***Minimal* or *Substantial* Compliance with WSCUC Standards**

**for Institutions Seeking Candidacy and Initial Accreditation Guide**

This guide is not a formula or analog by which a team will arrive at a mathematically precise determination. It is a tool to narrow the ambiguity inherent in making a complex, holistic judgment. Evaluators should complete the Guide individually then share their appraisal in a consensus-building session at the conclusion of the site visit. Teams should be able to recommend to the Commission whether, for each Standard, the institution has demonstrated either *minimal* or *substantial* compliance. Non-compliance may also be indicated.

MINIMAL:

* Evidence of understanding the principles or intentions of each Standard at a sufficient level to support continued development
* Elementary or initial development and implementation of structures, processes, and forms that operationalize the CFRs
* Understanding of concepts held by key leaders but less well understood at all levels of the organization

SUBSTANTIAL:

* The core concept or intent of the Standard is understood and articulated clearly as it applies to relevant operations
* Thorough and widespread implementation of structures, processes, and forms that operationalize the CFRs
* Understanding of concepts is held at multiple relevant organizational levels

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CFR** | **Summary of CFR**  **[From “Standards at a Glance”}** | **Rating** | | | | | | |
| Insufficient  Information | | Non- Compliant | | Minimal Compliance | | Substantial Compliance |
| **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** |
| **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives** | | | | | | | | |
| Std. 1 | Overall Compliance with Standard 1 | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Institutional Purposes* | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose that define values and character | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.2 | Clear educational objectives; indicators of student achievement at institution, program and course levels; retention/graduation data and evidence of student learning made public | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Integrity and Transparency* | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 | Academic freedom: policies and practices | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.4 | Diversity: policies, programs, and practices | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.5 | Education as primary purpose; autonomy from external entities | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.6 | Truthful representation to students and public; fair and equitable policies; timely completion | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.7 | Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair responses to complaints; evaluation of institutional performance | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 1.8 | Honest, open communication with WASC including notification of material matters; implementation of WASC policies | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions** | | | | | | | | |
| Std. 2 | Overall Compliance with Standard 2 | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Teaching and Learning* | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Programs appropriate in content, standards, degree level; sufficient qualified faculty | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.2 | Clearly defined degrees re: admission requirements and levels of achievement for graduation; processes to ensure meaning, quality and integrity of degrees | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.2 a | Undergraduate degree requirements, including general education and core competencies | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.2 b | Graduate degree requirements clearly stated and appropriate | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.3 | Student learning outcomes (SLOs) and expectations for student learning set at all levels; reflected in curricula, programs, policies, advising | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.4 | Faculty’s collective responsibility for setting SLOs and standards, assessing student learning, demonstrating achievement of standards | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.5 | Students actively involved in learning and challenged; feedback on learning provided | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.6 | Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.7 | Program review includes SLOs, retention and graduation data, external evidence & evaluators | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Scholarship and Creative Activity* | | | | | | | | |
| 2.8 | Scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation for both students and faculty valued and supported | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.9 | Faculty evaluation links scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Student Learning and Success* | | | | | | | | |
| 2.10 | Institution identifies and supports needs of students; tracks aggregated and disaggregated student achievement, satisfaction and campus climate; demonstrates students' timely progress | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.11 | Co-curricular programs aligned with academic goals and regularly assessed | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.12 | Institution provides useful and complete program information and advising | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.13 | Appropriate student support services planned, implemented, and evaluated | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 2.14 | Appropriate information to, and treatment of, transfer students (if applicable) | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability** | | | | | | | | |
| Std. 3 | Overall Compliance with Standard 3 | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Faculty and Staff* | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Sufficient, qualified, and diverse faculty and staff to support programs and operations | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.2 | Faculty and staff policies, practices, and evaluation well developed and applied | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.3 | Faculty and staff development planned, implemented, and evaluated | **☐** | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources* | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.4 | Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans for any deficits; integrated budgeting; enrollment management; diversified revenue sources | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.5 | Facilities, services, information and technology resources sufficient and aligned with objectives | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes* | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.6 | Leadership operates with integrity, high performance, responsibility, and accountability | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.7 | Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority to sustain institutional capacity and educational effectiveness | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.8 | Full-time CEO and full-time CFO; sufficient qualified administrators | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.9 | Independent governing board with appropriate oversight, including hiring and evaluating CEO | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 3.10 | Effective academic leadership by faculty | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| **Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement** | | | | | | | | | |
| Std. 4 | Overall Compliance with Standard 4 | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Quality Assurance Processes* | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Quality-assurance processes in place to collect, analyze, and interpret data; track results over time; use comparative data; and make improvements | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 4.2 | Sufficient institutional research (IR) capacity; data disseminated and incorporated in planning and decision-making; IR effectiveness assessed | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| *Institutional Learning and Improvement* | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Commitment to improvement based on data and evidence; systematic assessment of teaching, learning, campus environment; utilization of results | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 4.4 | Ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 4.5 | Appropriate stakeholders involved in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 4.6 | Reflection and planning with multiple constituents; strategic plans align with purposes; address key priorities and future directions; plans are monitored and revised as required | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
| 4.7 | Anticipating and responding to a changing higher educational environment | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | | **☐** | |
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