning processes that involve constituents and are aligned with goals • Adequate institutional research • Quality improvement systems designed in alignment with mission • Wide use of evidence in planning	• **Engagement of leadership** at all levels in learning processes • **Quality improvement system results** • **Evidence of a learning organization**

How is the EER different from the CPR?

Capacity and Preparatory Review	Educational Effectiveness Review
Are student learning outcomes set and published at the program and course levels? (1.2, 2.3)	**Are students learning** what they are expected to learn? At expected levels? Are these results good enough? (2.6)
Have expectations for levels of student achievement been determined and published? (2.4)	**How does the institution respond** if assessment shows that not all students are achieving at expected levels? (4.1, 4.6)
Are student learning outcomes expressed in course syllabi? (2.4)	
Are student learning outcomes for programs mapped to courses (such as through curriculum maps)? (2.3)	
Have assessment plans been developed and implemented?* (4.1)	**Is assessment being implemented** as planned? Is it effective? How does the institution know? (4.1)
Is the program review process developed and systematically deployed? Does it include both assessment of student learning and evaluation of student success indicators? (2.7, 4.4)	**Is program review conducted** as planned? What has each program learned from the reviews? Are patterns evident when reviews are compared? **Are reviews linked to the resource allocation process**, to provide for needed improvements? (4.4, 4.6)
Are co-curricular programs regularly reviewed with reference to stated outcomes? (2.11, 4.6)	What are the findings from **co-curricular assessment**? To what extent do co-curricular programs support learning? How does the institution respond to gaps in alignment of curricular and co-curricular efforts? (4.6)
Does institutional research support assessment of student learning and student success? (2.10, 4.5)	**What do data on retention/completion show** overall, and for various student groups? How do results compare with peer or aspirant institutions? What is being done to address gaps that are discovered? (4.5)
Do faculty have resources and support to assess and improve student learning and success? (2.4, 4.6, 4.7)	How do **the faculty demonstrate responsibility for assessment and improvement of learning**? (4.6, 4.7)

Recommendations of CPR Site Visit Team

Provide **ongoing support and resources to promote quality assurance practices and educational** effectiveness.
With its promising institutional research capacity, adopt **a culture of analytic thinking and reflection** so that AUA can articulate goals for student success appropriate to its mission, measure progress against those goals, and take action based on findings. In particular, the Commission expects **graduation rate and time-to-degree data to be disaggregated by variables important to the mission of the institution.** Consideration should be given to developing a student information database with unit records for each student.
In anticipation of its switch to a semester system, **ensure consistency and alignment among the policy on credit hours**, the information on syllabi, and practice. For example, the team found syllabi without credit hours, as well as instances of meeting times that might be inadequate according to policy.
Continue vigilance regarding **financial operations and advancement**, while providing the resources necessary for institutional growth and development, as the institution continues to move toward financial sustainability.
Continue to **develop and refine its student learning assessment practices** across all academic programs and to **develop guidelines for the systematic review of co-curricular and support services** such as career services, the library, and the registrar.

Where does AUA stand today?

Report of the CPR Site Visit Team – is online

Commission Letter – July 10, 2012

EER Working Group Initial Meeting – March 19, 2013

Working Groups Work – Begins March 2013

EER Working Group Additional Meetings
     June 2013   October 2013   February 2014

Report due – July 2014 (Approx.)

Site Visit – Fall 2014 (Date TBD)

A look again at our three goals:

- Recalibration of AUA's institutional mission and goals
- Focus on **student learning across the institution** and the development of more diverse and effective methods of assessment
- **Alignment of research and scholarship** with teaching at a graduate institution focused on impacting the development of a nation

Upcoming and Next Steps:

Working Groups - Need Volunteers for each theme.
   Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Assessment of Student Learning
   Theme 2: Cultivating a Community of Scholars

EER Working Group Additional Meetings
   June 2013   October 2013   February 2014

Progress Report on Substantive Change for Undergraduate Program:
   To be submitted March 22, 2013