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INTRODUCTION
Using the Guidebook

This Guide will be most useful to the individual who has been assigned primary responsibility for overseeing the Special Visit process (most often the Accreditation Liaison Officer, or ALO, at an institution). The document is divided into four parts:

1. Preparing the Institutional Report
2. Preparing for the Visit
3. Hosting the Evaluation Team on the Campus
4. Following up on the Visit

Institutional representatives are encouraged to review the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation and use this Guide as a resource. Contact Commission staff with any specific questions that remain unanswered. Refer to Appendix A to identify which staff member might best answer questions in a specific area.
The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is one of the six regional accrediting associations serving the United States. The Commission accredits institutions, not individual programs. As stated in the WASC 2001 Handbook of Accreditation, the process aids institutions in developing and sustaining effective educational programs and assures the educational community, the general public, and other organizations that an accredited institution has met high standards of quality and effectiveness. It achieves these goals by:

- Assuring the educational community, the general public, and other organizations and agencies that an accredited institution meets the Commission’s Core Commitments to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness, and has been successfully reviewed under Commission Standards;
- Promoting deep institutional engagement with issues of educational effectiveness and student learning, and developing and sharing good practices in assessing and improving the teaching and learning process;
- Developing and applying Standards to review and improve educational quality and institutional performance, and validating these Standards and revising them through ongoing research and feedback;
- Promoting within institutions a culture of evidence where indicators of performance are regularly developed and data are collected to inform institutional decision making, planning, and improvement;
- Developing systems of institutional review and evaluation that are adaptive to institutional context and purposes, that build on institutional evidence and support rigorous reviews, and reduce the burden and cost of accreditation; and
- Promoting the active interchange of ideas among public and independent institutions that furthers the principles of improved institutional performance, educational effectiveness, and the process of peer review (2001 Handbook of Accreditation, p. 9).

This Guide has been developed to help institutions prepare for and host a WASC accrediting team for Special Visits. It supplements the information found in the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation, taking institutions step-by-step from the preparation of an institutional report and scheduling of visit dates through the Commission action and follow-up to the visit.

The Nature of a Special Visit and Report

The Commission may schedule a Special Visit when taking action after the completion of a comprehensive staged review process and always schedules one when an institution is placed on a sanction. The team and institution are asked to focus on specific issues and concerns raised by the Commission in its action letter and by the last visiting team in its major recommendations. A report is required in preparation for the Special Visit. The complete format for such reports can be found in Appendix B.
Special Reports have a narrower focus and far fewer people involved in their preparation than do the portfolio and essays created for the comprehensive, staged review process. Since the Special Visit and Report are designed to focus on a few key issues, only those individuals in relevant parts of the institution need be involved in the development of the Report. However, leadership of the institution, including faculty, should review the Report to assure that it fairly and accurately represents the institution. In addition, the entire institution should be aware that a Special Visit is being conducted.
PART 1:
PREPARING THE INSTITUTIONAL REPORT
Special Visit Report Format

Under the WASC *Handbook of Accreditation*, when taking accreditation action, the Commission may request additional reports and site visits focused on identified issues of concern. In preparation for such a site visit the institution is asked to prepare a Special Report as described below. The Special Report must be submitted to the team and the Commission office eight weeks prior to the scheduled visit; four copies are sent to the Commission Office and one to each team member. Based on information from the Report and the site visit, the team prepares a report of its findings and makes a recommendation to the Commission. In most cases, the Commission accepts the report and sets or affirms the date of the next staged, comprehensive review. However, the Commission may also act to schedule further reports or special visits, change the date of the next staged, comprehensive review, or impose a sanction.

Special Reports should follow the format described below. Such Reports are intended to be limited in scope, not to be comprehensive evaluations of the institution. The Report should help prepare the visiting team understand the progress made by the institution in addressing the issues identified by the Commission and the major recommendations of the last visiting team.

A Special Report should include the following: (See Appendix B for institutions under sanction.)

1. **Cover Sheet.** The cover sheet should specify that the document is a Special Report prepared for a site visit. It should include the date of submission, the name and address of the institution, and the name of the person submitting the Report.

2. **Table of Contents.**

3. **Nature of the Institutional Context and Major changes since the last WASC visit.** The purpose of this section is to describe sufficiently the nature of the institution so that the visiting team can understand the issues in context. Describe the institution’s background; mission; and history, including the founding date, year first accredited, geographic locations, etc. In addition, briefly identify any major changes at the institution – in personnel, programs, enrollment, resources that would affect the team’s understanding of the current situation at the institution.

4. **Statement on Report Preparation.** Describe in narrative form the process of Report preparation, naming the constituents who were involved in it. Because of the focused nature of a Special Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of various institutional constituencies is not required. Faculty, administrative staff and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the institutional response. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and,
where appropriate, the Board of Trustees, should review the report before it is submitted to WASC, and such reviews should be indicated.

5. *Institutional Summary Data Form* (Appendix H).

6. *Response to Issues Identified by the Commission and the last visiting team.* This main section of the Report should address those special issues highlighted by the Commission as topics for the Special Visit. The primary focus of the report is on these issues, incorporating as appropriate related issues from the team report. In addition, the institution should provide an update on how it is addressing other major topics or recommendations identified in the team report. The institution should not respond to every issue discussed within the body of the team report, such as suggestions made throughout the report. Identify each key issue, providing a full description of the issue, and the action taken by the institution, along with an analysis of the effectiveness of the response. It is important that this section of the report include not only a description of the responses undertaken by the institution, *but equally important*, an assessment of the impact of these changes. Have they been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will such issues be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable?

7. *Identification of Other Changes or Issues Currently Confronting the Institution for the Future.* This brief section should identify any other significant issues or changes that are likely to occur at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described or identified in the preceding section. This will help the visiting team gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the responses of the institution discussed under #6 have taken place.

8. *Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook.* Effective July 1, 2002, all reviews are being conducted under the *2001 Handbook of Accreditation*. Progress on issues identified for the Special Visit are to be reviewed within the context of the 2001 Standards of Accreditation and institutions should review them in assessing the effectiveness of actions in response to Commission concerns under the Standards of Accreditation which led to the Special Visit. Looking to the future, since the new *Handbook* identifies higher expectations for institutional data analysis and evidence, and the review and improvement of student learning, it will be important to begin plans to address the new Standards of Accreditation. This section of the Special Visit Report is intended to be brief and only identify the plans or process the institution intends to use to prepare itself for its next comprehensive review under the 2001 Standards of Accreditation and the new multi-stage review process.
9. **Concluding Statement.** Reflect on how the institutional response to the issues raised by the Commission has had an impact upon the institution, proposing recommendations and follow-up steps.

10. **Required Documents, and list of hardcopy materials to be available in team room, including but not limited to:**

- current catalog(s);
- completed Set of Required Data Displays – The Data Displays are found in Appendix I and can be downloaded from the WASC website www.wascweb.org/senior/proposal_tables.doc
  - most recent Annual Report to the Commission;
  - budget for current year;
  - most recent financial statement and audit by an independent professional agency or, if a public institution, by the appropriate state agency; management letters, if any; and organization charts or tables, both administrative and academic, highlighting any major changes since the last visit.

**Reports by Institutions Under Sanction (See Appendix B)**

**Logistical Recommendations for all Special Visits**

Staff will respond to inquiries during the institutional review process. From experience with other institutions undertaking an institutional review, staff offer these additional suggestions:

- Begin planning the action to be taken in response to the concerns raised by the Commission and the visiting team soon after receiving the Commission action letter. The Special Visit team will be looking to the institution to demonstrate that substantive action and analysis has occurred; promises of future action are not sufficient.

- Start early with a pre-planning process in which the campus designs the process, and determines what data and exhibits need to be collected. The data collection also should begin early so that appropriate data are available to be analyzed.

- The assertions in the Report should be built on evidence. The institution should gather on-going assessment material, data, and reports that will reflect on areas to be covered in the Report. These materials can be organized into a Portfolio in support of the Report.

- The concluding statement is an important section. This concluding chapter should provide major recommendations and a clear sense of priorities and next steps in regard to the issues being addressed.

- The Commission does not expect that all constituents will agree on every issue or
recommendation in the presentation. State differences of opinion where such differences exist.

- At the end of the process, build in enough time for constituent groups within the institution to review the entire Report before it is sent to the Commission.
PART 2:
PREPARING FOR THE VISIT
Visit Date

Commission staff will send a letter to the CEO in May proposing dates for a visit that will occur 1½-2 years later. Special visits are typically scheduled for two days on campus (see Appendix C). However, visits scheduled for an institution on sanction with multiple compliance issues typically involve three days on campus.

Staff request that an institution respond to the visit dates as soon as possible. The CEO should request alternate dates if those proposed are not suitable for the institution. In agreeing to the dates, the CEO should be sure that administrators and faculty will be available, students will be in classes, and no other major campus activities that might conflict with the visit have been scheduled for the same time. The correspondence includes a separate form asking for suggestions of possible evaluation team members. This form should be returned to the staff within one month.

Commission staff assume that all further communication about the visit will go through the ALO. If another individual has been assigned responsibility for overseeing the visit process, the institution should inform Commission staff of that person’s name, title, address, e-mail address and phone number at this point in the process.

Evaluation Team

Each year Commission staff spend a significant amount of time selecting people to serve on evaluation teams. The information in this section describes the process.

The Team Chair

Choosing the team chair is a crucial step toward a successful visit. Staff, with the Commission chair’s approval, invite chairs in the summer of the academic year prior to the visit. The chair will be responsible for transforming a diverse group of people into a functioning team, assessing an institution’s responsiveness to concerns of the Commission and prior visiting teams, and drafting a report that gives the Commission a clear picture of an institution’s strengths and areas that need improvement.

The Team Members

Staff spend several days in the summer and fall of the academic year prior to the Special Visit selecting team members. Staff determine the appropriate number of team members based on the specific issues identified by the Commission that need to be covered. Staff members maintain a database of approximately 1,200 people who volunteer to serve on visiting teams. The Evaluator Biography Form (see Appendix D) shows the type of information gathered on each evaluator. In addition to disciplinary and evaluation areas, staff consider a number of criteria when selecting team members, including roles within
an institution (e.g., administrator, faculty, trustee); geographical location, gender, racial and ethnic background; and types of institutions represented (e.g., public, private, church-related, freestanding, etc.). Staff also work for a balance between experienced and new evaluators on a team. Information provided by the institution about possible team members is considered during this process.

Staff begin to send invitations to team members in October of the year preceding the visit and immediately replace those who are not able to participate. Occasionally staff will contact an institution for names of possible evaluators in specific evaluation areas or disciplines as replacements are needed. Staff attempt to complete all teams by May prior to the beginning of the academic year in which the visit is scheduled.

The Complete Team

As soon as the team is complete, staff send a packet to the CEO and the ALO with the final team roster and biographies of each evaluator (if available).

The institution is invited to review the team composition and accept it as presented or challenge any team member for cause. “Cause” is usually defined as evidence of bias or a conflict of interest. The WASC staff member assigned to the institution should be consulted with any question about team members or the areas of emphasis each team member will likely cover. The Commission reserves the right to determine the final team composition.

Staff occasionally will need to send an updated roster to the ALO if there are changes in titles or addresses, or a new member replaces someone who withdraws from the team. The ALO should keep only the most current roster so there is no confusion about who is on the team.

Commission Staff for the Visit

The final team roster will indicate which Commission staff member is assigned to work with the team chair and the institution throughout the visit.

In terms of the visit process, the Commission staff member or staff associate is responsible for:

- responding to questions from the institution and team chair;
- working with the chair on team organization and assignments;
- participating in the pre-visit discussion of visit logistics and format;
- participating in the pre-visit conference call with the team;
- attending the team planning meeting at the beginning of the visit; and
- commenting to the chair on the first draft of the team report.
Information to the Team

The team chair and members will begin reviewing information about an institution and the visit several weeks prior to arriving on campus.

Materials from the Institution

An institution sends four copies of its report to the Commission office and one copy to each visiting team member eight weeks before the visit.

The mailing to Commission staff and team members should include portfolio elements needed as a basis for understanding the Report. In all cases, the mailing should include the summary data form, current course schedules, a catalog, and the current financial audit. Staff understand that in some cases an institution may not yet have the current audit. In that case, the most recent audit should be included with a note attached indicating when the institution expects to receive the audit. When the current audit is received it should be sent to staff and team members.

There also are occasions when supplemental materials will need to be sent to specific team members, such as special financial reports to the finance evaluator or a report on general education to the team members assigned this area. Such arrangements should be worked out with the team chair and Commission staff.

Communications with the team should occur through the team chair (with a copy to the Commission staff). Contact with individual team members prior to the visit should be made in accordance with this Guide or as approved by the team chair or Commission staff.

On rare occasions, an institution may need to send the institutional presentation fewer than eight weeks before the visit. If this happens, the ALO must call the Commission staff member responsible for the visit to gain approval for the late submission, and follow up with a letter stating the date the document will be mailed.

Materials from the Commission Office

WASC sends materials to team members 10 weeks before the visit. This packet includes:

- a complete visiting team roster
- the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation
- other current WASC policy documents
- Special Visit Guide for Chairs and Evaluators
- the institutional accreditation history, which lists each Commission action on accreditation
- the most recent Commission action letter and visiting team report
- other relevant reports or correspondence.
In addition to these materials, the team chair receives the biography forms on each team member.

First Discussion with the Chair

Approximately seven weeks prior to the visit, WASC staff will call the ALO and team chair. The purpose of this conversation is to:

- set the date for a pre-visit discussion;
- discuss the schedule and logistics for the pre-visit discussion; and
- confirm that the institution is making hotel reservations for the team, reserving appropriate rooms for team meetings, and making arrangements for computer equipment for the team (see Visit Logistics section, p. 16).

First Communication (E-mail) from the Chair to Team Members

The team chair will send at least two communications to team members before the visit. Typically, an e-mail will be sent to team members about eight weeks before the visit and will include:

- welcome and general orientation to the nature of the visit;
- the beginning and ending times of the visit, including tentative dates for the pre-visit discussion (conference call);
- a reminder to complete travel reservations early;
- information on WASC travel guidelines, such as flying coach class and using ground transportation provided by the institution or hotel; and
- a reminder to review all the materials from the institution and the Commission office in advance of the visit.

Pre-visit Discussion

The pre-visit discussion is a telephone conversation held about six weeks before the visit. It is conducted as a conference call between the ALO, the chair, and the WASC staff liaison.

The team chair and Commission staff member will have read the institutional Report, discussed the major issues and developed a preliminary model of team organization. In making team assignments, the chair will ask team members to cover all or a portion of specific issues for the review. Prior to the pre-visit discussion, the institution should identify individuals, committees and groups with whom the team should meet.
The major functions of the Pre-visit discussion are to:

- discuss the primary issues that need to be addressed during the visit, which the chair considers in making team assignments;
- decide if additional information should be sent to specific team members or be available for the team during the visit;
- discuss team member expertise with regard to the issue areas;
- plan the visit schedule; and
- plan logistical support for team members during the visit.

The chair and the WASC staff liaison may also wish to have a conference call discussion with the CEO of the institution as part of their pre-visit preparation.

**Second Communication (letter) from the Chair to Team Members**

Following the pre-visit discussion, the chair sends a second communication to the team (e-mail or hard copy letter) that includes:

- individual team assignments;
- a draft visit schedule, including expectations for the first team meeting which may occur the night before;
- hotel and other logistical information;
- another reminder to complete travel plans immediately;
- a request that each member review all materials for the visit and then give special attention to the sections pertinent to individual assignments; and
- information about the team conference call

**Visit Schedule**

The ALO and the chair will begin discussing the visit schedule during the pre-visit discussion. The ALO will need to schedule all meetings for the team and assign locations based on what was discussed, and then send a copy of the proposed schedule to the chair and Commission staff for review a month before the visit. The ALO and the chair will decide who will send the detailed schedule to team members. Most meetings with team members will be pre-scheduled. The ALO will need to be available during the visit to make any necessary additions and/or changes to the schedule, as requested by team members.

**Specifics of Scheduling**

One or two team members will attend most scheduled meetings. Only a few important meetings will involve the entire team. Some general principles include:

- avoid having team members meet with large groups of institutional representatives (e.g., more than eight) at one time;
- schedule lunch meetings in private rooms; and
• make certain that the CEO and other needed members of the administration and faculty will be available during the entire visit.

Appendix C provides a sample visit schedule. Note that an additional day is scheduled when the Special Visit is to an institution under sanction with multiple compliance concerns. The following outlines the types of meetings that the ALO will need to schedule:

• Prior to arriving on campus, the team and WASC staff will have an initial team planning meeting. The Commission staff liaison will assist with team orientation, discuss Commission standards and answer team members’ questions. The ALO will need to determine the time of the meeting (typically 4 hours for a visit not involving a sanction and longer when the institution is under sanction). The ALO will secure a location for the meeting (typically at the hotel in which the team is staying). The team will use this meeting to focus questions to be pursued on site.
• The team will meet with the ALO after the team planning meeting to discuss final logistical arrangements and schedule changes.
• An initial meeting with the CEO should occur early in the visit.
• It is important not to overschedule the team to ensure it has time to review documents and to meet as a team.

Visit Logistics

The ALO, with the help of other institutional staff, will be responsible for all the visit logistics outlined in this section. Appendix E is a sample form that can help the ALO gather the needed information.

Computer Resources

Prior to the visit, the ALO should ask team members about computer hardware and software needs for report writing during the visit. Team members will need access to adequate computer resources in the team room, particularly on the last morning of the visit when they finish most of the report writing. A team member who brings a laptop computer will need appropriate printer support on the last morning of the visit.

Special Meals

The ALO should ask team members whether they have any special needs for meals, such as vegetarian or low fat, and make arrangements for those meals that are being scheduled for the person.
Hotel and Transportation

The institution is responsible for making arrangements for single-room accommodations for each team member during the entire visit; transportation for team members between the airport, hotel and campus; and a team meeting room at the hotel. The ALO should make hotel arrangements as far in advance as possible. The hotel should be comfortable and provide a fairly good range of amenities for team members. It also should be close to the institution to reduce travel time.

If the team is small enough, the ALO may be able to arrange for team meetings in a suite reserved for the chair. Otherwise, the ALO will need to make sure the team has a separate meeting room at the hotel for the opening team meeting, each evening and the last morning of the visit.

The ALO should notify the chair of hotel and transportation arrangements so this information can be added to the chair’s second letter to the team. The chair also may ask the ALO to notify team members directly.

Commission staff members will advise the ALO if they are aware of any team member who will require special physical accommodations.

The Team Room

The institution will need to provide an on-campus meeting room for the visiting team for the entire visit. The room may be used for team meetings and as a work room for team members to review documents and prepare their portions of the team report. Team members should have access to the team room during the day and evening hours. The ALO will need to make sure the team room has the following:

- supporting data and documents, including a list indicating which documents are hard copy only and which are on the institution’s website;
- computers, computer software and printers to match individual requests from team members, to the extent possible;
- convenience items such as a phone or two, campus directory, calculator, dictionary, water and juice; and
- access to duplicating facilities (also may be provided through support staff on the campus).

The ALO should send team members a list of team room exhibits three to four weeks before the visit so they may review the list and request copies of materials in advance.

Visit Information to the Campus Community

The ALO will need to inform campus administration, trustees, faculty, students and staff about the nature and purposes of the upcoming visit. This can be communicated in a variety of ways; institutions often use the website or a newsletter to provide information and updates about the review process or plans for the visit. The ALO also will need to
request that people be available to meet with team members at the scheduled times for interviews during the visit.
PART 3:
HOSTING THE EVALUATION TEAM
ON THE CAMPUS
Support for the Team

Team members will be extremely busy for the few days they are on the campus. To help make their visit run smoothly, the ALO might consider creating a brief information packet for them to use once they arrive on campus. The packet could include information such as:

- the key staff members including phone numbers available in case of questions or problems with meeting rooms, computer equipment, duplicating materials, etc.;
- access to campus buildings and parking;
- restaurant recommendations for team dinners;
- transportation arrangements between the hotel and campus each day, and to the airport on the final day of the visit; and
- a reminder about whether the institution will pay the hotel costs at the end of the visit or individual team members should pay their own hotel bills and be reimbursed.

The institution is strongly discouraged from providing gifts to team members in acknowledgement of their service as it can create a real or apparent conflict of interest.

Meetings with the Team

The team must accomplish a great deal in the brief time it is on campus. The CEO and ALO should emphasize the importance of everyone being available to meet with team members at their assigned time and location.

ALO Meeting

The team meets with the ALO after the initial team planning meeting to arrange additional appointments, make changes in the visit schedule and learn of final logistical arrangements. The ALO should respond promptly to team requests for schedule changes and confirm the times and locations of additional appointments for team members after they have been arranged. If time allows during this meeting, the ALO could show team members the team room; otherwise, this can be done first thing on the first full day on campus.

CEO Meeting

A meeting with the CEO occurs early in every visit. This is the CEO’s opportunity to welcome members of the team. The CEO should use the time to comment on the current status of the institution and on issues the institution needs to address in the future.
Open Meetings for Faculty, Staff, and Students

As a matter of Commission policy, only comprehensive visits are expected to include separate open meetings for faculty, staff and students. The institution has the responsibility to widely publicize these meetings to ensure that all campus constituencies are aware of them. If the nature of the institution is such that face-to-face meetings with all constituencies would not be possible, arrangements must be made for e-mail access to the team.

Interviews and Review of Evidence

Team members will meet with campus administrators, faculty, staff and students according to the schedule developed for the visit. The issues around which the visit is organized determine with whom the team will meet. In addition, team members will review additional evidence on site in the team room or as requested during the visit.

CEO Meeting with the Team Chair

The team chair typically will meet with the CEO alone just prior to the exit meeting for a briefing on major team findings.

The Exit Meeting

Attendance at the exit meeting is at the CEO’s discretion. Staff encourage participation of senior campus administrators and faculty leadership. The team chair usually leads the presentation of team findings and major recommendations. This meeting ends the visit. The accreditation recommendation of the team to the Commission is confidential.

Format of the Team Report

The Special Visit Team is asked to provide a written report of its evaluation using a template found in Appendix F.
PART 4:
FOLLOWING UP ON THE VISIT
Response to the Team Report

The chair is responsible for writing the team report based on written information gathered from all the team members and the knowledge of the institution gained through the institutional report and visit. Within two weeks of the visit, the chair sends the first draft of the team report to team members and Commission staff for comment. The chair then revises the report based on their comments and suggestions.

The “Correction of Errors of Fact Only and Omissions” Draft

The chair sends the revised draft of the team report to the institution for correction of factual errors only and omissions. The institution should expect to receive this copy of the report about five weeks after the visit. The chair will ask for a written response to errors of fact or omissions within a week to 10 days. The CEO or ALO is encouraged to call the chair if portions of the draft report are unclear. The chair considers the institution’s response and revises the report, as necessary, based on errors of fact. The chair has the right to decide whether matters constitute fact or professional judgment.

The Final Report

The revised report following the institutional response to the chair becomes the final report of the team. The chair sends the final report to the Commission office, and staff send a letter with a copy of the final team report to the CEO of the institution. This letter informs the CEO of the Commission meeting dates; institutional representatives do not typically attend the meeting although, in the case of a sanction, they may be asked to do so.

The institution is asked to acknowledge receipt of the final report and may respond to the report in writing to the Commission. If the institution chooses to respond, written comments must be received in the WASC office no more than seven days before the Commission meeting following a Special Visit. The Commission seriously considers an institutional response to the reports. It is helpful for the Commission to know whether the institution accepts the team findings and what steps the institution might take to address the most important issues identified by the team.

Questions about the Report or Process

The ALO will receive a copy of the letter and a form which can be used to evaluate the entire visit process. Any questions about the team report or process following the visit should be directed to the chair or Commission staff until the report has been completed. After the report is final, all questions should be directed to Commission staff. Note that under Commission policy, an institution must wait one year after the visit before hiring a team member as a consultant to the institution.
Commission Procedures and Actions

To conserve time and to maintain an effective and focused discussion, the Commission divides into panels to review the scheduled institutional actions. All panel members receive the team report and the institution’s response. In addition, two Commission readers will have copies of the institutional report and supporting documentation, and they will lead the discussion. The panel will propose a recommendation for final discussion and action by the full Commission.

Institutional and Team Representatives normally do not attend the Commission meeting after a Special Visit unless the institution was on sanction or serious problems are identified in the Special Visit team report.

The full Commission then takes the formal accrediting action. In taking action on Special Visits, the Commission elects to (1) receive the report of the visiting team and confirm the scheduling of the next visit, or (2) make an accreditation decision following the Special Visit. The institution will typically receive a Commission action letter 10 to 14 working days after the meeting.

Range of Commission Decisions

Commission Decisions on institutions are addressed on pages 51-60 of the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation. The sections that follow highlight the most common actions for accredited and candidate institutions. A confidential recommendation form is completed by the team and sent to the Commission with the final team report. In taking final action, the Commission also will determine or confirm the next visit date and type and may request a progress report on specific issues.

Under United States Department of Education regulations, when the Commission finds that an institution does not meet one or more of its Standards it is to place the institution on sanction and give it up to two years to take corrective action. If the institution fails to do so within the designated time period, the Commission is required under USDE regulations to terminate accreditation. The two-year timeframe may be extended only in exceptional circumstances for good cause.

Common Actions for Accredited Institutions

Reaffirm Accreditation. Reaffirmation of Accreditation indicates that the Commission has found an institution has met or exceeded the expectations of the Standards. It is granted for up to ten years and may be accompanied by the request for interim reports and visits. When accreditation is reaffirmed, institutions are most often placed on a seven- or a ten-year cycle.

Reaffirm Accreditation with a formal Notice of Concern. This action provides notice to an institution that, while it currently meets WASC Standards, it is in danger of being found in noncompliance with one or more Standards if current trends or findings continue. Institutions issued a formal Notice of Concern will have a special visit within four years to assess progress. If the issues are not addressed, a sanction will be imposed,
triggering the two-year rule as described on page 54 in the *2001 Handbook of Accreditation*.

A formal Notice of Concern is not made public by the Commission. This means it is neither published in the *WASC Directory* nor identified when members of the public call for information on the accreditation status of the institution.

**Issue a Warning.** A Warning reflects that an institution fails to meet one or more of the Standards for Accreditation. While on Warning, any new site or degree program initiated by the institution will be regarded as a substantive change (see Substantive Change Manual for details). The candidate or accredited status of the institution continues during the Warning period. A Warning is a public action, published in the *WASC Directory* and on the website (www.wascweb.org).

**Impose Probation.** Probation is a determination that an institution has been found to have serious issues of noncompliance with one or more Commission Standards. While on Probation, the institution will be subject to special scrutiny by the Commission, which may include a requirement to submit periodic prescribed reports and to receive special visits by representatives of the Commission. In addition, while on Probation, any new site or degree program initiated by the institution will be regarded as a substantive change (see Substantive Change Manual for details). The candidate or accredited status of the institution continues during the Probation period.

**Issue an Order to Show Cause.** An Order to Show Cause is a decision by the Commission to terminate the accreditation of the institution within a maximum period of one year of the date of the Order, unless the institution can show cause why such action should not take effect. Such an Order is typically issued when an institution, having been placed on Warning or Probation for one year, has been found not to have made sufficient progress to come into compliance with Commission Standards. The institution has the burden of proof to demonstrate why its candidacy or accreditation should not be terminated. The institution must demonstrate that it has responded satisfactorily to Commission concerns that it has come into compliance with all Commission Standards, and will likely be able to sustain such compliance. An Order to Show Cause may also be issued as a summary sanction for unethical institutional behavior (see Policy on p. 56 in the *Handbook 2001*).

The candidate or accredited status of the institution continues during the Show Cause period, but, during this period, any new site or degree program initiated by the institution will be regarded as substantive change requiring prior approval. In addition, the institution may be subject to special scrutiny by the Commission, which may include special conditions, the requirement to submit prescribed reports or to receive special visits by representatives of the Commission.

**Termination of Accreditation.** This is the most severe Commission action possible and usually follows other sanctions. In rare circumstances, such as serious issues of institutional integrity, the Commission may terminate accreditation without prior sanctions.
Follow-up to Commission Action

An important aspect of the accreditation process is the use of the Commission action letter and final team report by the institution. The Commission encourages widespread distribution of the action letter and team report within the campus community to stimulate further discussion and quality improvement. The documents may be made public by the institution. However, according to Commission policy, the institution should avoid quoting only those portions of the report favorable to itself.

Given the importance of the trustees’ awareness about accreditation, the Commission requests that trustees receive a copy of the Commission action letter and visiting team report within 30 days after an institution receives the action letter.

If a Formal Notice of Concern or any sanction is issued, the Commission requires that the CEO and representatives of the Board of Trustees meet with a Commission staff member within 90 days. The purposes of the meeting are to:

- further communicate the reasons for the Commission action;
- learn of the institution’s plan to inform its constituencies of the Commission action and the reasons for it; and
- discuss the institution’s plan for responding to the sanction.

Evaluation of the Visit Process

Staff send an evaluation form to the ALO when the final team report goes to the institution. The ALO is asked to respond after talking with other members of the campus community who participated in the process (i.e., writing the institutional review or report, meeting with the team, etc.). Commission staff review each evaluation carefully and take seriously the comments in working to improve the visit process each year. A sample of the evaluation form is included as Appendix G.

Visit Expenses

Commission staff bill an institution for all costs related to a Special Visit.

Budget for the Visit

Commission staff decide on the number of team members at least one year prior to the visit. ALOs often request this information as the institution is trying to estimate the total visit cost during its budget process. An institution is billed for the expenses of the visiting team, including the chair’s appearance before the Commission, if applicable. In addition, the Commission has established an administrative fee for: Reaffirmation, Initial Accreditation, Candidacy visits, and Special visits. These fees are available on the WASC website (www.wascweb.org).
Billing Procedures

To simplify accounting and reporting, staff prefer that team members pay their own travel and meal costs. Many institutions prefer to have hotel costs be placed on a master account paid directly by the institutions. The Commission reimburses team members directly and then bills the institution for team expenses plus the applicable administrative charge about six to eight weeks after the visit. If the team chair attends the Commission meeting, additional travel expenses may be billed separately.
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WASC STAFF

The Accrediting Commission employs a 12-member staff:

- **Ralph A. Wolff**, Executive Director
- **Stephanie Bangert**, Associate Director
- **Elizabeth Griego**, Associate Director
- **Gregory M. Scott**, Associate Director
- **Lily Owyang**, Adjunct Associate Director
- **Robert Benedetti**, Adjunct Associate Director
- **Tom Gallagher**, Finance and Operations Manager
- **Wanica Means**, Executive Assistant
- **Christine Ortiz**, Administrative Assistant
- **Barbara R. Nagai**, Administrative Assistant
- **Gwendolyn Salter**, Administrative Assistant
- **Jamie Wilkins**, Administrative Assistant

If you have questions about...call...

- Report design or contents...*Staff member responsible for your visit*
- Timetable for report...*Barbara Nagai*
- Visit dates...*Barbara Nagai*
- Evaluation team composition...*staff member*
- Visit schedule...*Barbara Nagai*
- Visit logistics...*Barbara Nagai*
- Team report timetable...*Barbara Nagai*
- Placement on Commission meeting agenda...*Wanica Means*
- Visit expenses...*Tom Gallagher*
- Off-Campus Programs...*Staff member responsible for your visit*
APPENDIX B
Special Visit Report Format for Institutions Under Sanction
Special Visit Report Format
For Institutions on Sanction

When the Commission places an institution on a sanction, a Special Visit is scheduled no later than two years after the Commission action. Within this time frame the institution must demonstrate that it has come into compliance with Commission Standards. (See Handbook, page 54). There are special reporting requirements for those institutional reports beyond that stated for typical Special Visits.

Under federal law, whenever the Commission finds that an institution fails to meet any of the Commission Standards, it is required to give the institution no more than two years to respond satisfactorily to Commission concerns and demonstrate it has come into compliance with Commission Standards. If the institution fails to do so, the Commission is required to take an “adverse action,” defined in the law to be the termination of accreditation. Thus, whenever the Commission imposes a sanction, which is by definition a finding on noncompliance with one or more Commission Standards, the institution is expected to address the issues identified by the Commission and demonstrate they have been resolved by the time of the next review. Special Visits to institutions under sanction are required to assess whether the institution has addressed the cited problems or issues satisfactorily and has come into compliance with Commission Standards. Promises of future performance are not sufficient.

In this context, institutions on Commission sanction (Warning; Probation; Show Cause) should follow the guidelines outlined in this document with particular emphasis and focus on how the institution has come into compliance with the Standards since the last Commission action. The institution should be prepared to provide evidence that demonstrates that it has satisfactorily responded to the specific concerns outlined in the Commission action letter where the accreditation decision was a sanction, and that it has come into compliance with Commission Standards.

In preparation for such a site visit the institution is asked to prepare a Special Visit Report as described below. The report must be transmitted to the team and the Commission office eight weeks prior to the scheduled visit; four copies are sent to the Commission Office and one to each team member. Based on information from the report and the site visit, the team prepares a report of its findings and makes a recommendation to the Commission. The Commission accepts the report and will take action on the sanction. If the sanction is removed, the Commission will set or affirm the date of the next staged, comprehensive review. However, the Commission may also act to schedule further reports or special visits. In exceptional cases, the Commission may extend the sanction upon a demonstration of good cause.

Special Visit Reports should follow the format described below. Such reports are intended to be limited in scope, not to be comprehensive evaluations of the institution. The report should help prepare the visiting team to understand the response of the institution in addressing the issues identified by the Commission.

A Special Visit Report for an institution under sanction should include the following:

1. **Cover Sheet.** The cover sheet should specify that the document is a Special Report prepared for a site visit. It should include the date of submission, the name and address of the
institution, and the name of the person submitting the Report.

2. Table of Contents.

3. Nature of the Institutional Context and Major changes since the last WASC visit. The purpose of this section is to describe sufficiently the nature of the institution so that the visiting team can understand the issues in context. Describe the institution’s background; mission; and history, including the founding date, year first accredited, geographic locations, etc. In addition, briefly identify any major changes at the institution – in personnel, programs, enrolment, resources that would affect the team’s understanding of the current situation at the institution.

4. Statement on Report Preparation. Describe in narrative form the process of Report preparation, naming the constituents who were involved in it. Because of the focused nature of a Special Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of various institutional constituencies is not required. Faculty, administrative staff and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the institutional response. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the Board of Trustees, should review the report before it is submitted to WASC, and such reviews should be indicated. The institutional preparation and review process should include awareness of the special circumstances surrounding the Commission action and the need to demonstration of compliance.

5. Institutional Summary Data Form (Appendix H).

6. Response to Issues Identified by the Commission and the last visiting team. This main section of the Report should address those special issues highlighted by the Commission as topics for the Special Visit. The primary focus of the report is on these issues, incorporating as appropriate related issues from the team report. In addition, the institution should provide an update on how it is addressing other major topics or recommendations identified in the team report. The institution should not respond to every issue discussed within the body of the team report, such as suggestions made throughout the report. Identify each key issue, providing a full description of the issue, and the action taken by the institution, along with an analysis of the effectiveness of the response. It is important that this section of the report include not only a description of the responses undertaken by the institution, but equally important, an assessment of the impact of these changes. Have they been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will such issues be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable?

Primary attention should given to issues cited as warranting a finding of noncompliance with Commission Standards. It is the responsibility of the institution to demonstrate that it has satisfactorily addressed each of the concerns of the Commission and has come into compliance with the Standards cited by the Commission in its action letter. Presenting and analyzing evidence that demonstrates that the institution has come into compliance with the Standards is important here. However, the institution should also reflect on the actions that would take it beyond minimum compliance to enable resolution of the concerns at a higher level.

7. Identification of Other Changes or Issues Currently Confronting the Institution. This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred at the institution
(e.g., changes in key personnel, major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described or identified in the preceding sections. The institution should be particularly attentive to issues, which might reflect a material change in compliance with other Standards. This will help the visiting team gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the responses of the institution discussed under item six have taken place.

8. Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook. Effective July 1, 2002, all reviews are being conducted under the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation. Progress on issues identified for the Special Visit are to be reviewed within the context of the 2001 Standards of Accreditation and institutions should review them in assessing the effectiveness of actions in response to Commission concerns under the Standards of Accreditation which led to the Special Visit. Looking to the future, since the new Handbook identifies higher expectations for institutional data analysis and evidence, and the review and improvement of student learning, it will be important to begin plans to address the new Standards of Accreditation. This section of the Special Visit Report is intended to be brief and only identify the plans or process the institution intends to use to prepare itself for its next comprehensive review under the 2001 Standards of Accreditation and the new multi-stage review process.

9. Concluding Statement. Reflect on how the institutional response to the issues raised by the Commission has had an impact upon the institution, proposing recommendations and follow-up steps.

10. Required Documents, and list of hardcopy materials to be available in team room, including but not limited to:
   - current catalog(s);
   - completed Set of Required Data Displays – The Data Displays are found in Appendix I and can be downloaded from the WASC website www.wascweb.org/senior/proposal_tables.doc
   - most recent Annual Report to the Commission;
   - budget for current year;
   - most recent financial statement and audit by an independent professional agency or, if a public institution, by the appropriate state agency; management letters, if any; and organization charts or tables, both administrative and academic, highlighting any major changes since the last visit.
APPENDIX C
Sample Visit Schedule
Sample Special Visit Schedule

Names/Groups listed may change depending on the visit issues. Chair and team members may choose to meet with other members of the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Member 1</th>
<th>Team Member 2</th>
<th>Team Member 3</th>
<th>Team Member 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 p.m.</td>
<td>Team meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p.m. Team meets with Liaison Officer to refine schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 p.m. Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Vice President, Finance</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td>General Education Committee</td>
<td>Diversity Task Force</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noon</td>
<td>Focus group with general education faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Team Member 1</td>
<td>Team Member 2</td>
<td>Team Member 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustees' Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team meeting and dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Team Member 1</th>
<th>Team Member 2</th>
<th>Team Member 3</th>
<th>Team Member 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team finishes draft reports</td>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit meeting</td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Evaluator Biography Form
EVALUATOR BIOGRAPHY FORM

Date: _____/_____/_____

Name ____________________________________________
(Last, First, M.I.)

Title ____________________________________________

Institution _______________________________________
(Full Internet Address - include server name)

Office Address _____________________________________

City ____________________________________________  State _______  Zip Code _________________

Home Address _____________________________________  Preferred Address ____Office ____Home

City ____________________________________________  State _______  Zip Code _________________

Racial/Ethnic Designation _____________________________ (optional)

1. EVALUATION AND DISCIPLINE AREAS: Team members are typically assigned responsibility for broad evaluation areas
under our accreditation standards, as well as a particular discipline or program. Based on your training and experience, please
identify no more than two Evaluation Areas and one or two Disciplines that you are most qualified to evaluate. (See reverse side of
this form for Evaluation Area Codes and Discipline Codes.)

EVALUATION AREAS

1. ___ ____________________  1. ___ _____________________

2. ___ ____________________  2. ___ _____________________

DISCIPLINES

1. ___ ____________________  1. ___ _____________________

2. ___ ____________________  2. ___ _____________________

2. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

(Degree) __________________ (Institution) __________________ (Year) __________________ (Field) ________________

______________________________ ________________________________ ________________________________

______________________________ ________________________________ ________________________________

______________________________ ________________________________ ________________________________
3. PRIOR POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Position)</th>
<th>(Institution)</th>
<th>(Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. OTHER ACCREDITATION EXPERIENCE (List service for other accrediting agencies or program review experience.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Accrediting Agency)</th>
<th>(Institution Visited)</th>
<th>(Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. RELATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (e.g., relevant committee assignments)

6. PLEASE ATTACH YOUR CURRENT VITA. This form along with your vita will be shared with your team chair to assist in making assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Area Codes</th>
<th>Discipline Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Diversity Issues</td>
<td>01 Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Planning (Strategic and Academic)</td>
<td>02 Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Institutional and Program Assessment</td>
<td>03 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Governance and Administration</td>
<td>04 Athletics &amp; P.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 General Education</td>
<td>05 Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Graduate Studies</td>
<td>06 Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Off-Campus and Adult Learning Programs</td>
<td>07 Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Faculty Affairs</td>
<td>08 Chiropractic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Library and Learning Resource Centers</td>
<td>09 Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Administrative and Academic Computing</td>
<td>10 Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Education</td>
<td>11 Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Engineering</td>
<td>12 ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>13 ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 ESL</td>
<td>14 ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Fine Arts (Identify Area)</td>
<td>15 Fine Arts (Identify Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Geology</td>
<td>16 Fine Arts (Identify Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Health Sciences</td>
<td>17 Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Higher Education</td>
<td>18 Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 History</td>
<td>19 Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 International Education</td>
<td>20 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Languages</td>
<td>21 International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Law</td>
<td>22 Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Mathematics</td>
<td>23 Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Philosophy</td>
<td>24 Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Physics</td>
<td>25 Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Mathematics</td>
<td>26 Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Political Science</td>
<td>27 Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Public Administration</td>
<td>28 Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Psychology</td>
<td>29 Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Religion</td>
<td>30 Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Sociology</td>
<td>31 Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Speech</td>
<td>32 Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Vocational Technical</td>
<td>33 Vocational Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Other (Please Identify)</td>
<td>34 Other (Please Identify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
Survey of Team Visit Support Needs
Survey of Team Visit Support Needs

Please return by (date) to (ALO name with FAX Number).

Name: ___________________________ Fax: ___________________________

Lodging has been arranged at the (name of hotel) for the nights of Wednesday through Thursday. We would be happy to arrange for Tuesday or Friday night lodging in addition. Please indicate the nights you plan to stay at the hotel. (Non-smoking rooms will be reserved, unless otherwise noted.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

We are making the following arrangements for transportation from the closest airport:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please provide information below:

Airline and flight number: ____________________________________________

City of origin: ______________________________________________________

Departure time and airline: __________________________________________

What is your preference for type of personal computer in the Team Room?

☐ Macintosh ☐ IBM-Compatible

What word-processing software would you prefer?  ☐ Word Perfect ☐ MS Word

Do you plan to bring your own computer?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you have any special dietary needs? ________________________________

Comments or questions:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX F
Team Report Template
Special Visit Team Report Format

Nature of the Team Report

The Report of the evaluation team plays is very important to the Commission and the institution. The team is responsible for enabling the Commission to determine whether the institution has satisfactorily responded to the issues identified as the focus to the Special Visit.

Team members are typically expected to submit to the Chair their assigned sections of the Team Report before leaving the institution. The content of the Report is agreed upon with the team chair at the time of the team conference call and/or opening team meeting. Specific documents or other evidence should be cited as justification for all observations and recommendations, to help the Commission understand how the conclusions were reached.

Content of the Team Report

The Team Report should include the following elements:

- **Institutional and Visit Context.** In this section, there should be a brief description of the institution and a summary statement of the accrediting history of the institution leading to the Special Visit. The Report should also provide a summary of the issues specified by the Commission as the focus for the Special Visit.

- **Quality of the Institutional Report and supporting Evidence.** The team should comment on the quality of the institutional report and the supporting evidence and documentation. Such comments are useful in promoting more effective reports and evidence presentations, and can assist the institution in preparing future presentations for its next review.

- **Description of the team review process.** This is intended to be a very brief description of how the team organized itself for the review and conducted its review. It is not necessary to append a schedule.

- **Team findings, analysis and recommendations.** This is the heart of the Team Report and is typically organized by issue or topic, paralleling the issues identified by the Commission in requesting the Special Visit. Each issue should be identified, followed by:
  - a statement of the evidence reviewed by the team in addressing the issue
  - the findings of the team with respect to the issue
  - analysis and commentary on the effectiveness of the actions taken and evidence presented.
  - Where appropriate, the team may make suggestions, which the institution may wish to consider, or formal recommendations, indicating steps or actions that need to be taken to further address the issue.

- **Other issues.** In its presentation, the institution is requested to identify major changes that have occurred since the last review. These may impact the team’s evaluation of not only progress with respect to Commission identified issues, but also lead to observations and comments by the team about issues the institution will need to address in the future. In this section of the Report, the team should comment if any such issues exist. These may be useful for the institution as part of the
evaluation process, as well as target issues for institutional consideration for its next accreditation review.

- **Institutional Plans to Address the New Expectations of the 2001 Handbook.** Since the next comprehensive review of the institution reviews will be under the 2001 *Handbook of Accreditation* with its new emphases on evidence of student learning and institutional data analysis and quality improvement systems, the team may wish to comment on ways the institution could organize itself to address the new Standards of Accreditation and multi-staged review process. This section of the Report is intended to be advisory and identify for the institution issues or approaches it might consider to position itself more effectively to address the new *Handbook*.

- **Major Recommendations and Summary of Findings.** This concluding section is an essential element of the Report and identifies for the Commission and the institution the teams major findings and recommendations. The number of major recommendations should be limited, and should be of the type that the institution would be expected to address.

- **The Confidential Team Recommendation.** The Confidential Team Recommendation form provides a checklist of possible team actions. The Chair will need to note the recommended action and the type and date of the next visit or report proposed. The Chair also needs to submit a brief explanation for the proposed action. This explanation should include several elements:
  
  - An explanation of the rationale for the proposed action. In the case of a recommended sanction, this should include an explanation of why this action is appropriate. Similarly, if the team is recommending the removal of a sanction, there should be clarity that the institution has brought itself into than alternative actions.
  
  - A list of the reasons why the type and date for the next visit/report are proposed. It is typical for a Special Visit to be followed by a comprehensive review, unless special circumstances warrant a progress report and another special Visit.
  
  - If a Special Visit or Report is recommended, an indication of what issues should be addressed.
  
  - A note about special considerations of the team, such as differing views about a particular issue.
Guidelines for Team Members Writing the Team Report

The following guidelines provide useful information for team members writing the report:

- The Team Report is written to the Commission and thus should avoid the use of the word “you” when referring to the institution.

- The Report should avoid stating that the institution is in compliance with a standard(s); this is a judgment for the Commission to make. The team may say that it reviewed the institution under a Standard and found that the institution had responded to previous concerns, or had made progress, or that it did not discover any issues or concerns.

- The Team Report should be evaluative, rather than descriptive.

- Avoid using individual names in your Report and avoid comments and suggestions related to personalities within the institution, even if they incorporate praise.

- Each section of the Report should have its own coherency.

- Writing should be clear, concrete, and assertions should be substantiated with evidence.

- Write the Report so it can be understood, and provide value to the multiple audiences who will use the Report, including the Commission, the institution, subsequent visiting teams, and Commission staff.

- Avoid jargon or code words that only people within the institution or possessing specific expertise will understand.

- Do not impose the standards or requirements of other accrediting associations or of governmental agencies.

- Double-space the Report to make it easy to read
APPENDIX G
Evaluation Form
SPECIAL VISITS
INSTITUTION'S EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

With the completion of this form, we are asking for your candid comments on the accrediting process, including the development of your Institutional Presentation and the work of the accreditation team that recently visited your campus. We encourage you to discuss this form with your institutional steering committee, and, to the extent possible, provide us with committee consensus in your response.

The information you provide about what worked well and what could be improved in the process will be useful as we plan our future curricula and resources to support institutional review. This evaluation is also important as we seek to gauge the impact of a particular team. Since, in many cases, members of a team will be invited to participate in subsequent accreditation visits, it is helpful to have information about their performance. The information you provide will be held in confidence with WASC staff only and will have no bearing on the final decision of the Commission.

Please return this form by email as a word attachment to: wascsr@wascsenior.org

__________________________________________________________________________________________
Institution Team Chair Your Name

1. Objectives for the Review. Please indicate the extent to which the following WASC objectives for Institutional Review were met for your institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Objectives</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Please check:</th>
<th>Fully Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Provided opportunity to focus on issues of greatest importance to my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Received a fair decision from the Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Demonstrated the WASC Standards were effective in guiding institutional self review and improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Provided useful and insightful team recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Addressed appropriate issues in the Commission Action Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Provided effective support from WASC staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Issues Reviewed in the Special Visit

A. Did the team provide a probing and effective review?

B. Did the review process improve institutional understanding and action? Please explain.

C. Did the team effectively review the evidence presented by the institution?

3. Personnel effectiveness. For your use as a reference, included with this mailing and available on the website is a series of behavioral indicators drawn from past evaluation forms that may stimulate your thinking about the performance of team members, the team chair, and the WASC staff.

A. Please identify any team members who made a distinctive contribution during the visit and what made the contribution valuable. Please also comment on any team member whose contribution or participation seemed limited or problematic, and why.

B. Please make any comments about the chair’s leadership and role.

C. Please comment on the effectiveness of your WASC staff liaison and support from WASC office staff.

4. Additional comments.

A. Please provide any additional comments about any aspect of the review process.

Thank you for your thoughtfulness in responding. We appreciate and carefully consider your comments.
APPENDIX H
Summary Data Form
INSTITUTION: ______________________________________________

PRESIDENT/CEO: _________________________________

DATE: __________

SUMMARY DATA FORM

1. YEAR FOUNDED: __________________

2. CALENDAR PLAN: __________________________________________

3. DEGREE LEVELS OFFERED: ______ Associate ______ Bachelors ______ Masters ______ Doctorate ______ Professional

4. SPONSORSHIP AND CONTROL: __________________________________________

5. LAST REPORTED IPEDS DATA FOR ENROLLMENT BY ETHNICITY AND GENDER

   Use IPEDS definitions for students. Data reported as of __________________________ (date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment by Category</th>
<th>Total FTE of Students*</th>
<th>Total Headcount of Students</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien Headcount</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native Headcount</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount</th>
<th>Hispanic/ Latino Headcount</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown Headcount</th>
<th>Total Male Headcount</th>
<th>Total Female Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If you have used a formula other than FTE = FT + (PT/3), please indicate how you have calculated FTE.

6. LAST 3 YEARS IPEDS DATA FOR 6-YEAR COHORT GRADUATION RATE BY ETHNICITY & GENDER:

   If you track graduation rates separately for freshman students and for students who transfer in to your institution, please use question 6 to record FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATES and question 7 to record TRANSFER STUDENT GRADUATION RATES.

   Please indicate if the data provided in question 6 table below is ______ for freshmen only OR ______ for freshmen and transfer students combined.
### Freshman Cohort Year (Entering Fall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Graduation Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien %</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native %</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander %</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino %</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If you track freshman and transfer graduation rates separately (see question 6), please provide

LAST 3 YEARS DATA FOR 6-YEAR COHORT TRANSFER GRADUATION RATE BY ETHNICITY & GENDER:

### Transfer Cohort Year (Entering Fall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Graduation Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien %</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native %</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander %</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino %</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. CURRENT FACULTY: **Total FTE** of faculty ____________ as of ______________ (date)

**Full-time** faculty headcount: __________ % Non-Caucasian __________ % Male __________ % Female __________

**Part-time** faculty headcount: __________ % Non-Caucasian __________ % Male __________ % Female __________

9. FTE STUDENT TO FTE FACULTY RATIO: ________________

10. FINANCES:

### A. Annual Tuition Rate:

- Undergraduate Resident Tuition: ________________
- Undergraduate Non-Resident Tuition: ________________

75
Graduate Resident Tuition: ________________________    Graduate Non-Resident Tuition: _______________________

B. Total Annual Operating Budget: _______________________________

C. Percentage from tuition and fees: ______________________________

D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: _______________ (FY20___); _______________ (FY20___); _______________ (FY20___)

E. Current Accumulated Deficit: _________________________________

F. Endowment: _________________________________

11. GOVERNING BOARD:
A. Size: _________________________    B. Meetings a year: ________________________

12. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS:
A. Number: _________________________    B. Total Enrollment: _________________________

13. ELECTRONICALLY-MEDIATED PROGRAMS (50% or more offered online):
A. Number: _________________    B. Total Enrollment: _________________
APPENDIX I
Required Data Elements
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES
ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

REQUIRED DATA ELEMENTS TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL & SPECIAL VISITS
Sample Data Exhibit Formats

Revised 01/11/02
Required Data Elements

As described, the Institutional Proposal and Special Visit Report will be accompanied by a Basic Descriptive Data Profile intended to provide important context for discussing the proposal. Other data relevant to this discussion will be assembled through the institution’s previous annual reports. Contents of the Basic Descriptive Data Profile include:

- Student Body Characteristics:
  - **Sample Format 1**—Enrollments by level
  - **Sample Format 2**—Enrollments by full-time/part-time status
  - **Sample Format 3**—Total degrees granted by level

- Faculty and Staff:
  - **Sample Format 4**—Faculty headcount (full and part-time)

- Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources:
  - **Sample Format 5**—Financial Ratios

- In addition, the following documentation is also required:
  1. Mission statement (unless in catalog)
  2. Organizational chart
  3. Catalog
  4. Financial Audits for the last two years
  5. List of academic programs currently offered [from Annual Report form]

Data Element 1—Headcount Enrolment by Level

**Description.** This table requests headcount enrollments by level, together with total FTE, as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are based on this Survey and are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Enrollment</td>
<td>8+14+22+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division Headcount</td>
<td>1+2+3+15+16+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division Headcount</td>
<td>4+5+18+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Headcount</td>
<td>9+10+11+12+23+24+25+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate (Non-Graduate Headcount)</td>
<td>13+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree Headcount</td>
<td>7+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Enrollment</td>
<td>8+9+((22+28)/3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
# Sample Format 1

Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall Term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>Lower Division Headcount</th>
<th>Upper Division Headcount</th>
<th>Graduate Headcount</th>
<th>Post-Baccalaureate (Non-Graduate) Headcount</th>
<th>Non-Degree Headcount</th>
<th>Total FTE Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Latest year
Data Element 2—Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location

**Description.** This table requests headcount enrollments by full-time/part-time status, as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Fall Enrollment Survey. Additional entries request information about enrollments at on-campus and off-campus locations as defined by the institution. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>[Line 29 IPEDS as in A-1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Headcount</td>
<td>Lines 8+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Headcount</td>
<td>Lines 22+28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Headcount</td>
<td>Attending at the institution’s “main campus” as defined locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Location</td>
<td>Not attending at the institution’s “main campus” as defined locally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
## Sample Format 2
### Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall Term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>On-Campus Location</th>
<th>Off-Campus Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Latest year
Data Element 3--Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level

**Description.** This table represents degrees and certificates granted by level on an academic year basis as reported by the institution on the IPEDS Completions Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Definitions for specific columns in the report are all drawn from entries in the “CIP Code = 99” section of the IPEDS Completions Survey and are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Degrees Granted</th>
<th>All Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2-year Awards</td>
<td>Lines 1+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees</td>
<td>Line 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degrees</td>
<td>Line 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate Awards</td>
<td>Line 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degrees</td>
<td>Line 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degrees</td>
<td>Line 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td>Lines 4+8+10+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
# Sample Format 3

## Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level (Academic Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Degrees Granted</th>
<th>Less than 2-Year</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Post-Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Latest year*
Data Element 4--Faculty by Employment Status

**Description.** This table presents information on the institution’s faculty as reported on the IPEDS Staff Survey. Percentage entries are all normalized on the first column of the report. Specific columns in the report are defined as follows:

- **Total Faculty Headcount**: Lines 22+77
- **Full-Time Faculty**: Line 22
- **Part-Time Faculty**: Line 77
- **Total Faculty FTE**: Line 22+(Line 77/3)

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
Sample Format 4
Faculty by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Faculty Headcount</th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Total Faculty FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Latest year
Data Element 5-- Key Financial Ratios

Description. This table requests information on key financial ratios that may be used to determine an institution's "financial health." The ratios help measure the institution's capacity to continue to provide promised educational services to students who have enrolled.

Issues and alternatives. The following definitions are provided to assist with completing the table.

− Return on Net Assets Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution's resources are growing. A typical way of measuring this is calculating the percentage change in net assets:

\[
\text{Change in Net Assets / Total net assets at the beginning of the fiscal year.}
\]

− Net Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not the institution is operating within available resources. The key question is, 'Did annual revenue-generating activities (including investment income) cover expenses?' This is typically measured as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Unrestricted Net Assets}}{\text{Total Unrestricted Revenues}}
\]

− Operating Income Ratio: A measure of whether or not core operating activities are covering expenses. A common way of calculating this ratio is:

\[
\frac{\text{Operating Income}}{\text{Total Education and General Expenses}}
\]

Operating income includes tuition and fees net of scholarships and financial aid; unrestricted grants, contracts and gifts; endowment income per the spending policy; investment and interest income on operating funds; other unrestricted income; auxiliary revenues less auxiliary expenses, and academic extension income. Education and general expenses exclude auxiliary expenses.

− Viability Ratio: This measures whether or not the institution has sufficient net assets to pay off its long-term debt. It is a measure of long-term viability. A typical way of calculating this ratio is:

\[
\frac{\text{Expendable Net Assets}}{\text{Long-term Debt}}
\]

Expendable net assets equal unrestricted net assets plus temporarily restricted net assets less net property plant and equipment plus long-term debt. Long-term debt includes the total remaining principal amount for any debt obligation with an original maturity of greater than one year.

A sample format designed to address this requirement follows.
Sample Format 5  
Key Financial Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>Change in Net Assets / Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>Change in Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Unrestricted Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>Operating Income / Total Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viability Ratio</strong></td>
<td>Expendable Net Assets / Long Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Expense per Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition per Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available