October 9, 2007

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for agreeing to help with one of the most important tasks the University faces, our reaccreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. By participating in the Educational Effectiveness Review Task Force, we will not only help discharge this responsibility, which has been prepared for over the past two years by many members of our community, but we will also get to know on an in-depth basis the educational practices and assessment methods of each other in what we hope to be a true learning experience for us all.

The members of the task force are:
Douglas Cremer (co-chair)
Phyllis Cremer
Paul Decker (co-chair)
Nathan Garrett
John Karayan
Vic Liptak
Dori Littel-Herrick
Norman Millar

Our charge is: "to invite sustained engagement by the institution on the extent to which the institution fulfills its educational objectives. Through a process of inquiry and engagement, the Educational Effectiveness Review also is designed to enable the Commission to make a judgment about the extent that the institution fulfills its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness: The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program levels, and employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure the delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded. Specific purposes of the Educational Effectiveness Review include:

1. To review the design and results of institutional efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs;

2. To examine institutional practices for evaluating student learning and to develop and share good practices in using educational results to improve the process of teaching and learning;

3. To examine the alignment of institutional resources with activities designed to achieve the institution's educational objectives; and

4. To promote sustained engagement with selected issues of Educational Effectiveness consistent with Commission Standards. These will have already been identified by the institution and approved through the Proposal Review Process. The institution is encouraged to select issues of importance to itself in this process, so the Review will be of maximum local utility.

(WASC Handbook 2001, 45-46)
We are proposing the following work plan to begin our process:
* Nine meetings finishing before CPR site visit (late February), roughly every other week (with a pause over the winter break), 1-1.5 hours each
* Our initial meeting will be an overview of charge and process, beginning with tackling points 1 and 2 above, which are about understanding our evaluation and assessment practices as well as sharing positive results and procedures that might be shared across programs. We believe this should include as a culminate exercise a public recognition of quality practices and individuals in the evaluation and assessment process for some time in the spring semester.
* Overview Presentations: We are asking each task force member to present an overview of APR, evaluation and assessment in their areas following the meeting schedule below:

**Fall Semester:**
* Tuesday 10/30 9-10am, DCR: Orientation
* Wednesday 11/7 12:30-2pm, DCR: WASC (David), IP and CPR (Nathan)
* Tuesday 11/20 9-10:30am, DCR: 1-2:30pm NAAB (Norman)
* Wednesday 12/5 1:30-3pm, TBD: NASAD (Dori)
* Tuesday 12/18 10-11:30am, DCR: ACBSP and AACSB (John)

**Spring Semester (dates and times to be determined)**
* ITS (Doug)
* OSD (Phyllis/Paul)
* Synthetic discussion
* Meeting prior to CPR visit

Linda Parks will be sending out individual scheduling invitations for each meeting so that you may easily add them to your calendar. The schedule is best we could devise through Outlook, so if you have unscheduled commitments that interfere, please let us know as soon as possible so we could make alternative arrangements. Also, if the day we have selected for you to present is difficult for you, please also let us know and we will gladly rearrange the presentation order.

* During this time we will be reading (or at least skimming through) the following:
  * Past Woodbury WASC accreditation, our Institutional Portfolio and Academic Program Review (http://my.woodbury.edu <http://my.woodbury.edu/> )
  * Professional Accreditations: NAAB (http://www.naab.org/), NASAD (http://nasad.accredit.org/), AACSB (http://www.aacsb.edu/), including our own reports to these bodies

Thanks again for your willingness in helping advance the university in its educational mission.

Sincerely,

Doug Cremer
Paul Decker