

ACS WASC Accreditation Status Determination Worksheet

Supplementary Educational Centers/Programs

Directions

1. Discuss the evidence reviewed through the self-study report and the site visit for each of the eight categories identified on the Documentation and Justification Statement. Particularly examine the **Strengths and the Critical Areas for Follow-up** identified that the center is required to address.
2. Use the rubrics below to guide the visiting committee's discussion that will lead to a status recommendation to the ACS WASC Commission.
3. As a Visiting Committee, come to **consensus** on the most appropriate rating for each category.
4. Complete the official "Documentation and Justification Statement" with a consensus rating for each category.

Rating Options:

- ✓ **Highly Effective:** The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence that this factor has had a high degree of impact on student learning, the center's program, and the center's operation.
- ✓ **Effective:** The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence that this factor has had a satisfactory level of impact on student learning, the center's program, and the center's operation.
- ✓ **Somewhat Effective:** The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence that this factor has had a limited impact on student learning, the center's program, and the center's operation.
- ✓ **Ineffective:** The results of the self-study and the visit provide evidence that this factor has had little or no impact on student learning, the center's program, and the center's operation.

Category 1: Success in Meeting the Seven Standards of Accreditation			
Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has completed the checklist for the seven standards and there are no standards that are unmet. The center has documentation to support the assertion that it fully meets all standards. The leadership of the center operates a highly organized center with positive learning results. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has completed the checklist for the seven standards and there are just one or two minor areas that are identified as "unmet." There is full disclosure of why any of the standards are unmet with clear plans in place to address the deficiency very soon. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has completed the checklist for the seven standards and several of them are identified as "unmet." The center is in the process of addressing unmet standards but a complete plan is not in place. There is generally a lack of full documentation in regard to the seven standards. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has either not completed the checklist thoroughly or has a high number of standards marked as "unmet." There is no plan in place to address the unmet standards. The Visiting Committee has a lack of confidence that the center has the capacity to address unmet standards. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>

Category 2: Use of Assessment			
Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has developed an overall assessment process that gathers learning data from multiple sources for analysis. Administration and faculty work together to analyze learning results so that meaningful conclusions can be drawn. Conclusions are connected to specific recommendations to address any identified growth needs. Analysis of learning data causes changes to the instructional program and the creation of needed policies and procedures. Teachers regularly use various assessment instruments and strategies to measure overall student learning success. Analysis of learning data is used in resource planning. The Action Plan is driven by assessment results. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has multiple assessment instruments in use and has started to develop an overall center assessment and analysis process. The administration and most of the faculty work together to analyze learning data in order to draw meaningful conclusions. Conclusions from learning data analysis are sometimes used to create strategies to address identified critical areas for follow-up. Analysis of learning data frequently impacts the instructional program and results in changes in policies/procedures. The administration and faculty occasionally use the analysis of learning results to talk about centerwide learning success. The Action Plan is often impacted by conclusions drawn through data analysis. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has only a few assessment instruments in use and not all teachers are involved in the analysis of learning results. The administration does most of the data gathering and analysis and shares results with the faculty on occasion. The administration and faculty are generally aware of learning results but seldom use them to develop recommendations for improvement to the instructional program. Analysis of learning data is seldom used to make changes to the instructional program. The Action Plan is generally developed apart from learning data analysis; every now and then, conclusions do impact the Action Plan. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center may have some assessment instruments in use, but there is no meaningful analysis of learning results. The administration and faculty do not have specific times set aside for discussions regarding the analysis of learning data. Learning data is not used to create recommendations for the center's Action Plan. The center does not use the analysis of learning data to make changes to the instructional program. The Action Plan is developed without any discussion of learning data analysis. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>

Category 3: Faculty and Staff

Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center employs personnel who are qualified and trained for their responsibilities. • The center staff supports the mission and purpose of the center. • The center's hiring process is marked by integrity and transparency, including the use of clear job descriptions and expected job skills. • The center provides the faculty and staff clear written personnel policies and procedures that are consistently followed. • All faculty and staff members are annually evaluated in order to help them improve. Results are used to determine professional growth planning. • Center leaders empower the staff and encourage commitment, participation, and shared accountability for student learning. • The center has a professional development program that supports and funds the growth and improvement of faculty and staff members. • The leadership regularly evaluates all non-teaching staff members to maintain a high level of effectiveness. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center employs personnel who are qualified and trained for their responsibilities, with only minor exceptions. • The center's mission and purpose are known, but not necessarily used in the hiring and evaluation of personnel. • The center has an organized hiring process with most positions supported by clear job descriptions. • Personnel policies are written and available to faculty and staff members. There is general consistency in the application of these policies. • Faculty members are evaluated at least once every two years. • Professional development opportunities are provided but not necessarily tied to specific growth needs of faculty members. • The leadership occasionally evaluates non-teaching staff members. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center employs some personnel who are not fully qualified educationally. • The center does not have a clear hiring process in place and does not use expected job skills in the evaluation of candidates. • There are many unwritten policies and procedures that personnel generally follow, but there is not yet a clear policy manual in place. • Faculty and staff are randomly evaluated and written reports are not always provided. • Center leaders are just beginning to develop a unity of mission and purpose that empowers staff members in their duties. • Professional development opportunities are at the discretion of the faculty members and are often at their own expense. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center has several personnel who are not qualified for their teaching duties. • The center hires in a random manner, often taking the first person who applies without careful reference checking. • Policies are not in place; decisions are made randomly based on the momentary circumstances. • Faculty and staff are not evaluated for effectiveness nor are there plans in place to help the faculty improve. • No professional development opportunities are available to teachers. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>

Category 4: Success in Addressing Past Critical Issues for Follow-Up

Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center carefully documents all critical areas for follow-up left by the previous WASC accreditation team. • The center can demonstrate with extensive evidence that it has addressed critical areas effectively. • The center understands well how to use the Action Plan to annually assess center progress and to add new action items or replace completed items during the six-year WASC cycle. • The center is highly competent in responding to identified critical areas for follow-up. Center improvement is clearly evident. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center has responded satisfactorily to all critical areas for follow-up left by the previous WASC accreditation team. • The center cites evidence to show how it has responded to past critical areas for follow-up. • The center does monitor and evaluate the successful responses to identified critical areas for follow-up. • The center is competent and able to respond effectively to areas of center improvement left by WASC accreditation teams. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center has responded to some, but not all, of the critical areas for follow-up left by the previous WASC accreditation team. • The center does not always show clear evidence regarding its response to past identified critical issues. • The center has good intentions but does not always follow through with responses to identified critical issues. • The center has limited competence in responding to identified critical issues. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The center is very inconsistent in responding to critical issues identified by the past WASC accreditation team. • The center does not monitor responses to past critical areas and cannot show evidence that it has addressed critical areas. • The center lacks understanding regarding the proper way to respond to identified critical issues. • The center is not competent to respond to critical issues identified by past WASC teams. <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></div>

Category 5: Curriculum and Instruction			
Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has defined what all students should know and be able to do for program as revealed in curricular mapping. The center has established a regular cycle of review and revision for each curricular area to ensure a challenging, relevant, and rigorous curriculum for all students. Students have access to texts, support materials and information resources that allows them to meet program objectives. The faculty provides high level instruction with depth, breadth, rigor, and sequencing in all programs. The faculty uses a wide variety of instructional strategies that effectively engage students in learning. The faculty addresses the various learning styles and needs of the students with adapted or differentiated teaching strategies. New technology is evident throughout the instructional program of the center; teachers use technology in instruction and students use technology in their learning experiences and class work. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has general educational goals for all programs so that teachers know what to teach for each program. Serious curricular mapping is in progress. The center has a review cycle in place to ensure that curriculum is challenging and relevant for students. Students generally have access to the curricular materials that are needed for their specific program. The faculty uses a variety of instructional strategies that effectively engage students in learning. The faculty does make some allowances for different learning styles of learners but not in a structured manner. There is evidence that most teachers use technology in the instructional program. Many students use technology in their learning activities and class assignments. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has a general sense of what students should be learning, but little curricular mapping has taken place. The center provides textbooks and/or materials for teachers to use but does not yet have a complete curricular overview for all programs. The center reviews texts and supporting materials occasionally as needed, but no systematic program for review is in place. Most curricular decisions are made independently by the administration, often without consideration of current educational research. Center texts and materials are not always readily available to all students. The faculty provides adequate instruction but not all students are challenged. Various learning styles are not often taken into consideration in instructional planning. There is little evidence of the integration of technology into the learning program. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center does not have any curricular plans in place; teachers are responsible to select texts and establish course outcomes. The center does not have any curricular review cycle in place. Curriculum decisions are made randomly and without much collaboration. Center learning materials are often unavailable to students. Instruction is not always adequate and there are gaps in learning opportunities for students. Faculty members are generally unaware of differing instructional practices and tend to teach the same way they always have. Teachers are unaware that students have different learning styles. Technology is not considered in the teaching and learning process. <input type="checkbox"/>

Category 6: Resources, Facilities, Technology, Health/Safety Services			
Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has more than sufficient resources to provide a full and complete program in line with its mission and purpose. The center operates with financial integrity and transparency so that the community has high confidence in the center and its future economic stability. The center has clearly written financial policies and procedures that allow all students to be handled fairly and consistently. An external audit is performed on a regular basis. Center planning reflects a realistic assessment of current financial resources as it strategically plans for visionary future growth and development. The center provides facilities that are exemplary, clean, safe, and well-maintained. The center has an emergency plan in place that is known by all and practiced at least once a year. The center provides sufficient student services that support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center is financially stable and has sufficient resources to operate the educational program. The center operates with financial integrity and is trusted by its constituency. The center has established financial policies and procedures that are applied equitably most of the time. The center occasionally has an audit performed. Facilities are safe, clean, and well-maintained, supporting the Center learning environment. The center has an emergency plan in place that is widely known by most faculty, staff, and students. The center provides basic student services that support student learning success. The learning environment on campus is generally positive for most students. The majority of students are actively engaged in the learning process. Students have an adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center has limited resources and often seems on the edge financially. Future sustainability is often discussed; sustainability relies solely on enrollment numbers. The center operates its finances with limited staffing, limited expertise, producing inconsistent results. The center has limited financial policies in place and there is a somewhat inconsistent practice with different students. There is rarely a financial audit performed. Facilities are adequate, but limited. There are many issues related to the classrooms, campus, and maintenance. The center does not have a complete emergency plan in place; most stakeholders are unaware of its existence. The center provides a limited number of services to students and they have little impact on student learning levels. The learning environment is unstable, sometimes positive, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center does not have the resources to maintain its program. It struggles from year to year and it is unlikely that the center can continue forward in the future. The center does have the personnel in place to operate the center with consistency or transparency in its financial matters. The center does not have written policies or procedures in place and financial operations are haphazard. Outside financial audits are not performed. Center facilities are inadequate, unsafe, unclean, or not maintained. Facilities discourage learning. The center does not have an emergency plan in place. The center offers an inadequate number of services or the services are generally not effective in supporting student learning success. The learning environment is marked by crisis, difficulties,

<p>high achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning environment on campus is positive so that most students are engaged in meaningful learning experiences. The center supports students from the first contact to admissions, to completion of programs. Center records are maintained safely, securely, and permanently with proper back-up in case of fire or natural disaster. <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>support system as they enroll at the center up until the time of program completion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center records are kept safely and securely and proper back-up systems are in place. <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>sometimes not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center records are kept safe, but not always backed up or kept in fireproof files. <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>and student dissatisfaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center records are kept haphazardly and are not always safe and secure. <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---	--

Category 7: Effective Use of the Strategic Improvement Plan (Action Plan)

Highly Effective	Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a center Strategic Improvement Plan (Action Plan) that reflects the efforts of all stakeholders to develop a culture of ongoing center improvement. The center uses the accreditation process throughout the six-year cycle to identify and prioritize critical areas for follow-up that will highly impact the levels of learning at the center. The center has procedures in place to implement the Action Plan and monitor its effectiveness two or three times a year. The Action Plan is used regularly by the center administration and staff to guide all center improvement efforts. The center maintains accountability to the governing board and reports progress on Action Plan items to all stakeholders. The Action Plan is always used by the center for planning, resource allocation, and the evaluation of existing programs. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center Action Plan is in place and reviewed annually so that adjustments can be made as necessary. The center completes all accreditation expectations and meets WASC criteria and includes all stakeholders in the process. The Action Plan is monitored annually and there is accountability maintained to implement the Action Plan. The Action Plan is used by the center to generally direct center improvement activities. Successful implementation of the Action Plan is reported to the governing body and updates are provided to most stakeholder groups. The Action Plan is kept in view frequently for planning, resource allocations, and evaluation of existing programs. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center Action Plan exists but is not frequently used to guide center improvement activities. The center meets most, but not all, WASC expectations and seems to be last minute and hurried in preparations for accreditation visits. Not all stakeholder groups are included. The Action Plan is not regularly reviewed, monitored, and there is inconsistent accountability to the board. The Action Plan is used sparingly to guide center improvement activities. The implementation of the Action Plan is reported to the board once a year; neither the center nor the board sees the Action Plan as a vital document to guide the center. The Action Plan is sometimes used for planning, resource allocation, and evaluation of existing programs. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center either does not have an Action Plan or it is a document that is not used or regularly updated. The center does not complete the self-study report and Action Plan in the appropriate manner and does not involve all stakeholders in the process. The Action Plan is not effectively used and there is no monitoring of successful implementation. Center improvement is not connected to the Action Plan. The board is not aware of the Action Plan and there is little or no accountability for the center to successfully implement it. The Action Plan is not used for planning, resource allocation, and evaluation of existing programs. <input type="checkbox"/>

Capacity to Implement the Action Plan

Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center's governing body, administration, and faculty share a solid commitment to implement the Action Plan and carefully monitor results to ensure success. The leadership of the center 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 center is marked by ongoing center improvement, commitment to the accreditation process, and an advanced understanding of how to use the Action Plan effectively. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center's governing body, administration, and faculty are committed to using the Action Plan to guide center improvement efforts. Results are generally monitored to ensure success. The leadership of the center is stable and gives evidence that it is competent and will follow through with the implementation of the Action Plan. The capacity of the center is sufficient; there is confidence that the center will follow-through with Action Plan implementation. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center generally is committed to using the Action Plan for ongoing center improvement, but not all the stakeholder groups related to this task (board, faculty, and administration) are directly involved. The leadership of the center is not fully stable and there are concerns that the implementation of the Action Plan may not be done well. The capacity of the center is suspect; it affirms it will implement the Action Plan but it is not clear whether they will be able to do so effectively. <input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The center does not understand the role of the Action Plan and does not yet use the Action Plan to guide center improvement efforts. The leadership of the center is unstable or uncertain. The capacity of the center to implement the Action Plan is limited at best. It is not likely the Action Plan will be implemented or monitored in any way. <input type="checkbox"/>