WASC Educational Effectiveness Framework: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

On the following page, UC Merced scores itself on the WASC *Educational Effectiveness Framework* and provides, for comparison, the WASC Visiting Team's assessment (p.49) [3] of UC Merced's development at the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

Blue shading reflects UC Merced's self-evaluation as of fall 2010. Peach shading reflects the WASC Visiting Team's evaluation as of fall 2009. When UC Merced and Team conclusions are identical, only blue shading is provided. When UC Merced is judged to have a level of development intermediate to two adjacent levels (ex. Emerging/Developed), the two adjacent cells are shaded the same color. The Visiting Team did not provide an Overall Rating (final row); UC Merced's self-assessment is indicated in green.

UC Merced's Self-Score on The Educational Effectiveness Framework vs the WASC Visiting Team's at the time of the CPR Review

Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning

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

UC Merced's Self-Score on The Educational Effectiveness Framework vs the WASC Visiting Team's at the time of the CPR Review

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 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