REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

ACCREDITATION REVIEW

To

California State University Channel Islands

April 8 – 10, 2015

TEAM ROSTER

Carol Christ, Team Chair, Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE) and President Emerita, Smith College

Stephanie Bangert, Assistant Team Chair, Executive Director, Communications and External Relations, Samuel Merritt University

Beverlee Anderson, Team Member, Professor of Business and Marketing, California State University, San Marcos

Bonnie Paller, Team Member, Academic Assessment and Program Review, Professor of Philosophy, California State University, Northridge

Maureen Maloney, WSCUC Staff Liaison, Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

---

The team conducted its review and evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). Formal action is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CSU CHANNEL ISLANDS
TEAM REPORT - APRIL 8-10, 2015

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

California State University Channel Islands (CI) is the newest campus in the California State University (CSU) 23 campus system. Since its opening in the fall of 2002, the campus has grown considerably. In the fall of 2014, CI enrolled 5,080 students, 4,881 undergraduates and 199 graduate students in 28 degree programs—23 undergraduate majors and 5 masters programs. It has 855 employees, including 400 faculty members. Located in Camarillo, California, on the former Camarillo State Hospital site, CI also offers programs at three learning sites, in Thousand Oaks (TO), Santa Barbara, and Goleta.

The university community shares a strong sense of mission: "Placing students at the center of the educational experience, California State University Channel Islands provides undergraduate and graduate education that facilitates learning within and across disciplines through integrative approaches, emphasizes experiential and service learning, and graduates students with multicultural and international perspectives." The mission statement reflects what the university has defined as its four pillars— international, integrative, multicultural, and community engagement.

CI was granted Initial Accreditation in 2007; the April 2015 review is its first for reaffirmation. The team carefully studied the institutional report and supporting documents in the fall of 2014. It met at WSCUC headquarters on October 29–30, 2014, to discuss its initial responses to the CI report and materials, conduct a video

conference with the president and executive staff, and identify lines of inquiry for the visit. The team held a subsequent conference call on February 27, 2015 to prepare for the visit, conducted on April 7–10, 2015.

During the team's visit on campus, it met with chief administrative officers; principal planning and policy committees, including those responsible for program review and assessment and student success; task force groups and councils (diversity and equity, and institutional centers); the WSCUC Steering Committee; and CI Foundation trustees. The visit schedule also gave the team an opportunity to meet with student, faculty, and community partners engaged in research projects to better understand the role of student research on campus. The team held open meetings for students, faculty, and staff.

The team thanks CI for its hospitality and candor. All meetings were characterized by full, frank, and open discussion of the university's aspirations, plans, and challenges. Conversations were conducted with integrity and serious engagement with WSCUC *Standards of Accreditation*, policies and expectations.

Accreditation History

CI was granted Initial Accreditation in 2007 for seven years (the longest possible period). The Commission's action letter of July 2007 commended the institution for its completion of four self-study reports and site visits in five years: the Candidacy visits in 2003 and 2004, and the Initial Accreditation visits in 2006 and 2007. CI was approved by the Commission for a change in degree level at the bachelor's level from I (Initial) to G (General) effective 2008. Additional substantive change approvals have been granted

since 2009: fast track authorization for master's degree programs and Master of Arts in English (2009); Bachelor of Science in Business (2010, Santa Barbara off campus program); Master of Business Administration (MBA; 2011, Goleta off campus program); Master of Fine Arts (2011, new degree); Bachelor of Science in Business (online); and fast track reauthorization for master's degrees (2013). The team visited the TO learning site; findings are provided below.

Off-Campus Visit: Thousand Oaks

On the day prior to the campus visit, two members of the team visited the TO learning site. The team met with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Division of Academic Affairs, Extended University (EU) and International Programs; Associate Provost, Division of Academic Affairs; and site staff including the TO campus director, who also holds the position of MBA associate director in the EU division. The mission of the EU is to develop programs that reflect regional partnerships and offer support in response to local educational needs. These programs are not supported by state money, and only offered if not provided by the main campus.

At the TO site, an MBA and Master of Science (MS) in biotechnology were developed in response to regional demand from the local biotechnology industry. The facility houses all courses for these degrees, except laboratory courses. Some state supported courses are offered to relieve pressure on the main campus, though with a new building opening on the main campus, fewer state supported courses will be offered on the TO campus.

The TO site is located in an attractive office building near a major regional interstate freeway south of Camarillo. Its classrooms are state of the art, and technology needs are fully supported by an information technology (IT) staff member, who comes to the site from the main campus on a weekly basis. Library resources are available electronically at main and satellite sites. Both adjunct and full time faculty come from the main campus, and TO students are advised by staff onsite and from the Camarillo campus as needed.

One director oversees programs in TO and at the Santa Barbara City College location. EU and the degree program are responsible for marketing materials, website, print and e-advertising, IT needs, user services, and marketing for events. A monthly CI newsletter produced by the EU and available on its dedicated website recognizes the achievements of its off-campus students. An evening and weekend coordinator works with graduate students and faculty. Advisors help students use program-developed curricular road maps; the graduate studies center supports student writing, e.g. for theses. Orientation occurs at off-campus sites. The staff sees the need to improve tracking of retention and graduation and of students after they graduate.

The team observed that the TO site has created a small learning community in which students interact with each other, and with faculty and staff. CI has developed the culture of the site to anticipate growth, planning for the capacity to support more programs. Currently, there is particular interest in computer science and a medical technician certificate programs. The leadership of TO see advantages in increasing

partnerships with local industry, in building bridges to the business community in order to solicit scholarships, and in increasing online classes offered from the main campus.

The Institutional Report

The team found that the institutional report provided meaningful context for the visiting team in its description of CI culture as defined by its compelling mission, vision and values. The institutional report responded to Commission concerns, providing analysis of progress made by the university since its founding in 2002. CI has a strong sense of its distinctive contribution to the CSU system, the region and California: to educate a diverse, underrepresented and first generation student population. The team found that the institutional report and the evidence reviewed during the site visit demonstrated that CI had addressed all WSCUC *Standards of Accreditation* as well as the *Core Commitments* (student learning and success, quality and improvement, and institutional integrity and accountability). CI meets federal requirements.

The institutional report seeks to portray the condition of the institution. The team found the report accurate in its depiction of a sustained, robust and authentic culture at CI. There was extensive involvement of the campus in the preparation and writing of the report; some 150 faculty and staff participated in work groups that collected and assessed data and conducted the self-study. The institution was fully responsive to the team's inquiries and questions, and provided all the materials and data requested.

The team found the CI report to be thoughtful and well written. It was organized in a hybrid manner in accordance with WSCUC guidelines given to institutions preparing for

review under the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation* (HB). The HB requires institutions to address nine components (or essays), two of which (components 2 and 8) may differ from institution to institution depending upon its stage in the accreditation cycle and the manner in which it chooses to organize its report. The CI report addressed the WSCUC requirements throughout the narrative in greater or lesser detail in relationship to their relevance to institutional issues. The report was organized around four essays: Defining Meaning and Ensuring Quality of the CI Undergraduate Degree; Defining Meaning and Ensuring Quality of the CI Graduate Degree; Using Student Data to Ensure Success; and Planning for the Changing Education Environment and to Ensure Financial Viability. It included an overview of progress in responding to previous Commission recommendations and concluded with an essay on considerations for the institution's future success. CI chose not to write an integrative essay, an optional element.

Even with extensive community involvement in the preparation of the institutional report, the team was struck by how much recent institutional context, central to the institution's plans and priorities, was not evident in the report. For example, the report did not fully describe the status of the university's strategic plan or indicate the existence of divisional strategic plans. The team attributed this to several factors. CI is an institution in rapid and early stages of development. Much had happened in the 18 months between the time that the institutional report was drafted and the time when the team made its visit. The visit provided the team an opportunity to talk to numerous groups and individuals about the strategic plan, and explore with CI how decisions and actions would flow from it.

Given the multi-dimensional requirements of the HB, the team wondered whether the rubrics provided by WSCUC for the organization and content of the report are effectively formulated for encouraging institutions to foreground those questions most fundamental to their development. The visit gave the team ample evidence that CI had indeed identified key issues for its future and its sustainability. The campus community was eager and generous in providing information and assessment, demonstrating engagement in those important issues during the visit.

Team Process

The team conducted the Offsite Review (OSR) and the Accreditation Visit (AV) in accordance with WSCUC guidelines, amplified by the staff support provided teams that now use the 2013 HB. Following the OSR, one member of the team left the group because of medical reasons, resulting in a team of four including the chair, and assistant team chair and editor. Team member assignments covered WSCUC components and *Standards of Accreditation*, CI report essays, federal requirements, and the off-campus site review. The team report is organized around WSCUC components. Where the CI report provides commentary and evidence with regard to the components, this report makes reference to that material.

In the course of the review, twenty-five confidential emails were sent to the WSCUC digital account. Team members reviewed each email carefully. The team appreciates the thought demonstrated by faculty, staff, and students who took the time to express their views. The quality and nature of these private communications reflect an open and intelligent campus community.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

COMPONENT 1: Institutional Context and Response to Prior Issues

The CI report provided a good introduction to the university's founding, vision, culture and aspirations. During the visit, the team learned a great deal about current campus climate, relationships with and among internal CI committees and councils, relationships with external community and industry groups, the effectiveness of organizational structures, and progress in the development of CI and divisional plans. A summary of institutional context is provided in Section I.

The Commission action letter of July 17, 2007 granted CI Initial Accreditation and noted five areas for continued institution attention: 1) maturing the centers; 2) faculty and staff workloads; 3) data-supported planning; 4) assessment of learning; and, 5) collaboration with the (CSU) System Office. The team found that the CI institutional report addressed each of these areas, providing updates and analysis within the essays. In addition, the AV schedule was organized so that the team could engage with a broad spectrum of staff, faculty, and students to evaluate CI's progress in this regard.

Following are the team's findings in regard to CI's progress in addressing the recommendations from its initial accreditation.

- The *Institutional Centers* (Center for International Affairs, or CIA; Center for Integrative Studies, or CIS; Center for Multicultural Engagement, or CME; and the Center for Community Engagement, or CCE) each have a clear purpose and

sense of direction, arising directly from the ethos of CI culture and the collective commitment to place students at the center of learning. The work of the centers is considered essential both to realizing the university's vision and to achieving institutional outcomes. Despite limited funding and staffing, the campus has maintained the positions of faculty director or co-director for each center. With the exception of CIS, each has a dedicated staff person.

- *Faculty and staff workload* is an area of concern for CI and its leadership; adequate staffing is essential to the institution's plans for growth, its quality, and its role in the region. In meeting with the president and individual members of his cabinet, and in the open staff and faculty meetings, the team was struck by the continuing commitment by CI employees to give their best on behalf of students; nonetheless, all are acutely aware that a critical mass of staff and faculty is required to keep pace with increasing enrollment targets, program development and goals for student success. Although CI was able to increase its tenure-track faculty by about 40 percent and staff by about 50 percent since 2007, the impact of this increase was diminished by the growth in student enrollment at a rate of over 65 percent during that same period.

- *Collaboration with the System Office.* CI leadership believes the most important issue for the institution is the need for the CSU system to allocate greater and appropriately proportional funding commensurate with CI's status as the newest CSU campus and in support of projected enrollment growth of 8 percent per year to meet regional and state demand for access to quality higher education. CI only received a 1 percent increase in funding while the overall increase across the system was 4 percent. New faculty and staff hires depend upon tuition dollars.

11

- *Data-supported planning* has been effectively addressed by the hire of a full time, experienced and highly qualified director of the office of institutional research, aptly renamed Institutional Effectiveness (IE). CI has made rapid strides with the work of the office, creating accurate foundational data sets and processes. Additionally, IE has built strong relationships with key leaders and managers including support of assessment and planning bodies. Appropriately, the IE director sits on the Provost's Council and other institutional bodies. Everyone we interviewed respects and values the work of the office.

- *Assessment of learning* is the area in which the campus has shown most improvement. The team carefully assessed the program review process, the results of those reviews, and the work of the Curriculum Improvement Committee. Members of that committee demonstrated that they understood how to align the various threads of assessment work across the institution.

COMPONENT 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements

The 2013 HB requires an institution under review for reaffirmation of accreditation to demonstrate that it is in substantial compliance with the *Standards of Accreditation*. This requirement is to fulfill federal law. The HB asks institutions to complete the *Review of WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements* worksheet, a self-rating form organized standard by standard. The evaluation tool requires an institution to indicate institutional priorities, identifying strengths and areas where improvement is needed. Embedded in this worksheet are four federal compliance checklists: credit hour and program length; marketing and recruitment; student complaints; and transfer credit policy. CI completed the comprehensive and rigorous worksheet and the four

compliance checklists in a thoughtful, comprehensive manner. The appendix includes these checklists.

The team found that the institution's *Review under the WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements* to be an excellent internal assessment of CI's response to the Criteria for Review (CFR). Because actions were aligned with broad themes and Commission standards, the team could focus lines of inquiry on issues it thought were critical to CI's mission and effectiveness. Although WSCUC no longer requires an institution (under reaffirmation of accreditation review) to write a narrative essay regarding its review of the *Standards of Accreditation*, the worksheet provides valuable information and analysis (perhaps easy for WSCUC teams to overlook). CI is to be commended for its diligence in this regard.

To acknowledge the effort made by CI in completing its self-evaluation, the team believed it important to provide the Commission its assessment of CI's compliance with respect to the *Standards of Accreditation* as part of the institution's first reaccreditation review.

Standard I: Institutional Purposes and Educational Objectives

The team was not only impressed but moved by CI's mission statement. It defines CI's essential character and value, and appeared embraced by all members of the community (CFR 1.1); the four pillars are core commitments of the institution. Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the university, and much institutional data, including evidence of student achievement, retention, and graduation,

is present and easily accessible on the school's website (CFR 2.2). The institution has made an appropriate statement of its commitment to academic freedom (CFR 1.3). CI's commitment to diversity is one of its four pillars, and readily apparent throughout the institution. The university has education as its primary purpose and operates with appropriate autonomy (CFR 1.5); it truthfully represents its goals, treats its students fairly and equitably with appropriate policies, and assures they can complete degree programs in a timely fashion (CFR 1.6). CI exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations (CFR 1.7), and it has undertaken this review process with seriousness, candor, and integrity (CFR 1.8).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives

Teaching and Learning

As a campus within the CSU, CI has clearly defined degrees with appropriate course content and numbers of qualified faculty sufficient for their programs, though some programs are new, and faculty numbers need to grow in order to offer the range of courses adequate for a degree program. The CSU also outlines and reviews unit requirements for undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, and general education. General admission policies are specified by the system (CFR 2.2, 2.3).

Program learning outcomes are designed by program faculty. The campus makes available all statements of program student learning outcomes and expects course learning outcomes to be available on course syllabi (CFR 2.6). Implementation of these expectations is uneven (CFR 2.3) as is the assessment of program learning outcomes

(CFR 2.4). The onsite visit provided the team evidence of emerging plans to improve the clarity and consistency of this process.

CI has developed clear expectations for the structure and content for cyclical program review. The program self-study is followed by a visit from two well-regarded external reviewers. After the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) review of this report, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is developed that forms the basis for strategic planning. Progress on the strategic plan is reviewed at the two-year and five-year mark (CFR 2.7). The schedule for program review for degree programs is made available online, as are the program review portfolios for completed reviews. A program review for General Education (GE) has not been completed though at least some rubrics for sections of GE have been drafted, and some rubrics have been used for direct assessment. There is a Student Affairs Assessment Council that oversees assessment for student affairs programs. The status of assessment and program review for programs within the purview of student affairs and co-curricular programs is less clear (CFR 2.11).

Campus administration expects results of program assessment to be part of the program self-study during program review, but it is unclear what assessment structures are in place to encourage programs to engage in continuous assessment so that they have assessment results at that milestone.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

CI is active in promoting student learning within the classroom, outside of the classroom through service learning and community involvement, and through exciting campus

programs (CFR 2.5). Some examples include the Stepladder Program for Inter-disciplinary Research and Learning (SPIRaL), the CI Research Conference, and programs for community engagement through partnerships (CFR 2.8).

The CSU faculty contract specifies the area, though not the standards, for faculty evaluation. The areas include research and scholarly activity, teaching, and service (CFR 2.9).

Student Learning and Success

The Academic Advising webpages indicate thorough and careful consideration of the needs of students, whether new freshman, transfer students, or students about to finish their degree (CFR 2.10, 2.12, 2.14). Advising centers allow students to receive individualized attention. Faculty are available to advise students in their majors.

Standard 3: Resources and Organizational Structures

The university acknowledges the challenges it has to maintain appropriate staffing that the growing institution requires (CFR 3.1). Documents and discussions with faculty and administration indicated that tenure-track faculty hiring has not kept pace with enrollment. Documents provided by the institution show that currently there are 112 tenure-track faculty members, including five Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty positions that are mandated to be half time positions. This contrasts with the 288 Lecturers, 62 of whom are full-time, and 226 who are part-time. Tenure-track faculty appear substantially fewer than non-tenure-track faculty. The percentage of tenure-track faculty for CI is reported to be the lowest in the CSU system.

The faculty hiring plan presented to the team indicates that the hiring of faculty is planned to keep pace with enrollment projections at 8 percent per year. The documents also suggest that the proportion of full-time faculty will increase over time. However, this year the enrollment is projected to increase by only 2 percent, so the anticipated number of tenure track positions to be filled this coming year is not certain. Plans to achieve enrollment targets and faculty hiring goals were not specifically addressed in the documents. The faculty hiring plan provided to the team does not indicate specific action plans regarding the recruiting and hiring of faculty. (See Component 7, page 34 for an update provided to the team during the visit.)

There does not appear to be a staff hiring plan at CI although the team reviewed the *Strategic University Hiring at CSUCI*. This paper provided CI's philosophy, practice, and stance on planning; goals and outcomes were not presented.

Specific plans for increasing staff positions as enrollment increases were not addressed in the institutional report. In an open meeting with the staff and in confidential emails received by the team, there is concern by some staff that they are over-worked and under-appreciated. A few said they felt like second-class citizens on campus. While the majority expressed passion for the institution, love their jobs, and are committed to serving students in the most effective way, many feel somewhat overwhelmed by all that is expected of them at a time when CI is expanding programs, increasing enrollment and becoming more structured and complex. Staff workload is not addressed in any detail in the documents other than a concern expressed that the

college was not voted as a "Great College to Work For" in 2013 as it had been in previous years.

Issues of workload and faculty and staff burn-out are recognized and in some cases are being addressed. Faculty development workshops and improvements in sabbatical leaves and grants, as funding permits, are designed to help with faculty burn-out (CFR 3.2). The number of faculty development workshops listed for spring 2015 is impressive; they cover a range of teaching and research topics (CFR 3.3). Staff training does not appear to be as high a priority or as organized as faculty development although several staff expressed appreciation for their supervisors, who are supportive of continuing professional development and good mentors.

The current finances are solid, and ratios are in-line with public, state assisted institutions. Financial ratios examined for the three years under review indicate CI to be in a medium to strong financial position (CFR 3.4). The IT resources appear to meet the changing needs of the institution. The IT division has been engaged in strategic planning for several years, and understands the changing needs for information and technology. The *Information Technology Strategic Plan 2011-2014* makes the case for appropriate funding.

Several public/private partnerships are underway, which are anticipated to provide more revenue to the institution. The CI acreage is a resource that the campus is attempting to develop into a revenue producing stream. Currently the university is considering building housing and apartments that would produce income. The success of these

endeavors will aid the campus in funding many activities and initiatives currently supported by grants and contracts. As a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), CI has been very successful in receiving several HSI grants that are currently funding activities that are contributing to student success (CFR 3.5).

CI, as a growing institution, has evolving structures that are being redesigned for more efficient and effective decisions and communications (CFR 3.7). The team observed the institution's leadership, at all levels, to be characterized by integrity, high performance and accountability (CFR 3.6). Some structures, however, appear to be president-centric, with less distributed decision-making than is typically found at more established institutions. The team believes that the organizational culture and youth of the campus may create challenges in leadership transition when its founding president chooses to retire.

There have been recent changes in reporting structures, and the institution is reviewing its academic structure this summer. The team saw evidence that key CI stakeholders understand the importance of building and developing leadership for the institution's future as it moves towards its second decade.

The president has been with the institution since its founding. His vision and impact is seen in almost every aspect of the institution. (For example, he interviews all faculty candidates.) As the institution continues to grow, however, many of the original structures have not worked as effectively as they once did. There are numerous large committees which are seen by some as essential to the culture, but as the institution

grows, the scale and scope of these numerous committees will need to be reexamined. Communication and transparency are recognized as areas needing more work.

Standard 4: Organization Committed to Quality, Learning and Improvement

CI provides evidence of employing a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas (CFR 4.1). In academic areas, for all undergraduate and graduate programs, there is an infrastructure for the assessment of student learning and cyclical program review. Originally, the CI Core Assessment Team was responsible for the quality of student learning outcomes assessment and works in conjunction with the President's Cabinet and the IE office, as shown in the flowchart for *Assessment and Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness* found in the evidence CI presented for the review. The last annual report from the Assessment Council to the president reviewed activity for 2011–12. The team observed that the responsibilities of the Assessment Council (AC) appear to be managed by the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC). The primary responsibility of the CIC is to refine and guide the program review cycle for all degree and non-degree programs in Academic Affairs (CFR 4.3, 4.4).The CIC is comprised of representatives from each degree program, other academic units, academic centers, major grants, GE, and degree levels. Members representing non-degree areas come from the library, academic advising, and the writing center. CIC annual reports summarize all completed program reviews and action plans. The intent of these reports is to provide useful information and data for program development, academic planning, resource allocation, and opportunities for partnerships on and off campus, thus providing an integrated

approach to more holistic academic planning and decision making based on evidence from program review.

The process for cyclical program review is articulated in the CI *Guidelines for Program Review*. CI is to be commended for its insistence that the program review process is an opportunity for programs to assess themselves and use the evidence gathered, in conjunction with external reviewers' reports, as the basis for a strategic plan and continuous improvement. Degree programs develop a self-study that includes the program's goals and objectives, the assessment of learning, resources and program capacity, and program planning. External reviewers are provided with a document that serves as the framework for their visit and final report, the *Overview for External Reviewers: Program Review Template for the Site Visit and Report*. The Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) provides peer and administrative reviews through an independent written evaluation both of the self-study and the external reviewers' report. On this basis an action plan is developed, which outlines recommendations for program improvement and an implementation strategy (CFR 2.7).

The CIC now oversees these functions and responsibilities of the PARC (CFR 4.2). Self-studies are made publicly available on the program review website. While many programs are queued for program review at the same time, wisely, the review schedule has been staggered, reducing the logistical burden of handling a large number of program reviews concurrently. Plans for streamlining the scheduling process are underway for improving the efficiency of the review process.

Programs within the division of student affairs are developing a cyclical program review process that will include a self-study, an internal site review, and an external

professional review. Some programs are in the initial self-study phase but none have been completed.

Student review of teaching is facilitated by an online Student Ratings of Teaching (SRT) instrument (CFR 4.4). Students access the SRT online via their student login page and complete the survey form anonymously. Faculty members receive a report at the close of the survey period.

In addition to student review of faculty, faculty review faculty colleagues through a well-defined process of peer review (http://policy.csuci.edu/sp/12/sp-12-011.htm). The Peer Review Committee (PRC) is comprised of the program chair (unless the program chair is of lower rank than the faculty being reviewed) and two tenured faculty members of equal (or greater) rank to the faculty member being reviewed. The PRC is responsible for evaluating the faculty portfolio and reporting results to the appropriate assistant vice president.

The new office of IE "provides demographic and statistical information about university students and faculty/staff, research reports…" Information for each degree program is utilized in the development of each program self-study (CFR 4.2).

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity

As a campus within the CSU system, CI has mandated core functions, but as a new institution, it has had the opportunity to design innovative methods for achieving educational objectives. CI has done so in many ways, framing its educational mission around four pillars of educational and social commitment.

The CI mission "places students at the center of the educational experience…and provides undergraduate and graduate education that facilitates learning within and across disciplines through integrative approaches, emphasizes experiential and service learning, and graduates students with multicultural and international perspectives." This mission, and the values and attitudes endorsed therein, is expressed and executed in the four centers. Each center is defined by its own specific objectives which, with GE learning outcomes, are woven throughout curriculum and pedagogy, and experienced by students as a key characteristic of the culture of the campus.

The institutional centers (CIA, established 2004; CIS, established 2005; CME, established 2006; and CCE, established 2007) together provide a value-based foundation for the educational objectives of the university. They represent and define the meaning of the CI degree.

The centers and the activities which flow from them serve to indicate a deep cultural commitment to high impact practices in the service of student learning. The CIA promotes study abroad, short term faculty led courses, and an international lecture. Their experiences are shared with the campus at the annual Spring/Winter Travel Experience Event. The CIS promotes inter-disciplinary education across campus, provides faculty with mini-grants for course proposals, new pedagogies, events, publications, and faculty retreats. Their innovative SPIRaL program enables students to maintain the interdisciplinary experience throughout their time on campus. The CME provides faculty workshops for increasing multiculturalism in the curriculum, faculty awards for projects which promote multicultural engagement, such as buying books for migrant workers who work in the local area, safety training for lesbian, gay, bisexual,

and transgender (LGBT) students, focus on needs of undocumented students, and campus safety for all students. It promotes connections across campus, across divisions, and between faculty, students, and staff. The CCE provides opportunities for service learning. Fifty course sections have a dedicated service-learning component. Even though the value of high impact practices is recognized across campus in the four pillars and the four centers, both faculty and administrators indicate the problem of finding funding to sustain innovative projects and programs.

Each degree program has a comprehensive list of explicitly articulated student learning outcomes that are made available widely to the public and to students through the *Students Guide to Student Learning Outcomes*, orientation fact sheets, the catalog, academic program websites, and course syllabi (CFR 2.3). CI intends that degree program learning outcomes are measurable and level appropriate. A review of program outcomes shows that some degree programs have not yet succeeded in making their program outcomes measurable ones, though most do so.

Component 4: Educational Quality, Student Learning, Core Competencies

The CI undergraduate learning outcomes include seven general university learning outcomes along with the disciplinary knowledge, skills, and abilities specified in the learning outcomes of the student's major program.

The GE program has measurable student learning outcomes for each section. The CI *General Education Assessment Plan*, developed in October 2011, called for the development of a new course UNIV, which would be used to assess general education and institutional learning outcomes, a course that has since been successfully

developed as their UNIV 150 course. GE outcomes, as well as institutional learning outcomes, have begun to be assessed in UNIV 150 using direct embedded assessment of student work. In particular, student achievement of learning outcomes (critical thinking, information literacy, and multicultural perspectives) has been and continues to be assessed (CFR 2.2a).

Signature assignments in the area of critical thinking were developed and implemented. The faculty developed rubrics for critical thinking, which have been used to assess student work. Evidence provided by student performance on critical thinking signature assignments has been gathered since fall 2011. Student learning outcomes for information literacy have been assessed since 2007; student learning outcomes for multicultural perspectives have been assessed since 2011. Assessment of written communication has the longest history, having begun in 2003. It is with assessment of written communication that we can see clearly how CI has used the assessment results to inform programmatic changes and "close the loop;" on the basis of assessment results a new sophomore-level writing course was introduced as well as a writing guide that provides explicit information on academic writing specific to a variety of disciplines.

While UNIV 150 is used as a baseline to assess institutional and general education learning outcomes, it is part of a sequence which includes UNIV 250 and 349. In addition, there are various opportunities across upper division and capstone courses for students to demonstrate their achievement of these same learning outcomes at later stages of their undergraduate careers. A couple of features make this sequence of courses especially attractive in their design. The campus collectively intends to use the

sequence as a platform for assessing the growth of core competencies in their students. All sections can be used to assess the university learning outcomes.

The fundamentally integrative character of the educational experience at CI is exemplified in the core sequence of UNIV 150, 250, and 349 courses. A central intent of the design of UNIV 150 is to expose students at the start of their higher education experience to campus resources for tutoring, careers, graduate studies, the CI mission, together in order to promote academic and social success. Like many first year experience programs at other universities, the curriculum of the UNIV 150 course is designed to be both academic and practical, appealing to the needs of the primarily first generation student body, organizing itself around a complex social problem which can be approached from a multitude of disciplinary points of view. The UNIV 250 course builds on the integration of academic content and exposure to resources that is the special feature of UNIV 150, but does so around the pillar of community engagement and service learning. And finally, as students approach upper-division status in UNIV 349, a complex social problem is again approached through multi-disciplinary lenses.

Second, students currently enrolled in the courses are supported by peer mentors, students who are successful in negotiating college. The peer mentors are embedded in the sections and are responsible for facilitating the academic and social experience of the students, thereby serving as a high impact practice for the mentors. At their disposal is a toolkit of resources which includes lesson plans developed for their use and an app which maps the syllabus to their calendar and integrates campus and other social events, thereby enabling them to tie together the curricular and co-curricular. The core competencies assessment is supported and sustained via the electronic platform TK20,

which also serves as an electronic portfolio for all students. The effectiveness of execution and design of this course sequence has been recognized at a presentation at the national association of educators of Hispanic serving institutions.

Faculty continue to develop and refine rubrics for general education and institutional outcomes. The sociology department is piloting the development of a standardized rubric for written communication that could be used in lower division, upper division, core, and capstone courses in the program. This pilot would indicate that there are not standardized rubrics for other general education and institutional outcomes but that a multitude of rubrics are being used (CFR 2.2).

Component 5: Student Success

The team was convinced of CI's commitment to student success, expressed through its determination to place students at the center of the learning experience. The faculty and staff with whom the team met shared a collective ethos to mentor, elevate and empower each student to achieve their greatest potential, master learning competencies and contribute to their communities and future workplace. We commend CI for its spirit and will to achieve its mission despite funding challenges (CFR 1.4, 2.11, 2.12).

The *CI Strategic Plan* defines student success by three priorities. CI students will:
- Achieve established learning outcomes and be academically prepared to graduate;
- Actively engage in curricular and co-curricular programs and support services that enhance their learning experience; and,

- Apply their academic and co-curricular experiences to further their education, advance their careers, and positively contribute to a diverse and dynamic society.

The plan embodies student-centeredness: CI will ensure that students' best interests are at the center of all university decisions. Accordingly, one of the three strategic priorities is dedicated to student success (facilitate student success; provide high quality education; realize our future).

The team noted that the CI report wove its conception of student success through all component essays. The report included detailed description of the *multicultural perspectives* learning outcome for undergraduate and graduate programs and of an array of what the team considered best practice co-curricular learning experiences such as the Hank Lacayo Internship Program and the annual CI Student Research Conference. Impressively, a number of CI students from across the institution have been recognized locally, nationally and some cases internationally (see institutional report, pages 37–40).

Both formal and informal structures and support services at CI dedicate energy and resources to student success. Examples include the many community partnerships in which students contribute, opportunities available to students for sharing their accomplishments in poster venues, fairs and conferences, and on-going student membership and participation in important committee and center work focused on issues of equity, diversity and inclusion (CFR 2.13).

An open invitation was given to students to meet with the WSCUC team; approximately 30-40 students attended. The students represented a variety of majors; many indicated that they work 10-20 hours per week, most on-campus. Most students said they take advantage of the many opportunities offered at CI such as special service projects and participation on committees. They said how happy they are with their choice of CI; they believe the required interdisciplinary courses were one of the reasons. They acknowledged the "growing pains" of the university such as construction noise and occasional difficulty getting into classes. Overall, these CI students were enthusiastic and positive about their experiences.

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement

The Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) in academic affairs is the body whose primary role and function is to bring together program review and assessment in their effort to make evidence based decisions and improvements across degree programs. The charge of the CIC, found on the CI website, is to refine and guide the five year program review cycle. "Through this process key campus stakeholders will use information to facilitate meaningful improvement across programs and services; suggest capacity building in the areas of program review and assessment of student learning; avoid duplication and build partnerships across academic affairs; integrate the information gleaned from program review and assessment into campus conversations about budget and academic planning; use reports to inform future WSCUC reports and visits; and suggest technologies and innovations that enhance the program review process and assessment of student learning."

CI program review guidelines describe a two-year cycle for program review which begins with the development of a program self-study, followed by an onsite visit from two external reviewers, reviewed by the CIC, and culminating in an MOU which prescribes both a two year and five year action plans for the program. If the campus integrates program review into planning and budgeting, there does not appear to be a formal process (CFR 2.7).

The review of available self-studies indicates that assessment of program learning outcomes is not used consistently in program self-studies. The self-study for the degree in Political Science is a good example for how a program could use degree program outcomes assessment. The assessment section of their self-study identifies measurable program learning outcomes, provides a course alignment matrix which identifies where learning outcomes may be assessed and where the program provides student learning opportunities. The program assesses one learning outcome per year using rubric based, direct embedded assessment, and the results are used to make and recommend curricular changes. The external reviewers' report, using a template provided by CI, scores the program as mostly 4s (out of 4); the team is in agreement with this favorable assessment given the evidence. The program could be a model for other degree programs in this regard. In addition, the program aligns their program learning outcomes with the four pillars of the university. In comparison, while the program in Sociology has program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes, it used two rubrics developed for GE learning outcomes for oral communication and written communication to assess student achievement in the program capstone course, which, of course, provides no evidence of student achievement of program learning outcomes in Sociology. A note of encouragement is that part of their strategic plan is to refine their

program learning outcomes and establish cyclical program assessment using methods for direct embedded assessment.

The program review for Economics raises further questions yet. Their self-study uses a self-study template which was not used by Political Science or Sociology. The self-study for Economics does not include program learning outcomes and does not include a summary of assessment plans or results. The external reviewers' report refers only to course learning outcomes. But they also refer to assessment of program learning outcomes by the School of Business and Economics as part of the capstone course. This would perhaps indicate that all students in the school take the same capstone course and perhaps there are common program learning outcomes across the school.

Program assessment is just developing in general. All programs use matrices that map course outcomes to program outcomes. Programs use an annual program assessment report to share findings; the annual report is distributed to all on the provost council and chairs of major planning and budgeting committees. Each program is required to provide two updates during the five years in between program reviews. Despite this general infrastructure, program self-studies are inconsistent in their reporting on student learning outcomes assessment (CFR 4.1). Perhaps an assessment subcommittee of the CIC charged with working with individual programs on their program assessment design and implementation would help address the inconsistencies. The workload for assessment design and implementation needs to be balanced with faculty workload. While there is progress in the development of measurable learning outcomes, as noted, other pieces which are useful for assessment planning and implementation are missing. For example, alignment matrices are not provided, and thus it is not clear whether

students have sufficient learning opportunities for developing associated knowledge, skills, and abilities specific to each program. In addition, it is not clear whether programs develop a formal plan or strategy for assessing each program outcome and whether programs are required to develop five-year assessment plans. Programs develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that includes a five-year plan or strategy for assessing each program outcome.

Many programs have capstone courses. Use of a capstone course for assessment seems to be in development, but it is not clear where the university is with this component. The completed program review self-studies made available to us would indicate that program capstone courses are intended to be used to assess student achievement of program learning outcomes. But it is not clear whether each program intends to develop a capstone course which could then be used for assessment of program learning outcomes (CFR 2.5).

The CI graduate degree is defined by six general graduate program learning outcomes. In addition, each degree has measurable and level appropriate learning outcomes specific to the degree program. As for undergraduate programs, graduate programs are subject to cyclical program review, which includes a self-study reporting on student achievement of program learning outcomes (CFR 2.2b).

Two programs are accredited by outside disciplinary accreditation agencies and are not subject to internal program review. The baccalaureate degree in nursing at CI is accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education. Programs in the

college of Education are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

Component 7: Sustainability, Financial Viability and the HE Environment

CI is stable and anticipates a sustainable future that will see growth and changes in methods, technologies and efficiencies (institutional report p. 62), while remaining true to its mission and vision. As a state assisted institution, CI is dependent upon both enrollment and the state for its continued existence. Revenues from the state are dependent upon the economy and the will of the legislature to make higher education a priority. Revenues from student enrollment are dependent upon an aggressive and successful plan to recruit students (CFR 3.4, 4.7).

The institution projects an 8 percent enrollment per year for the next 10 years to reach the targeted figure of 15,000 FTES (full time equivalent student). However, the CSU has mandated only a 2 percent growth in enrollment for this coming year; this equates to approximately 100 FTES. Thus the 8 percent target will not be met this year. The institutional report suggested the institution wanted to keep the same proportions of undergraduate (96 percent) to graduate (4 percent) students. However, in onsite meetings with the president, Provost's Council and faculty, there appears to be a desire to increase the proportion of graduate enrollment. An intention to increase the number of veterans and international students, if realized, may also contribute to increased revenue.

To service this increase in enrollment the university recognizes that it must hire faculty and staff to serve these students; however, there do not appear to be specific targets or plans in place to accomplish this (CFRs 3.1, 3.2). CI indicates it plans to develop a five-year hiring plan (see Standard 3).

The team learned during the visit that the president and his cabinet decided in fall 2014 that "beginning with fiscal year 2015/16 the campus would adopt a budget strategy that links enrollment growth funding to the authorization of new tenure-track faculty lines. As funding for new enrollment growth is allocated to the CI campus from the Chancellor's Office, the tenure-track positions to support the new enrollment growth will be calculated based on student-faculty ratios. For example, in 2015/16 with the authorized growth of 100 FTES, four new faculty lines will be recommended for approval in the 2015/16 budget. While this process is reasonable and prudent, it points out the inadequate funding that CI receives. There is a significant need for additional faculty, but without an investment by the CSU, it is problematic to budget for greater numbers of hires." (Excerpt from April 9, 2015 update written to the WSCUC team from the Provost and the VP of Business and Financial Affairs.)

The expertise of faculty members recruited and hired will depend on development of future programs. The section on academic planning outlined in the physical master plan indicates that "an appropriate number of faculty will be hired. . ." (see the institutional report, page 53). Current plans do not address program priorities, which are a basis for faculty hiring. The planning appears not to be at the level of program development at this time (CFR 4.7). The relatively new Provost is working with the Provost Council to

develop a new *Academic Plan* that will align with the strategic priorities of the developing *University Strategic Plan*. While on campus, the team heard various groups mention interest in engineering as a new program priority. The development of programs appears to be primarily based on regional area workforce needs. An open meeting with faculty, however, revealed to the team that not all faculty members support this approach.

The *2025 Vision Plan* with a goal of $10 million, shows that public and private partnerships are expected to play a key role in the future development of the university. CI is fortunate to have strong support in the region, and community partnerships have been instrumental in financing the development of the institution. Each member of the Foundation Board is expected to "give or get" a contribution. Thus far, over $1 million has been raised.

In planning for the future, the institution has involved several standing committees and has organized group summits that have discussed trends in higher education, workforce trends and other macro trends that are relevant to higher education (CFRs 4.5, 4.6). Identifying trends is the first step that will ideally lead to the university identifying how these trends will or should impact CI. This work on trends has not yet resulted in an explicit strategy for the institution with respect to its future.

Planning for the future is not an easy task for an institution with diverse interests and goals. The mission and vision statements provide some lofty goals, but do not give concrete action plans. The details of the university's plans are not clearly delineated.

The themes, priorities and goals identified in various planning documents include: creating more/better access, increasing student success, strengthening the academic enterprise, strengthening STEM programs, promoting environmental sustainability, hiring and retaining excellent faculty and a few others more specifically dealing with athletics. The institution's institutional report (p. 62) states that there is a ". . . plan, but no single path" (p.62). The *University Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020* is currently an expansion to four pages of a one-page document that identifies three strategic priorities: "Facilitate Student Success," "Provide High Quality Education," and "Realize Our Future." Each strategic priority identifies three or four somewhat more specific goals. With a very few exceptions, specific paths for any of the priorities are not articulated. The CI *Strategic Plan* includes divisional priorities and initiatives, many of which were found in the divisional strategic plans not included originally in the supporting materials but made available to the team during the visit. These documents were useful evidence as to the scope of current planning and the alignment between initiatives and the overall strategic direction of the institution (CFR 4.6).

At the program and division levels there are strategic plans that are in various stages of development. For example, Technology and Communication has had a well-developed strategic plan for several years. It is now being revisited to align with the university strategic plan priorities. There are also individual program strategic plans that are well developed. For example within Student Affairs (Career Development Services), *Employer Relations Plan, 2015-2020* is well done and specific as to strategies, timelines and evaluation criteria. Planning at CI is not purely "top — down" or "bottom-up" but more of putting the completed and developing pieces together. As if it is constructing a

jigsaw puzzle, the university is working to develop some coherence among the many levels of planning. There is currently no one coherent document which describes the specifics that will be measured or the actions the university must undertake to achieve these goals and targets. Planning documents do not delineate who or which bodies will be responsible and accountable for achieving targets and goals. This divisional strategic plan is a work in progress.

There are some trends, such as the "school to work" movement and the traditional focus on general education that institutions face. CI's plans and documents do not address these rather challenging issues, any of which may impact the program priorities. One initiative cites a goal of graduating high quality students. To graduate high quality, the programs must be of high quality. The institutional report (p. 71) mentions writing deficiencies in students, but other deficiencies may come to light through improved assessment initiatives. The strategic planning documents do not address the issue of sustaining (and improving) quality of programs and educational experiences (CFR 4.3, 4.4).

There are other trends in higher education that may be relevant to CI. For example, there is a trend toward more short courses, just-in-time learning, and micro certificates. The team noted that little is mentioned about the role of extended learning (i.e. EU) in strategic planning documents. Most of the programs at off-campus sites are EU programs. It is possible that given the funding situation and other academic programs requirements, EU programs may have a more prominent role in the sustainability of CI while not explicitly stated.

The planned growth in enrollment will also require attention to the physical plant. The physical master plan, *Vision for the Future*, provides comprehensive plans and designs for building out the campus (CFR 3.4). The plan states six goals and objectives: accommodate growth to 15,000 students; enhance CI's precepts of integrative and innovative; reflect the character and intimacy of the core campus; express the cultural heritage of the site and area; engage the larger community; and embrace sustainability. The *2025 Capital Expansion Plan* is intended to address the revenue and non-revenue physical plant projects for the next 10 years. Given the changing funding rules for capital projects, the success of this capital expansion plan is essential to assure adequate and appropriate space for growth. In addition to the capital campaign, CI is also actively seeking to increase its grant activity and gifts from private philanthropic foundations and corporate sponsorships.

The institutional report ends with a question: what will CI look like in 2025? The institutional report concludes that the current mission will still be the guiding principle (institutional report, page 73). However, the report leaves unanswered the alternative paths it will explore during the coming years.

Component 8: Optional Thematic Essay

CI chose not to include an optional essay in its institutional report.

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement - Concluding Essay

The CI report concluded its institutional report with reflection on considerations for its future success. While brief, the essay was a succinct and clear summary of the issues seminal to the university's future and sustainability: 1) building capacity for 8 percent student growth annually; 2) placing students at the center of assessment; 3) recruiting students representing diverse and first generation populations; 4) improving overall retention and graduation rates; and 5) benchmarking student learning and success. These goals are consistent with the lines of inquiry identified in this review and indicate the university's willingness to extend its commitment and capacity for sustaining its mission and aspirations (CFR 4.7). The team is optimistic that despite its challenges, CI is clear-sighted about its future direction and leadership role in the region, the CSU system and beyond.

SECTION III: OTHER TOPICS

Under the 2013 HB, institutions no longer prepare electronic portfolios; rather they make available to teams all pertinent documents, evidence and required checklists as part of the institutional report. CI fulfilled these obligations, and the team was provided additional materials as requested during the site visit. Although the Compliance Checklist requirement no longer exists, CI found it useful in its preparation of the report.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

As required by WSCUC, CI submitted with its report a useful and comprehensive *Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)* analysis. The team found the analysis to be complete and candid, framing critical lines of inquiry around components 3 (meaning and quality of the degree), 4 (educational quality, student learning, core

competencies) and 6 (quality assurance, program review, assessment) (CFR 1.2).

Educational objectives at the undergraduate level are widely recognized throughout the

university (CFR 1.2), and there is steady progress at the graduate level. All degrees

have clearly defined levels of student achievement (CFR 2.2). Student learning

outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and

as appropriate, institutional level (CFR 2.3). Students are able to consult the publication

A New Student's Guide to Student Learning Outcomes at C I and appear

knowledgeable about doing so*.*

The team found especially helpful the information provided in the IEEI for understanding

more clearly who at the institution develops the learning outcomes, which bodies

interpret achievement results, how findings are used and at what intervals, and which

programs have completed program reviews or are scheduled for upcoming reviews

(reported in Section II, Component 2).

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CI used the reaffirmation process in preparation for the April 2015 onsite visit to engage

in serious reflection as a learning community focused on student success and

educational achievement. The institution demonstrated in its report and supporting

material that it carefully considered the WSCUC *Standards of Accreditation* and all

requirements specified in the 2013 HB, fulfilling the intended outcomes of the review. CI

created a comprehensive and inclusive process for the WSCUC review including clear

articulation of progress and evidence in its report and during the site visit of significant

institutional improvements since the 2007 visit (CFR 1.7, 1.8).

The team especially acknowledges the formidable economic challenges of the CSU system, and commends the institution for its creativity, ingenuity and tenacity in sustaining quality educational and co-curricular results for their students (CFR 4.7).

The team, therefore, offers the following commendations and recommendations. The team appreciated being part of the review process and hopes that CI thrives and prospers for the benefit of the region and state.

Team Commendations and Recommendations

The CI reaffirmation of accreditation team commends CI for:

- A mission-centered design that keeps students and their success as the focus of planning and decision-making.

- Passion for the mission of the university, expressed through the four pillars that informs institutional ethos and culture.

- Commitment to diversity, realized through the demographic composition of the student body.

- A pedagogical design that puts multidisciplinary understanding at the core of student learning.

- Commitment to student success, exemplified by many and varied support systems and evidenced by nearly identical retention and graduation rates for underserved and better served students.

- A focus on regional issues that, together with an entrepreneurial spirit, fuels creative thinking about public/private partnerships.

- Recent improvements to institutional research and data.

The team recommends, therefore, that CI:

- Continue to develop its strategic plan to include detailed steps for implementation. While the strategic priorities that the plan identifies seem the right ones for the institution, they are framed generically. The plan needs a detailed and sequenced design for implementation that specifies priorities, resource allocation, timelines, and assessment measures.

- Develop a plan to increase its proportion of tenure-track faculty. The current proportion of tenure-track faculty is not of sufficient size to fully realize the university's educational ambitions. The vagaries of state funding make this a difficult task. The CSU System needs to respond to the particular needs of new and developing campuses. The team acknowledges efforts by institutional leadership to develop a budget strategy linking enrollment growth to authorization of new tenure-track faculty. CI for its part needs, however, in its plan to

regularize the creation of new ladder faculty lines and to identify new revenue sources to fund them. The team recommends also that CI develop an overall design for faculty hiring, including identification of areas of emphasis and growth.

- Use its program review process as the primary vehicle for assessing educational effectiveness and thereby continue to increase the collection and use of institutional data, regularize collection of evidence from student learning outcomes assessment, and increase reliance on an electronic repository as a resource for providing continuity for program review.

- Streamline its administrative processes in order to best serve the needs of the campus as it grows. There is a tension between extensively collective decision-making and its costs in human capital. The collectivity that served the campus so well in its early years may not be the best structure as it continues to grow. Without compromising CI's powerful sense of mission, the team recommends that the institution work to make its governance processes as nimble and efficient as possible.

- Develop a strategic and integrated plan for the growth of its graduate programs as it expands its educational offerings in response to regional needs. The development of graduate programs appears to have been ad hoc. CI would be well served by a coherent plan for graduate study, aligned with the strategic objectives of the university.

- Give careful attention to leadership development and transition. As a first generation institution, in its second decade of growth, CI has a particular challenge in developing the leadership that can transition the institution from its founders. The president has done a brilliant job in founding the institution and in establishing a broadly shared sense of culture and mission. It is critical for the campus to develop leadership to ensure that the achievements of CI's early development persist and thrive through its next stage.

APPENDICES

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS TEAM REVIEW REPORT (2013 Standards)

Institution: CSU Channel Islands
Name of reviewer/s: Stephanie Bangert and Bonnie Paller
Date/s of review: April 7, 2015: Thousand Oaks Learning Center

1. **Site Name and Address**

   CI Thousand Oaks Site
   501 Marin St. Suite 200
   Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

2. **Background Information**
   As described on the CI website "the primary function of the Extended University Thousand Oaks campus is to better serve residents and employers in the more eastern Ventura County." The facility is designed for working adults offering courses in evenings and on Saturdays. GRE and GMAT study materials are available on site. The programs offered at the site are: the MBA, MS Biotechnology lectures, Human Resources Management courses, and Osher Lifelong Learning Institute and other professional development courses of interest to the community.

3. **Nature of the Review**

   Team members toured the CI Thousand Oaks learning site that featured several well-appointed smart classrooms, spacious reception space and large conference room, a student lounge, a small library, and additional offices for the director, recruiter and other campus staff who visit the site. The team met with Gary Berg, Associate Vice President for Extended University and International Programs and Dan Wakelee, Associate Provost and 5 members of the staff:

   Janet Egiziano – TO Campus Director/Associate Director and Faculty, MBA Program
   Jeff Ziskin – Administrative Office Coordinator
   Andrew Conley – Graduate Programs Recruiter
   Bill Ochs, IT Services Technician
   Diego Uribe and Isamar Montana - Student assistants

   Marketing, recruitment and advising materials were examined on site.

   Observations and findings can be found on the following chart. For additional details, refer to the CI team report (Section I).

OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)	Excellent alignment with CI mission, values and operations.	None.
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Site visit demonstrated strong commitment and culture of CI as an institution. Staff conversant with campus ethos.	None.
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)	Attractive, well-maintained physical environment. Classrooms state of the art; attention to students' study and social space requirements.	None.
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)	Site is sufficiently staffed to provide front office, advising, counseling, library, IT and faculty support to students.	None.
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)	Faculty come from the Camarillo campus. Some faculty are from industry but examples provided to the team about strong CI partnerships with industry. Faculty participate in assessment on main campus.	None.
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	Courses appear designed, approved and evaluated in same manner as main campus coursework. Team report notes that program assessment can be uneven.	Institution has identified the need to strengthen assessment processes across programs.
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	The team did not analyze these data.	NA
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)	Student learning assessment for off-campus sites is same as for campus. Team met with two key administrators including the VP of EU and the Associate Provost who have accountability knowledge of assessment requirements for the site.	NA. See comment above.
Quality Assurance Processes: CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? *EER:* What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)	Unclear whether CI's quality assurance processes are modified for off-campus programs. Assessment appears consistent between main campus and sites; however, this could be a line of inquiry in next review.	NA

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT TEAM REVIEW

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments: All evidence reviewed conform to federal regulations on recruiting students. There are no violations of Section 487 (a) (20) of Higher Education Act.	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Estimated costs for attending CSUCI are clearly communicated both with and without living on campus. Notice is also given that tuition and fees may be changed. This is particularly true since the CSU system has control over tuition charged by the campuses.	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments: For each major, information sheets provide types of careers for which the major gives basic career preparation. The Career Center has some information on the types of jobs recent graduates have obtained. Institutional research is developing a survey to be sent to recent graduates regarding employment. While self-reported information, there is some information that is communicated to students.	

*§602.16(a) (1) (vii)

**Section 487 (a) (20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Beverlee Anderson
Date: April 29, 2015

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH TEAM REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ❏ NO
	Where is the policy located? Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Website, http://senate.csuci.edu/comm/curriculum/csu-def-credit-hour.pdf
	Comments: CSUCI uses the above CSU Policy on Credit Hour, which is reviewed and updated at the system level. The CSU definition of a credit hour is consistent with federal regulation 602.24(f).
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES ❏ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: CSUCI reviews credit hour assignments through cyclical curriculum and program review processes.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: http://www.csuci.edu/academics/catalog-and-schedule/
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 2
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS and MA
	What discipline(s)? Biology and Education
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: The sample syllabi reviewed contain explicit description of the pedagogy and curriculum for the course, worked to be accomplished, information on office hours, grading policy, etc.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kinds of courses? Lab
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Art, Biology
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Syllabi specify hours dedicated to laboratory time and, where relevant, lecture time.
Sample program information (catalog,	How many programs were reviewed? Most programs
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Degree programs and General Education

website, or other program materials)	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate and Master's level
	What discipline(s)? Business, Anthropology, Biology, Psychology, Sociology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Information on degree programs and General Education is available through program dedicated websites and in the course catalog.

Review Completed By: Bonnie Paller
Date: May 3, 2015

TRANSFER CREDIT TEAM REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?	Yes
	Is the policy publically available? If so, where? Student transferring from CA Community Colleges and 4-year public institutions may refer to articulation agreements on the ASSIST website to find CSUCI major course equivalencies for work completed. ASSIST also provides CSU GE and IGETC certification lists and approved courses for the fulfillment for the American Institutions Requirement. www.assist.org. All policies regarding transfer credit and for academic work accomplished elsewhere can be found at http://www.csuci.edu/academics/advising/articulation.htm http://www.csuci.edu/records-registration/carr.htm	
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? Criteria are established by each academic department and codified in ASSIST.	
	Comments: CSUCI adheres to CSU policy for recognizing academic work completed at California community colleges and at other CSU campuses, at other institutions of higher education, and to CSU EO 1065 for General Education requirements. CSUCI also recognizes advanced placement courses offered in the high schools, international baccalaureate, military service, the College-Level Examination Program, and the English Equivalence Examination.	

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

Review Completed By: Bonnie Paller
Date: May 3, 2015

STUDENT COMPLAINTS TEAM REVIEW REPORT

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	Yes
	Comments: Students are told of the process, it is on the student website. http://www.csuci.edu/studentaffairs/procedures/student-grievance.htm	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: There are two procedures – one for complaints against faculty, one for complaints against individuals other than faculty (administrative office or staff members). The complaint is first dealt with at the lower levels and then progresses up the chain of reporting until it reaches the Vice-Presidential levels.	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: Since the Student Conduct person began (last July) there have been no formal complaints from a student regarding staff.	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Prior to the hire of a new Student Conduct staff member, formal complaints from students were recorded in the CARE reporting module of Advocate (SIMPLICITY) as an "issue of concern." The information was given to the team by the Associate VP for Student Affairs and Dean of students, however, not verified.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: The institution is currently working on improving the process with newly hired staff.	Yes, process evaluation underway.

Review Completed By: Beverlee Anderson
Date: May 5, 2015