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Outcomes of Self-Study Process

- Involvement and collaboration of all stakeholders
- School’s mission and Schoolwide Learner Outcomes
- Program assessment showing impact on student learning
- Creation/modification of schoolwide action plan
- Development and implementation of system for monitoring the plan
Road to the Action Plan

Learner Outcomes + Data + Criteria Strengths + Criteria Growth Areas = Action Plan
Thinking about Action Plans

They are PLANS and meant to be changed/revised/altered

Manageable number of sections

Everything doesn’t need to start at the same time

Keep modest records

Celebrate your successes
Goal is ONE plan for the school. If not, they should be reasonably congruent.
Action Plan Components

- Statement of key issue
- Rationale for key issue
- Schoolwide Learner Outcomes addressed
- Ways of assessing progress, including
- Means to monitor and report progress
- Who’s responsible and involved
- Specific steps, including professional development
- Timeline
- Resources
How do school staff monitor implementation and accomplishment of the Action Plan?
Chapter I

School description and accreditation history

Outcome, Process, and Perception Data

Schoolwide Learner Outcomes

Findings
Chapter II: Progress Report

1. Significant Developments

2. Implementing and Managing the Plan

3. Report on Plan including Growth Targets; Key Activities linking to Schoolwide Areas for Follow-Up; Additions/Deletion; Show success in addressing issues raised by Visiting Committees
Chapter III

Focus Groups Criteria

Profile Team
Leadership Team Criteria; Plans & Guides

Program Groups
Data, Observations, Interviews, Student Work, & Criteria
Chapter III: Criteria Response

**Process**

- Program Groups
- Leadership Team
- Focus Groups

**Product**

- Analytical response to criteria
- Evidence
- Strengths
- Key areas for follow-up

Professional knowledge
Data
Observations
Surveys/interviews
Student work
Documents
Levels of Criteria Responses

General
All students

Differentiated
Programs, Departments
On time to the Chair and Visiting Committee Members

6 weeks before the visit
Chairperson/Coach

team work

motivation

innovation

vision

leadership

inspiration

success
The Visit: Committee Members
Preparing for the Visit

Remembering
Planning

Hosting
Accommodations and meals

Students
Staff and supporters

Technology
Schedule
Evidence
Think about....

What have we learned during the self-study?
Are we clear about our next best work?
How might our deeper understandings affect thing in my classroom? My department? Our school? In the next three-five years?
Schedule/Activities

Daily feedback meetings between Visiting Committee members and school leaders

Classroom/campus observations

Informal interviews

Meetings with Leadership Team, Focus Groups, and others

Daily meeting of VC Chair and principal

VC report editing/reviewing
VC Report

Chapter I
Introduction

Chapter II
Progress Report

Chapter III
Evaluation of School’s Response to Criteria

Chapter IV
Action Plan Effectiveness
VC Report

- Analysis
- Conclusions – Action Plan
  - Schoolwide strengths
  - Schoolwide critical areas for follow-up
    - Support identified areas
    - Strengthen identified areas
    - Address additional areas
VC Schoolwide Major Key Issues

**Support** those areas already identified by the school in the Action Plan sections

**Strengthen** those identified areas in the Action Plan sections

**Address** additional areas identified by the Visiting Committee

**Who**  **What**  **Why**
What accreditation status best supports the school’s improvement needs?
The revised Action Plan incorporating the Schoolwide Critical Areas for Follow-up from the Visiting Committee (at the end of their Chapter IV) are due to ACS WASC not later than 6 weeks following the visit.
Accreditation Status

• Six-Year Accreditation Status
  Progress Report at mid-cycle
  Progress Report and one-day visit at mid-cycle
  Progress Report and two-day visit at mid-cycle

• One-or-Two-Year Probationary Status with an in-depth progress report and a two-day visit

• Accreditation Status Withheld
Accreditation Status Recommendation

WASC accreditation is an ongoing six-year cycle of quality whereby the school demonstrates the capacity, commitment and competence to support high-quality student learning and ongoing school improvement.

The Visiting Committee's CONFIDENTIAL recommendation to the Accrediting Commission:

1. **Six-Year Accreditation Status with a Mid-cycle Progress Report**: There is compelling evidence that the school needs little, if any, additional support for high-quality student learning and the implementation, monitoring, and accomplishment of the schoolwide action plan, which includes the identified critical areas for follow-up.
   
   Provide the rationale for the accreditation status recommendation in the Justification Statement.

2. **Six-Year Accreditation Status with a Mid-cycle Progress Report and** (choose one option below):
   - **One-Day Visit**: There is compelling evidence that the school needs additional support in strengthening student achievement by addressing the identified critical areas for follow-up. Based on the scope and seriousness of the issues and the size of the school, a one-day visit is recommended.
   
   Provide the rationale for the accreditation status recommendation in the Justification Statement.

3. **Probationary Accreditation Status with an In-depth Progress Report and Two-Day Visit** (choose one option below):
   - **One-Year**: There is compelling evidence that the school deviates significantly from the WASC criteria in one or more critical areas requiring immediate attention and support.
   
   Provide the rationale for the accreditation status recommendation in the Justification Statement.

4. **Two-Year**: There is compelling evidence that the school deviates significantly from the WASC criteria in one or more critical areas that need to be addressed within two years.

Provide the rationale for the accreditation status recommendation in the Justification Statement.

5. **Accreditation Status Withheld**: There is compelling evidence that the school does not meet the WASC criteria/indicators and other accreditation factors and deviates significantly in several areas that impact student learning and well-being, the school's program, and supporting operations.

Provide the rationale for the accreditation status recommendation in the Justification Statement.

* See Accreditation Status Explanation.

**Note:** The Commission reserves the right to grant accreditation status other than those above, including a recommendation for a full self-study at any time. Such action will follow a Commission review of the Visiting Committee Report. In the event of a formal appeal, this document will be provided to the school's chief administrator.
## ACS WASC Accreditation Status Determination Worksheet

### Postsecondary Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1: Institutional Mission and Schoolwide Learner Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The school has established a recently updated statement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission/purpose that reflects the beliefs and philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The student/community profile data has impacted the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of the school mission/purpose and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide Learner Outcomes (SLOs or ESLRs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A high degree of involvement by representatives of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire school community has occurred in the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the school mission/purpose and SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School leaders use current education research in a regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycle of review and revision of its mission/purpose and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is a clear and systematic network of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the school’s mission/purpose and SLOs within the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School leadership uses the mission/purpose of the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as the basis for decisions and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The school has a statement of mission/purpose that reflects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the beliefs and philosophy of the institution; however,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it has not been recently reviewed and updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Profile data is used occasionally to influence the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development and measurement of school SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Most, but not all, stakeholders are involved in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educational research is occasionally consulted in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development and measurement of SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Most, but not all, stakeholder groups know the SLOs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are connected with their continual evaluation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School leadership occasionally uses the mission statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and SLOs as the basis for decisions and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The school is in the process of developing a statement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission/purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The student/community profile data is not yet used to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact the development and ongoing revision of the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission/purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is some collaboration on the review of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission and purpose, but most stakeholders are not yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no regularly planned review of school mission/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose and school’s SLOs nor is current educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research used in any revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The entire school constituency is not yet familiar with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school mission/purpose and SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The mission/purpose and SLOs are not often included in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the decision-making processes of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The school does not yet have a clear statement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose/mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student/community profile data is not used to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide Learner Outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders are not involved in the development of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school mission statement or SLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decisions and planning are not connected in any way to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school mission or SLOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
## Capacity and Commitment

### Capacity to Implement the Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The school’s governing body, administration, and faculty share a solid commitment to implementing the Action Plan and carefully monitor results to ensure success.  
• The leadership of the school is strong and stable and gives evidence that it has a high degree of competence to successfully implement the Action Plan.  
• The capacity of the school is marked by ongoing school improvement, commitment to the accreditation process, and an advanced understanding of how to use the Action Plan effectively. | • The School’s governing body, administration, and faculty are committed to using the Action Plan to guide school improvement efforts. Results are generally monitored to ensure success.  
• The leadership of the school is strong and stable, and gives evidence that it is competent and will follow through with the implementation of the Action Plan.  
• The capacity of the school is sufficient; there is confidence that the school will follow through with Action Plan implementation. | • The School generally is committed to using the Action Plan for ongoing school improvement, but not all of the stakeholder groups related to this task (board, administration, faculty) are directly involved.  
• The leadership of the school is not fully stable and there are concerns that the implementation of the Action Plan may not be done well.  
• The capacity of the school is suspect; it affirms it will implement the Action Plan but it is not clear whether they will be able to do so effectively. | • The school does not understand the role of the Action Plan and does not yet use the Action Plan to guide school improvement efforts.  
• The leadership of the school is unstable or uncertain.  
• The capacity of the school to implement the Action Plan is limited at best. It is not likely the Action Plan will be implemented or monitored in any way. |

### Success in Addressing Past Key Issues for Follow-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • The school carefully documents all critical areas for follow-up left by the previous ACS WASC accreditation team.  
• The school can demonstrate with extensive evidence that it has addressed critical areas effectively.  
• The school understands well how to use the Action Plan to annually assess school progress and to add new action items or replace completed items during the six-year ACS WASC cycle.  
• The school is highly competent in responding to identified critical areas for follow-up. School improvement is clearly evident. | • The School has responded satisfactorily to all critical areas for follow-up left by the previous ACS WASC accreditation team.  
• The school cites evidence to show how it has responded to past critical areas for follow-up.  
• The school does monitor and evaluate the successful responses to identified critical areas for follow-up.  
• The school is competent and able to respond effectively to areas of school improvement left by ACS WASC accreditation teams. | • The School has responded to some, but not all, of the critical areas for follow-up left by the previous ACS WASC accreditation team.  
• The school does not always show clear evidence regarding its response to past identified critical issues.  
• The school has good intentions but does not always follow through with responses to identified critical issues.  
• The school has limited competence in responding to identified critical issues. | • The school is very inconsistent in responding to critical issues identified by the past ACS WASC accreditation team.  
• The school does not monitor responses to past critical areas and cannot show evidence that it has addressed critical areas.  
• The school lacks understanding regarding the proper way to respond to identified critical issues.  
• The school is not competent to respond to critical issues identified by past ACS WASC teams. |
Accreditation Status Factors:
VC Recommendation & Commission Action

- Highly effective
- Effective
- Somewhat effective
- Ineffective
How well are the students achieving?

Is the school community doing everything possible to support high achievement for all its students?
Sylvia Taylor
staylor@acswasc.org
650.235.8621

Elizabeth Oberreiter
San Diego Office
691.693.2550

Chancellor’s Office
Adult Education Programs
We Are Student Centered