

Framework for Evaluating Educational Effectiveness

Key Descriptive Terms ELEMENT & DEFINITION	Highly Developed Institutional Structures and Processes	Well-Developed Institutional Structures and Processes	Emerging Institutional Structures and Processes	Poorly Developed Institutional Structures and Processes	Inadequate Institutional Structures and Processes
Learning Outcomes: A. Are established, referenced in publications, cited and used by faculty and advisors:	For all units (academic and co-curricular), and for GE; cited widely by faculty and advisors; used by all faculty to design curricula, assignments, and assessment	For all units (academic & co-curricular), and for GE; cited often but not in all appropriate places; most faculty cite; used in most programs for design of curriculum, assignments, and assessment	For many programs and units, and most GE aspects; beginning to be referenced in basic documents; beginning to be used by some faculty as reference for design of curriculum, assignments, and assessment	For only a few programs and units; only vaguely (if at all) for GE; not referenced in publications; only a few faculty know and use for designing curriculum, assignments, or assessment	Not established for GE or for vast majority of programs, and/or for any of the units, thus not used for curriculum, instruction, or assessment
B. Outcomes are assessed:	Regularly; using multiple methods, including authentic and performance-based; pedagogy systematically reviewed and revised based on assessment data	Periodically, sometimes using authentic and performance-based methods; may lack documentation; pedagogy is occasionally reviewed and revised	Occasionally, principally using surveys; beginning to move beyond self reports toward some direct assessment; seldom leading to revision of pedagogy	Occasionally, using surveys and self reports; seldom using direct assessment; rarely leading to revision of pedagogy	No direct evidence of student learning is evaluated
C. Learning is demonstrably achieved:	For all students at or above levels set by institution; results are discussed regularly and deliberatively by all faculty	For all students at or above levels set by institution; results discussed periodically by most faculty	For most students at levels set by the institution; faculty are beginning to discuss results	At levels that may not be up to standards; concerns that standards set by institution are too low for a baccalaureate-level institution	Poorly, with substantial concern that students are not achieving at institution-set levels and/or that levels set are too low for baccalaureate-level institution
Teaching and Learning Processes: A. Curricula & pedagogy are:	Highly visible, fully aligned with learning outcomes; in all programs, achievement beyond mere completion of designated courses is demonstrated at both the program (comprehensive) & course levels	Broadly aligned with learning outcomes; in most programs, student achievement beyond the mere completion of designated courses is demonstrated in most areas	Beginning to be aligned with established learning outcomes, with achievement demonstrated in some areas beyond mere completion of designated courses	Not visibly aligned with outcomes; few programs have evidences of achievement beyond mere completion of designated courses	Curricula not aligned with learning outcomes, even in cases where outcomes are present
B. Curricular processes are:	Regularly informed by good learning practice (such as employing assessment-as-learning), consistently the result of scholarly reflection by relevant faculty based on evidences of student learning	Informed in many cases by good learning practice; reviewed and improved by relevant faculty; often based on evidences of student learning	Informed in a few instances by good learning practices; some curricula reviewed and improved but with little reference to evidences of student learning	Rarely informed by good learning practices; few curricula reviewed, mostly without reference to evidences of student learning	Curricula not reviewed by any identifiable process; references to good learning practice rarely found

Organizational Learning: A. Indicators of educational effectiveness are:	Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated widely, compared to program benchmarks in all programs	Multiple, with data collected regularly, disseminated; some performance benchmarks set and used for comparison	Found in some areas; dissemination of performance results is beginning; no reference to benchmarks	Not effectively in place	Not visible in any form
B. Review of the effectiveness of Program Review processes is:	Deliberate, systematic, and institution-wide, with results being broadly disseminated and used to improve the processes	Frequent, in most divisions or units, with results being used at the departmental level to reflect on effectiveness	Occasional, in some departments or units, with the results being infrequently used to suggest process improvements	Rare, if at all, with little or no useful data being generated	Not visible in any form
C. Faculty, staff, and institutional leaders are:	Visibly committed to creating and sustaining a "culture of evidence" in planning at all levels	Supportive of a culture of evidence at top levels, by most mid-level personnel, and some faculty and staff	Supportive at top levels only, or sporadically and unevenly, for the development of a culture of evidence	Not visibly committed to a culture of evidence except in isolated cases	No evidence of commitments to creating a culture of evidence at top levels or elsewhere
D. Performance data are:	Consistently obtained, used and documented by decision-making bodies for program improvement at all levels	Frequently considered by decision-making bodies at all levels, but with few documents of data use or outcomes	Beginning to be considered in making improvement decisions at institutional level and in some program levels	Not in evidence in any decision processes or used for improvement in any programs	Not considered in decision-making processes or used for improvement at any level
E. In reference to accreditation processes, the institution:	Promptly and fully incorporates prior Commission actions, showing forward momentum and a positive trajectory in virtually all programs and units	Has taken formal actions and/or begun processes to implement prior Commission actions in most programs; momentum and impact need to be verified	Hesitant or partial implementation of prior Commission actions, some concerns whether momentum can be sustained after Commission review	Apparent indifference to Commission actions or expectations and/or failure of leadership to resource and expect such implementation; little, if any, momentum	Virtually no evidence of engagement in the goals and values of the accreditation process; no response to previous team recommendations
Overall: The institution can best be described as follows:	Operates at an exemplary level in addressing its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness	Mostly well-established commitments to Educational Effectiveness; some areas for improvement	Promising commitments to Educational Effectiveness in most areas; significant number of areas noted for improvement	Committed to some aspects of Educational Effectiveness; if other areas are not addressed, continuing reaffirmation of accreditation is threatened	Almost a complete lack of responsiveness to Educational Effectiveness; does not meet the Core Commitment