

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

ACCREDITATION REVIEW

Chapman University
October 21-23, 2013

Team Roster

Dennis Ahlburg - Chair
President, Trinity University

Bethami Dobkin - Assistant Chair
Provost, Saint Mary's College of California

Ann S. Ferren - Team Member
Senior Fellow at the Association of American Colleges and Universities

Robert J. Naples - Team Member
Associate Vice Chancellor, Student & Campus Life and Dean of Students
University of California, Los Angeles

George A. Pardon - Team Member
VP for Administration and CFO, California State University, Los Angeles -
retired

Christopher Oberg - WASC Institution Liaison
Vice President, WASC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University Standards of Accreditation and 2013 Reaffirmation of Accreditation Process, and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission.

The formal action concerning the institution's status 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 WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process 3
- B. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor 4
- C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission actions and Reviews 4

SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Essays 1 &2: Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their quality and rigor; achieving "graduation proficiencies" 5
- B. Essay 3: Defining and promoting "student success" 12
- C. Essay 4: Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness and planning for the changing environment for higher education 15
- D. Integrative Essay 22

SECTION III - FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW 24

APPENDICES

- Compliance Checklist
- Credit Hour Policy
- Student Complaints Policy
- Marketing and Recruitment Review

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaffirmation of Accreditation Process

Chapman University was founded in 1861 as Hesperian College in Woodland, California by members of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). Since that time, Chapman has gained prominence as a comprehensive, regional university in Orange, California, with a total enrollment of approximately 7900 students. The institution prides itself on its leadership, selectivity in admissions, increasing national attention, and a clearly articulated mission and central commitments. Chapman University's current mission "to provide personalized education of distinction that leads to inquiring, ethical and productive lives as global citizens" has guided the institution for over 20 years (*Mission, 2012-13 Fact Book*, p. 10). The mission is built on the values of the intellectual, spiritual, social, and physical development of the whole person (*Core Values, 2012-13 Fact Book*, p.13), and supported by an academic vision expressed as Core Commitments. These Commitments, developing a learning community, focus on educational effectiveness, selectivity and global citizenship, and a balanced living and learning environment are woven through many of the initiatives and plans across campus.

Chapman University was initially accredited by WASC in 1956. Recent accreditation activity includes a full review conducted in 2004 and 2005. Following a spring 2007 Special Visit and following various Substantive Change proposals during intervening years, WASC approved the PhD Program in Education, a Systems Review for offering online programs, and several off-site locations. The current WASC review of Chapman University is based on their acceptance of WASC's invitation to participate as a pilot institution in their redesigned pilot, reaccreditation program, with an off-site review in spring 2013 and an on-site review for fall 2013.

In preparation for the WASC 2013 Reaffirmation process, Chapman University began a strategic planning session in 2007-08 that identified themes which would be presented in the subsequent institutional self-report. Over the next two years, faculty and administrators identified six themes: student/faculty research, interdisciplinarity, a new general education program, educational effectiveness, organizational resources (transparency in resource allocation supportive of academic priorities), and learner engaged community. In 2010-11, a WASC Steering Committee and subcommittee structure was established, with over 75 Chapman community members participating. The next year, Chapman University agreed to become among the first institutions to pilot WASC's redesigned accreditation process, with the Institutional Reaccreditation Report

submitted in February, 2013, followed by an off-site review and conference call on April 30 and an on-site team visit October 21-23, 2013.

B. Institution's Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

As noted by the Offsite Review team, members "enjoyed reading Chapman's four essays and reviewing the extensive references and exhibits provided; furthermore, the team appreciated the attention with which the report and exhibits were presented." The Visiting Team experienced similar attentiveness during the onsite visit and appreciated the hospitality, responsiveness, and attention to detail extended by Chapman University at all levels. Based on the Offsite Review, the Visiting Team made considerable requests for additional information and schedule adjustments and was accommodated with expedience and careful attention to all standard areas of policy and process. The staff exhibited the highest levels of professionalism, and staff, faculty, and students throughout the visit exuded enthusiasm for Chapman University.

Several strengths in Chapman's Report were noted by the Offsite Review Team, including the commitment to "thoughtful, cyclical, and inclusive strategic planning, most evident at this point in its Academic Strategic Plan (CFR 4.1)"; comprehensive assessment structures, program review tools and processes, and alignment of academic and student life learning outcomes (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 2.10); the inclusive involvement and engagement of faculty and staff in planning processes (CFRs 2.4, 3.11, 4.1); transparency of data and robust communication channels for subsequent findings (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 4.3); programs designed to increase first-year retention (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.13); and a "laudable history of effective financial management, capacity, and effectiveness" with "impressive growth in net assets, gross tuition revenue, net tuition revenue...healthy debt service coverage ratio and unrestricted cash and investment-to-debt ratio." (CFR 3.5)

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Offsite Review

The Offsite Review Team identified several areas of inquiry that were pursued by the Visiting Team and which are addressed in this report in the context of the essays presented by Chapman University's Institutional Report. In the area of program review, the Visiting Team examined documents and conducted interviews to learn about how assessment and program review findings are being used to make improvements, including reports provided by the Chancellor as evidence of improvements made as a result of learning assessment and program review findings. (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)

The Visiting Team also spent considerable time examining financial documents and plans regarding financial sustainability of Chapman University after noting the aggressive growth of the past decade, the significant addition of students and facilities, the evolving relationship with Brandman University, and the impact of recent borrowing. The results of this inquiry are presented in response to Chapman's Essay 3.

One advantage of the on-site visit process is the opportunity afforded to team members to clarify seeming inconsistencies in data presentation and understand interpretations of evidence made in the Institutional Report. Chapman University members were exemplary in helping the Visiting Team gain deeper understanding of data collection and reporting processes. (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 4.3) The onsite review process also helped Visiting Team members learn about the implementation of plans for supporting graduate students and programs, the progress of efforts underway to support some of the original self-study themes identified in Chapman's report (educational effectiveness, engaged learner community, organizational resources, faculty-student research, general education, interdisciplinarity - CFRs 2.10, 2.13), and greater understanding of the ways that Chapman is tracking, planning for, and responding to specific changes in the higher education landscape. (CFRs 4.1 - 4.3, 4.6, and 4.7.)

SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Essays 1 and 2: Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their quality and integrity; achieving "graduation proficiencies"

Meaning of Chapman Degrees

The Institutional Report includes general definitions of the degrees indicating expectations for each level. Additional information from the catalog, assessment documents, and other materials demonstrate that the expected outcomes are appropriate to each level (CFR 2.2, 2.3). Chapman has used an inclusive process to determine the learning outcomes for all programs, noting that beginning in 2009, "degree program faculties were asked to revise and design more effective program learning outcome statements that were reflective of core disciplinary standards, high level cognitive and critical thinking skills appropriate to the particular discipline and level of degree awarded." (CFR 2.4)

Each of the programs has developed a curriculum map indicating which outcomes are introduced, reinforced, or mastered by individual courses. This is an important tool for ensuring that outcomes are well integrated throughout the courses in a program and lead to exit level competencies. The outcomes also

serve as the basis for assessment and program evaluation. (CFR 1.2) As might be expected there is a wide range of specificity in both the outcomes and the curriculum maps across departments. The assessment reports and program review plans indicate that continuing attention is being paid to updating outcomes, including program and course outcomes on all syllabi, and revising course sequences and program designs, as needed. As faculty continue to develop the outcomes and maps for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees, they are improving consistency in quality and rigor by comparing standards to external tools such as specialized accreditation, disciplinary societies, and programs at comparable institutions. (CFR 4.4)

The outcomes, curriculum maps, and the process for assessment are readily available to both internal and external constituencies on the Chapman website and demonstrate the institution's commitment to quality processes. Additional attention to internal distribution and communication of findings as appropriate to various audiences would help the process mature. The institutional report notes some concern about being too transparent for external audiences. One option is to include more information on career opportunities, alumni data, licensure exams results, and specialized accreditation results on program websites as this information would give both a fuller meaning and a positive view of the degrees at each level. (CFR 1.2, 1.7, 2.3, 4.3)

Finally, this section of the Institutional Report begins with asserting that the graduating senior student outcomes are increasingly aligned with the meaning of the distinctive undergraduate degrees offered by Chapman University. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2). While the goals expressed are laudable, the evidence to support such claims could be more convincing. For instance, the report cites the *College Senior Survey (CSS) Trends Report: 2003-2011* to show that "graduating seniors from Chapman are consistently more inclined to attend graduate or professional school" (p. 15), but this number has dropped from 30.4% (2003) to 23.3% (2011), with a peer comparator number of 23.6% (2011). Also, while the institutional report cites 2011 NSSE gains in "unique characteristics that distinguish Chapman's seniors," such as understanding "someone else's views" or "had serious conversations with students of different race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values" (p. 15), the NSSE data also show no change from freshman to senior year on this latter item, and lower ratings compared to peer institutions for "encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds." As the Chapman Research in Brief summarizes, "The NSSE also asks students to evaluate their institution's effort towards promoting diverse interactions. On both items, Chapman freshmen and seniors reported less institutional contribution in these areas than students in the Selected Group" (January 2012, Vol 8 No. 24). Given these data, it is difficult to assess the extent to which the expressed meaning of

Chapman undergraduate degrees has contributed to the reported student outcomes.

Institutional Themes Aligned with Student Learning Outcomes

In addition to the program specific outcomes, Chapman has made clear the way in which its mission, values, and traditions influence the overarching institutional themes and purposes, including “global citizenship, personalized education, inquiry and critical thinking, ethical behavior, interdisciplinarity, and faculty/student research.” (CFR1.1) The Mission Theme Index referenced in the Institutional Report shows how these are integrated with general education and the majors. At this time, many programs reference only two of the institutional themes with the rationale that this provides flexibility for both faculty and students. Whereas personalized education and academic freedom are important principles, periodic attention by the units and curriculum committees should be given to reviewing syllabi to be sure all students have sufficient learning experiences connected to each theme in their course work after General Education.

These themes are not only reflected in the descriptions of academic programs but also in the student life programs as well as in recruitment, the website, and other public materials. In addition to making sure that these themes/institutional outcomes are understood on campus, resources have been committed to strengthen and extend this work. For example, additional resources have been allocated to improve advising, increase research opportunities, and extend study abroad. A number of centers provide visibility for these guiding themes. (CFR1.1, 1.2) As in the examples above, the NSSE data do not show significant progress since 2003 on many of these priorities, thus the institution will want to continue to monitor the success of these recent initiatives.

Several of the assessment reports indicate that students are to some degree left to integrate the parts of their education and may not be fully aware of the intentionality of the Chapman education. Recent changes in the advising process aim to address this by clarifying the relationship between general education and major requirements. Further campus discussion of the central importance of these defining themes may show additional ways they might be integrated into the students’ learning experiences whether in the classroom, co-curriculum, community, or abroad so that they have the transforming impact Chapman desires. In addition, the institution may want to share data on just how many students are participating in these initiatives to inform the new advising process that encourages students to do long range planning. Follow-up with alumni would also indicate the extent to which these domains influence life- long learning and student success. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.12)

Ensuring Quality and Integrity of Degrees through Assessment and Program Review

All programs provide an annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Report that is reviewed by the Assessment Committee. The first section calls for alignment of the Institutional Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, and Course Learning Outcomes to emphasize the importance of integrated curricular design. (CFR 2.2, 2.3) The evidence supports this alignment but it is not clear that the expectations in courses and programs “reflect rising levels of proficiency.” Students report varying degrees of challenge related to the differences in programs and faculty expectations and believe Chapman can be as challenging as a student wants it to be. Careful attention to sequencing learning opportunities and calibrating expectations by faculty can ensure the quality of the degree. (CFR 2.1, 2.2a) Some of the departmental assessment reports from 2011/12 indicated that not all faculty include outcomes on their syllabi nor do they have systematic opportunities to discuss how their courses contribute to the whole. As one might expect, those programs with specialized accreditation appear to be more advanced in their curricular design and assessment work, for example, the Doctorate in Physical Therapy is a model of detail and evidence to support quality, and progress overall had been achieved by the time of the site visit.

The second section of the annual assessment report includes the data and analysis for that year. The third section asks for progress on the previous year’s findings. The self-study notes that after initial resistance to this systematic process which was fully redesigned after the last WASC review, by 2012 “80% of programs are now receiving scores of emerging, developed, and advanced” for their assessment processes. The assessment process appears to be well developed with protocols, forms, training sessions, and faculty involvement, thus those units that are still developing their assessment efforts should be able to make progress toward fuller implementation. Ultimately, for assessment to be sustainable, faculty must find the analysis of findings meaningful and the improvements effective. (CFR 4.4, 4.7)

Even though the institution is not at the stage it wants to be, there is clear progress both in assessment planning and use of assessment results. In response to the Offsite Review teams’ inquiry about whether the well- developed processes had consequences, additional material was submitted describing recommendations and follow up. The recommendations show the process continues to be fine-tuned, for example, adding a second evaluator for inter-rater reliability, developing signature assignments to increase consistency across courses, improving the portfolio process, adding a comprehensive exam, and redesigning rubrics. More important, because the changes impact student learning, are the variety of curricular improvements such as introducing primary

literature, emphasizing skill development, reviewing the sequencing and number of assignments, providing more regular feedback to students, and giving greater attention to how field work is conducted. (CFR 4.6, 4.7)

Given the value Chapman places on having a strong assessment program, a next step would seem to be to explore how students might be more involved both in assessing their own educational progress as well as contributing to implementation of program improvements. For this to happen, students need to be fully aware of the outcomes of courses and programs, receive guidance in understanding how achieving these outcomes contributes to their education and career aspirations, and have mentored opportunities to reflect on their progress and be encouraged to achieve. Several departments do use student input effectively in considering program changes. The Committees that oversee assessment processes may want to collaborate in disseminating findings and holding broader campus discussions about the environment for learning based on both disaggregated data and summary data. Emphasizing reflection on curricular and pedagogical evidence can underscore that “assessment is learning” for both faculty and students. (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10, 4.8)

Program Review

The well-established periodic program review process serves as an important anchor for annual assessment activities as well as for promoting analysis of the future of the program in a changing environment. The department self-study is expected to include an analysis of trends and progress over a period of time as revealed by assessment, along with the action steps for improvement. The reports of external reviewers, although varied in detail, provide context and ensure program expectations are at an appropriate level for the field. The Assessment Committee notes that the external reviewers are particularly useful in establishing comparative standards. The detailed Chancellor’s letters that respond to the program reviews give good guidance and set expectations while also promoting internal consistency in standards across the institution. The reports as well as conversations with faculty who had recently completed program review provided rich examples of the many improvements made in both curriculum and pedagogy. They range from improving the preparation for senior theses to establishing prerequisites to increasing opportunities for team teaching. Faculty who had experienced several rounds of program review described how well the process has developed over time.

The Assessment Committee members have considerable expertise that may be useful across campus. Currently, they only focus on academic assessment. The Institutional Research Office has useful data such as from NSSE and other surveys that could provide evidence of how the academic program and student affairs experiences shape the students. Careful annual assessment and program

review of co-curricular activities and services would provide important information about the learning impact of these activities. As the processes of both assessment and program review continue to develop, some cross program analysis, as well as out of classroom experiences might reveal improvements that may be better handled at the institutional level rather than the departmental level, such as advising and managing technology improvements. Such meta-analysis will contribute to the desired culture of evidence as faculty share responsibility for the success of all aspects of the Chapman experience. (CFR 4.6)

Requests for resources through the program review process are reviewed according to whether they are related to the institutional strategic plan, are consistent with equity in faculty/student ratios across programs, and will enhance learning outcomes. Many of the improvements identified, such as faculty mentoring, working with adjuncts, and learning more about using technology, do not take money but do take time and leadership. Faculty perceive the program review process is meaningful and equitable. Summarizing all positive improvements or action steps, whether new concentrations or new facilities, on the Educational Effectiveness website page for each program is an important indicator of both the importance of the process and the progress made. (CFR 2.7, 4.4)

Achieving Core Competencies through General Education

The recently revised General Education Program at Chapman University serves as the entry point for the development of the Institutional Learning Outcomes that reflect the mission and values of Chapman, as well as the specific General Education Outcomes and WASC Core Competencies. They include Global Citizenship, Interdisciplinarity, Ethics and Values, and Inquiry and Critical Thinking as well as oral and written communication, information literacy, and quantitative skills. The General Education program includes many of the best elements of a liberal arts education in that it is developmental and integrative (starting with a first year foundations and ending with an Inter/Multidisciplinary Cluster or minor connected to the major), skill oriented, attentive to globalization, provides broad appreciation of disciplinary methods of inquiry, and connects students to the community. (CFR 2.2a) Although mentioned, attention to diversity seems underdeveloped.

The 2007 WASC report emphasized the importance of having a well- developed assessment plan with significant faculty involvement as part of the revision effort for General Education, and Chapman has responded well in both designing a process and involving faculty. Faculty committees used both direct and indirect methods in assessing each of the General Education outcomes and wrote extensive and candid reports. The initial goal for GE review was to provide a benchmark for comparison with later reviews but the results were insufficient for

that purpose. The reports describe a variety of process problems including, small sample size, lack of clarity on criteria, poor alignment of assignments with the rubrics, and inadequate work samples. Steps have already been taken to improve the process for the additional assessments.

Faculty have a good understanding of the basics of well written outcomes, clearly understood rubrics, and signature assignments, for example, and also recognize the challenge of assessing outcomes for a program that offers students so many choices. Additional work with faculty on both their understanding of assessment data and cooperation with the process should solve the problem of generating appropriate direct evidence of learning. It appears that the GE assessment efforts were valuable for making recommendations on how to improve the assessment process even if they did not yield as much useful information on the effectiveness of the General Education program as desired. (CFR 2.7, 3.11)

The external review of the General Education Program provided important information with regard to student views of the program ranging from positive (some of their favorite courses, liked the fact they could be taken pass-fail) to the negative (confusing, felt I wasted credits, and not needed for my career). It is not clear what the response should be to students' complaints about the high level of learning expected in mathematics and foreign language. However, careful analysis of student attitudes should be part of the commitment to personalized education. Faculty will also want to review what level of proficiency is expected, what percent of the students should meet a particular standard, and what remediation will be expected, if any, for students who do not meet the standards. Standardizing the number of categories on the rubric, the expected proficiency level, and the percentage of students meeting it across all of the competencies could help identify areas that need special attention or additional resources for improvement.

Of particular importance is determining whether the curriculum is "appropriately ambitious" and whether course sequences are designed so that students attain progressively advanced skill levels and higher order competencies by the time of graduation. The General Education program has so much flexibility in it that such intentionality would be hard to achieve as students do not take the courses in any prescribed order. Recent changes in the advising program aim to link General Education courses to the major to give students greater guidance in designing their program. (CFR 2.12) The next step would be to check to see that what students are introduced to in a 100 or 200 level course can be further developed through their specialized course of study.

The Role of Faculty Governance in ensuring Quality and Integrity of Degrees

Guiding the overall framework for curricular development and evaluation is a well-developed *Academic Strategic Plan 2012-2017* that includes indicators of effectiveness. At this point, data to support these elements has been identified, but without base lines or quantitative goals. The Institutional Research Office is well positioned to help track progress. The standard process on campus is to identify a problem area, assign a task force to work on solutions, and then allocate appropriate resources. Advising, retention, and support for graduate students have all been handled in this way. It is equally important to be sure there is ongoing monitoring of the implementation with reporting back to the campus community. Faculty appreciate the many opportunities to be involved in academic planning whether it be in open forums, on task forces and working groups, or on committees. (CFR 3.10)

Chapman has a well-developed curriculum approval process that involves faculty at several levels to facilitate development. All course proposals require clear statements of outcomes connected to program and institutional outcomes. The extensive work on setting outcomes, developing courses and programs, mapping the curriculum, assessing student learning, and so forth are in place with many forms, rubrics, calendars, and websites. Workshops and trainings are held to support implementation. A new Institute on Teaching Excellence is positioned to support new ideas about curricular design and pedagogy. Many informal faculty-to-faculty initiatives supplement the work of the Curriculum Committee, General Education Committee, and Assessment Committee to name just a few of the formal structures that play a part in ensuring students achieve graduation competencies for both the undergraduate program and graduate programs. Increased dissemination of information, analyses of data, discussion of findings, and follow through on action steps would build capacity and broaden faculty support. (CFR 4.4, 4.6)

B. Essay 3: Defining and promoting “student success”

Student Life and Community Engagement as an Institutional Priority; Student Life Learning Outcomes

The Student Affairs organization is headed by a Vice Chancellor with a dedicated staff of professionals. The student learning outcomes developed by Student Affairs are clear and closely aligned with those of the institution. (CFR 2.3, 2.11) Chapman provides a rich learning environment with a wide variety of courses, centers, special interest clubs, lectures, and cultural activities. Students acknowledge both the academic and social value of engagement with the campus. Faculty are encouraged to integrate co-curricular opportunities into academic work as well as to accompany students to such campus activities.

Student Affairs has committed significant time and attention to understanding the student experience, as evidenced in the collection and evaluation of data (e.g., triangulation of NSSE, Noel-Levitz SSI, and EBI survey questions). The explicit recognition of a need to refocus attention based on such analyses is important. (CFR 2.11) The institutional report notes increased gains in residence and Greek life; however, it should be noted that participation in an EBI survey for these student populations provides far more data from these than non-resident, non-Greek students. Disaggregation of student outcome data, not just based on residency or Greek status but also other demographic categories might provide more nuanced understanding of the student experience.

According to the Office of Institutional Research, the crosswalk data analysis also reveals a gap in return on investment for both undergraduates and graduate students (Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory: 1995 – 2012, CIRO Research Brief, September 2013 Vol. 10, No. 29). This measure of satisfaction deserves attention given the high tuition dependence of Chapman. Finally, the diversity of the student body is an asset in achieving outcomes such as perspective-taking and global citizenship; however, courses, programs and activities to help students develop cross-cultural appreciation are not as visible as they might be given the campus commitment to community engagement and globalization. (CFR 1.4)

Graduation, Time-to-degree and Retention Rates

The institution has established a goal to maintain a consistent full time, first year retention rate greater than 90%, which Chapman has achieved in recent years. Several programs may have contributed to this achievement, including Living-learning communities that allow first year students to live together in residence halls based on their course of study, and Mapworks, an early alert program that allows Student Affairs staff to meet regularly with students identified as being potentially at risk.

Chapman has also created and expanded an Academic Advising Center, developed a First Year Experience program, expanded existing and planned for more university housing. Currently, 40% of the undergraduate student population lives on campus. President Doti explicitly referenced his belief in the positive correlation between campus housing and student retention as a motivation for increased investment in on-campus residences. Further, the President meets with the student government leadership on a monthly basis to better keep his finger on the pulse of student needs.

Whereas the campus communications among advising units has improved, there is widespread acknowledgement that there is still a need for better data to determine why students leave the institution and interventions made based on

analysis of that data. For instance, transfer retention and graduation rates are considerably lower than for first-time freshmen, yet programs that have been created to aid retention/graduation are primarily geared toward first year students (e.g., living learning communities, financial aid programs, housing, First Year Experience) rather than transfers. Also, if enrolling more transfer students is an institutional goal, then their access to popular majors may need to be expanded. Similarly, though gaps in student success are apparent in the WASC retention and graduation rate tables (e.g., in performance of Asian-American students), no attention was found in the institutional report, supplementary data, or during campus discussions. (CFR 2.13, 2.14)

Student Satisfaction

Staff regularly measure the effectiveness of their efforts with various metrics including the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Noel Levitz's Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI). It is not clear how the institution differentiates among the more important and less important learning outcomes. The preliminary data suggests that student clubs and Greek life experiences were most highly rated (more than twice as high as the next - interactions with peers and faculty and significantly more than other experiences). Approximately 20% of undergraduates belong to Greek letter organizations. (CFR 2.10)

Also of note is the institution's recognition of the students' major dissatisfaction with the academic advising program. This program has been recently revamped including the hiring of a new Director. The new improvements include the development of a campus wide Advising Council and the development of an extensive assessment form to gauge students' experience with the center. Perhaps most importantly, the academic advisors have been assigned as liaisons to academic departments to assure a seamless transition of students through the two separate but compatible systems.

Graduate Education

The new Academic Strategic Plan includes a focus on further strengthening graduate education and developing new graduate programs in the health sciences that are specifically aimed at meeting community demand. As attention to graduate education has developed, Chapman University has established an administrative position to insure oversight for services to graduate students and for curricular and policy issues. The Graduate Academic Council, now in its second year and with broad faculty representation, serves as an advocate for graduate education and a forum for addressing issues specific to graduate students. Bolstered by the appointment of a full-time Vice Chancellor of Graduate Education, a number of new initiatives have been developed. The Vice Chancellor has instituted a university wide Orientation for all graduate students. To enhance their professional development opportunities, he has also created a

Speaker's Series and was instrumental in the formation of a Graduate Student Council. Ongoing challenges for this newly created position include the enhancement of financial support for graduate students, a space for graduate students to call their own, and better tracking of graduate alumni. These initiatives should help reduce concerns graduate students have expressed about lack of support. (CFR 2.13)

The recently formed Graduate Academic Council and Vice Chancellor are also developing the necessary infrastructure to support graduate programs. The accomplishments in just two years include activities as diverse as training programs on how to publish, research grants and funding to attend conferences, social activities, orientation, and establishing a graduate student council. Specific opportunities to enhance the level of graduate study include research opportunities, fellowships at centers, and teaching assistantships. Handling such initiatives university-wide, and not just by each program, is giving greater visibility and sense of community to graduate students. Attention is also being given to how graduate education enhances undergraduate education.(CFR2.2b)

The ultimate challenge for the institution will be to recognize itself as an institution that educates and serves both undergraduate and graduate students. Furthermore, the shift of graduate programs away from the central campus (e.g., to Irvine) may pose additional challenges in creating a unified graduate program culture at Chapman. The status and recognition of graduate students, as an evolving critical constituency of the institution, was noted in many conversations with campus personnel.

C. Essay 4: Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future and planning for the changing environment of higher education

Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness

Institutional capacity should start from a well-articulated strategic plan which includes goals, timelines, facilities master plan, and finances (including fundraising). In 2009, Chapman began developing its Academic Strategic Academic Plan for 2013/14-2017/8. A process was established to gather inputs from all campus constituencies. This academic strategic plan informs a new institutional strategic plan, "Moving into the Health Sciences", that was presented to the Board and approved in September 2013. Key performance indicators are being developed for the academic strategic plan and past plans have included financial metrics.

Financial Capacity and Effectiveness

Chapman has seen impressive growth in enrollment, net assets, gross tuition revenue, net tuition revenue, and investment in facilities. Chapman has a strong balance sheet, healthy debt service coverage ratio and unrestricted cash and investment to debt ratio.

Since 1991-92, Chapman's successive five-year strategic plans have included financial metrics that are monitored and reported to the Board subsequent to the formal adoption of each Strategic Plan. Chapman University has demonstrated consistent financial stability and growth. The University's academic budget has grown from \$65,424,936 in 2006-07 to \$117,495,041 in 2012-13. This financial strength has directly provided for new program development, increased salary levels, sabbatical support, research grants, teaching awards, technology support and 118 new faculty lines since 2006-07.

Chapman plans its operating budgets annually in light of the priorities and parameters of the current Strategic Plan by utilizing a rigorous proprietary forecasting model known as FuturePerfect. On the basis of detailed historic financial data that reconciles precisely to prior audited financial statements, the planning model forecasts annual operating results for up to 10 years in the form of both the Statement of Activities and the Statement of Financial Position. The model also incorporates capital plans and calculates all key financial ratios. The model allows Chapman to test the sensitivity of its finances to different assumptions which should give the administration insight into vulnerabilities. Although operating budgets are said to be annual, the discussion of modeling suggests they are in fact multi-year. The budget and strategic plans are connected in the model. (CFR 3.5)

There are some essential elements of Chapman's financial strategy, but the common factor among them is the pursuit of nationally-recognized excellence. When he became Chapman's President, Jim Doti led the Board to commit to grow average faculty salaries by rank to meet the highest quartile reported by the AAUP. Chapman has achieved and sustained that goal. The campus has a very transparent budgeting process with strongly engaged leadership including the Board of Trustees. (CFR 1.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

The University has doubled the market value of its endowment and has recovered its value after a significant decline during the "great Recession." Market value of endowment grew 22% in fiscal year ending May 31, 2013 through a combination of an excellent investment return of 18.5% and gifts to the endowment totaling \$13.7 million. Endowments have increased by 141% between 2002-03 and 2012-13, from approximately \$95 million to approximately \$229 million. Endowment returns support chairs, professorships and centers for special studies. (CFR 3.5, 3.10) The performance of the endowment has

surpassed that of a representative peer set of colleges and universities and the NACUBO set of institutions over the last 5-years, and reportedly over a longer time period. The endowment is managed by Cambridge Associates, a well-established and well-regarded firm.

The debt service coverage ratio for the year ending May 31, 2013 is 4.55 while the bond covenants require a minimum of 1.25. While the University is anticipating incurring an additional \$133 million in long-term debt for the construction of new buildings to facilitate new growth, the campus is projecting the debt service coverage will hit a low point at 3.45 and then increase to 6.15 at the end of its current 10 year forecasting model.

Chapman University, excluding Brandman, has been on a steady climb, producing a 51% increase in Total Net Assets across the five-year period through 2012-13 with an average annual increase of 10.2%. Total net assets have grown from \$462,573,786 in 2008-09 to \$698,516,599 in 2012-13. Although Brandman University has been separated from Chapman, its financials are still interwoven; upon the request of the Visiting Team, separate financials for both institutions were provided. The financial plan for the next five years assumes an aggressive growth in the "profit" transferred from Brandman to Chapman. There is sufficient uncertainty in on-line education to raise some question about the size of the future transfer. However, the Administration provided a thoughtful response when questioned on this point. They have clearly thought through the challenges. Even if the transfer from Brandman to Chapman were to fall significantly, it would have relatively little impact because it is a small percentage of overall revenue.

Growth in net tuition and fees for Chapman University, excluding Brandman, has been very strong over the past five years, increasing from \$123.1 million to \$186.6 million (51.6% with an average annual increase of 10.32%). The growth in this revenue line is a combination of enrollment growth and fee increases. Key assumptions for the next five years are annual increases in undergraduate and graduate tuition between 4 - 4.5% and for Law, an increase between 3 - 4.25% annually.

Chapman has added significantly to its plant assets over the past ten years. To support and expand academic programs and offerings, Chapman has developed its campus through the creation of state-of-the art facilities. Net Plant Assets have increased over the ten years from \$169.2 million to \$455.9 million, an increase of 169%. The following chart lists the new construction and major renovation projects completed by Chapman during the prior decade.

BUILDING PROJECTS 2004 - 2013 Year of Construction	Building	Purpose	Gross Square Footage
2004	Leatherby Libraries	Main campus library	100,106
2004	Fish Interfaith Center	Chapel and office space	12,356
2004	Oliphant Hall	College of Performing Arts classrooms and office space	22,764
2004	Public Safety	Office space	1,648
2004	Campus Planning & Operations, Facilities Management, Purchasing & University Services	Office space	21,670
2005	Information Systems & Technology (IS&T)	Office space	15,360
2006	Marion Knott Studios	Film School classrooms, studios, and office space	76,193
2006	Lastinger Parking Structure	Parking	272,000
2006	Wilson Field	Athletics	154,149
2006	Entertainment Technology Center	College of Performing Arts workshops and storage	18,331
2007	Western Cordage Building	Physical Therapy Department and Psychology Department	31,668
2008	Financial Services & University Advancement	Office space	37,170
2008	Allred Aquatics Center	Swimming pool and stadium	62,084
2009	Sandhu Residence/Conference Center & Randall Dining Commons	Residence hall, dining commons, and conference center	198,456

2009	Von Neumann Hall	Math Department office space	6,000
2009	Brandman University – Main	Main campus Offices and Classrooms	115,000
2012	Argyros Forum Expansion	Add Student Union space	23,361
2013	Doti Hall	Classrooms/Faculty Offices	17,059

Over the next five years, the University is planning to construct several other facilities as well as acquire buildings to meet its growth objectives. These projects include an 1100-seat Center for the Arts; a 140,000 square-foot, state-of-the-art facility to house the Schmid College of Science and Technology; the purchase of two buildings in Irvine to allow for expansion of graduate programs in allied health science fields creating a Health Sciences Campus; and additional residence halls, tennis courts, and structured parking.

While the growth in new facilities is commendable, the University anticipates borrowing as much as \$133 million in long term debt to fund these projects which is more than the existing long term debt of \$124 million. If all the key assumptions made in the forecasting model are correct, the debt to net assets ratio will be 14.2% and the debt coverage rate will be 6.15 at the end of fiscal year ending May 31, 2022. Although these are very favorable ratios, it is recommended that the University monitor the actual financial results on a regular basis so adjustments can be made so these ratios can be sustained.

In addition to new, state-of-the-art facilities, the campus is to be commended for maintaining the beauty and integrity of existing buildings and the campus grounds, and for its significant investment in its technology infrastructure. The availability of technology to assist students and operations is excellent, and infrastructure has been upgraded to provide for smart (mediated) classrooms. The campus refreshes its computers every three years in the student labs as well as for faculty and staff. (CFR 3.6, 3.7)

Chapman exhibits financial strength but has aggressive plans that may introduce financial challenges. However, the University and the Board and its Finance Committee are conversant with the financial modeling employed by the University and are well informed about the financial situation and the risks inherent in the strategic plan. The Board appears to exercise good financial oversight, as the members closely monitor the financials and indicated that they would intervene to restrict expenditures that implied unacceptable financial risk.

Tuition Revenue

Although the institution has “made a virtue of being tuition dependent” it has also undertaken recent and significant borrowing. It appears that net tuition revenue has been growing but not at a similar pace to gross tuition because the discount rate has been increasing. The University plans moderate tuition increases for the next five years. Given the strong growth in applications, increased marketing, and a very attractive campus, the University should be able to make its goals for moderate growth in undergraduate enrollment.

There have recently been significant decreases in applications to law schools and MBA programs. Chapman is fortunate to have excellent leadership in their law school dean, who has devised a strategy to decrease the focus on the JD program and grow enrollments in the LLM program. It will be important to monitor the success of this strategy so that the Law School does not become a drain on university finances.

Educational Effectiveness

The University has invested significantly in an infrastructure of assessment: the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs; the Institutional Research Office; Assessment Committee of the Faculty Senate; and the General Education Committee. Each year, fifteen degree programs and 76 Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports are evaluated. In addition to academic programs, Chapman also evaluates key support programs. As noted earlier in the report, it appears that a culture of assessment has taken hold at Chapman. The Institutional Research Office is fully staffed. The staff provide information to units to support these evaluation processes and also prepare summaries of surveys to disseminate to the campus. Additional attention to how the analyses are used at all levels would strengthen the alignment of data with decisions.(CFR 4.5)

Planning for Higher Education’s Changing Environment

Chapman University’s financial sustainability has been addressed above. The University has done an excellent job in making data publicly available (transparency) and establishing mechanisms to show accountability and educational effectiveness. Through these efforts the University is well-placed to address Federal mandates on graduation proficiencies. Through Brandman University, Chapman has been able to address the educational needs of at least some non-traditional students.

Chapman lists a number of challenges to higher education: maintaining financial sustainability; student debt; demonstrating transparency; accountability and evidence of educational effectiveness; the impact of non-traditional student

populations; Federal pressure to standardize graduation proficiencies. The University monitors these challenges and “attempts to take proactive steps” to meet these challenges. However, the institutional report does not discuss which of these threats it considers most relevant to Chapman nor does it discuss the extent to which these challenges are currently being felt. Chapman states that it “strives to look forward and imagine the type of institution it might become” (p.57). That is a very useful exercise and would help shape not only policy but also help identify the most pressing challenges. The culture of Town Hall meetings provides a vehicle by which challenges might be identified, discussed, and prioritized.

Expanding programs in Allied Health Sciences meets a clear future demand for workers in these fields. Chapman University has looked closely at potential demands for education in these fields and the potential of students to afford graduate tuition. Chapman has also discussed its plans with local employers regarding the provision of internships and jobs. Thus, Chapman has carried out extensive market research to ascertain whether expansion into the health sciences is warranted.

The creation and sustaining of interdisciplinary programs is to be applauded for helping students understand and address the complex challenges they will face. At the same time, faculty and staff are aware that adoption of an interdisciplinary culture requires investment and attention, such as: revising the Faculty Manual tenure and promotion guidelines to allow and reward interdisciplinary teaching and research; greater integration of interdisciplinary courses in the GE curriculum; and funding of interdisciplinary courses and research. Results of the most recent HERI survey show that faculty consider lack of time as the greatest barrier to pursuing interdisciplinary interests and suggest that faculty see “interdisciplinarity” as one more thing they are expected to do rather than as a different way of approaching teaching and research. This view will impede progress on interdisciplinarity.

Chapman has also identified Global Engagement as a major commitment and has introduced a number of initiatives to support this commitment, such as establishing a Center for Global Education, expanding international course offerings, increasing funding for study abroad, introducing a Global Citizen cluster in GE, and increasing the number of international students. However, the percentage of students studying abroad is still relatively low. It is not clear whether students value study abroad or whether financial constraints stop more of them from studying abroad.

Chapman has increased its community engagement by establishing programs in the Santa Ana community; notably, Libreria Martinez , Padres Unidos, and the

Nicholas academic Center. It is admirable that Chapman is supporting these organizations financially, and these programs may provide a rich learning experience for students, giving them an understanding of the challenges that many communities and individuals face in the U.S. However, the impact of these programs on student learning outcomes is unknown, as is the extent to which they will add to the diversity of the student population.

Finally, Chapman has foregrounded student-faculty research as a primary component of a personalized education and has decided to monitor trends in student-faculty research. Although little information was provided in the Institutional Reaccreditation Report on funding of student-faculty research or on outputs in terms of publications, performances, and the like, the program for the most recent on-campus research day included over 100 different presentations of student work across a variety of disciplines. Chapman has contributed substantial resources to support undergraduate research and has made it part of a faculty members' evaluation; however, it will be important to track the number of students and faculty involved and the outputs over time. (CFR 2.8)

Faculty Roles, Development, Evaluation, Profiles

As Chapman has changed and the expectations for faculty have changed, so have the policies. The Faculty Manual is regularly updated and outlines in detail terms of appointment, teaching loads, expectations for performance, opportunities for professional development, and the evaluation process. More complete criteria are established in each unit, tailored to the forms of scholarship and creative activity appropriate for the field. There is a strong emphasis on professional standards and collegiality. The increasing emphasis on scholarship and creative work is supported by adjustments in teaching load as well as by resources. As barriers to initiatives, such as team teaching or supervising undergraduate research, are identified by faculty, some flexibility such as banking for a course release have been introduced. At the same time, faculty and staff on campus frequently refer to the "Old" and "New" Chapman, reflecting uneasiness with some of the recent changes in culture and expectations. The implications of this changing culture for progress on key Chapman initiatives will be discussed in the context of the final essay. (CFR 3.3)

There are ample opportunities for faculty development, including pre-tenure sabbaticals as well as sabbaticals for faculty not on tenure lines. The adjunct Faculty Manual provides advice and policies on everything from grading to parking. The Institute for Excellence in Teaching offers a wide variety of workshops and resources to facilitate student learning, including course development and integration of technologies, as well as one-on-one consultations. Specific support is provided for new faculty as a group and

individually. Faculty are engaged in the life of Chapman in many ways, both formal and informal, and service expectations are clearly identified part of the culture. (CFR 3.4)

D. Integrative Essay

National Prominence in Research, Personalized Education, Graduate Studies, Health Care, Culture of Assessment/Program Review, Benchmarking

The final essay of the Institutional Reaccreditation Report highlights some of the key strategic initiatives of Chapman University. The Visiting Team found considerable internal consistency across these themes. The emphasis on national prominence was clearly articulated and recognized by faculty both in group sessions and in the 2011 HERI data presented for review; across several relevant dimensions (your university's priority is to "enhance the institution's national image, increase or maintain institutional prestige," "hire faculty 'stars'"), Chapman University's faculty rated their institution 24% to 70% higher than faculty at peer institutions. At the same time, faculty expressed lack of congruence between their own values and those of the institution (63.6% v. 75.9% at peer institutions).

The emphasis on a distinctive, personalized education is also clearly articulated across campus. As noted previously, the realization of this distinction often came in discussions of faculty-student research, though probably not envisioned as occurring at the expense of high-quality teaching. Chapman undergraduate faculty seem to think that such a compromise is being made; according to the report, *2010-11 HERI Faculty Survey Results: Chapman University's Full-Time Undergraduate Faculty*, "Among the comparison group results, one item stood out. Exactly 25.7% of faculty in the comparison group believe that faculty are rewarded for being good teachers in comparison to 6.2% of Chapman faculty." The Visiting Team recognizes some recent investments in faculty teaching, such as the appointment of a new director to launch the Institute for Effective Teaching, and encourages the expansion of support and approach to personalized education at Chapman University.

Finally, the same survey (2010-11 HERI) suggests that faculty respect for each other, and respect for the expression of diversity, is considerably lower at Chapman than at peer institutions (Faculty here respect each other: CU 42% v Privates 50.7%; Respect for expression of diversity: CU 28.4% v. Privates 41.3%). Additional institutional data corroborates these results:

When quantitative and qualitative data are taken together, findings from the 2013 Campus Climate & Work Environment Survey suggest that the areas that are in most need of attention according to Chapman employees are:

- the lack of diversity or value placed on diversity at the university;
- the accommodations or access provided to people with disabilities on campus; and
- fair compensation.

Overall employees believe that the climate of Chapman University is welcoming, safe and not a place where inappropriate comments about people who are different are frequently heard on campus. Further, findings show that there is strong agreement that Chapman University is a place that values treating everyone with civility and respect. However, quantitative and qualitative data also indicate that there are many employees who believe that Chapman University is not a place that values diversity. Many of the open ended comments brought attention to the lack of attention, support or resources devoted to diversity at Chapman. (Chapman University Research Brief, October 2013, Vol. 11, No. 30)

Data such as these about campus climate were not identified as key benchmarking measures for Chapman. However, they are likely consequences of the rate of change and energy behind specific institutional objectives that should be addressed by Chapman's leadership. In addition to monitoring student satisfaction and progress toward degree, critical areas for Chapman's long-term sustainability, the University may also wish to consider climate data in ensuring campus support for and progress toward other institutional objectives.

SECTION III - FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

The transformation of Chapman University over the last 20 years is remarkable. Specifically, the Visiting Team commends the University for the following areas:

1. Financial planning shows careful consideration of market trends and community needs, exemplified by recent debt restructuring, the fiscal relationship with Brandman University, and plans to develop programming in health sciences.
2. Strategic planning appears to be appropriately data-driven, and there is ample evidence of the use of data to make decisions at the highest administrative levels. Priorities are clearly identified and implemented with immediacy and efficiency while keeping long-term viability in mind.

3. Program level assessment and review has progressed well, with robust practices of program improvement and broad faculty participation.

4. There appears to be considerable cohesion across administrative levels, with a shared sense of purpose, vision and direction while retaining the ability to respond creatively and flexibly to external opportunities and the needs of the campus community.

5. Faculty governance committee members expressed high levels of satisfaction. There are clear operating principles, appropriate representation, the ability to influence policies and procedures in light of changing academic needs, and broad, active faculty engagement.

6. The attention to campus infrastructure is impressive. In addition to expanding facilities, the campus continues to maintain the beauty and integrity of existing buildings and grounds, and the investment in technology infrastructure extends throughout the campus.

7. Chapman University is investing in the total student experience in many ways, notably by the expansion of student housing.

The Visiting Team is supportive of Chapman University's vision and directions and offers the following recommendations in pursuit of Chapman's goals:

1. While the growth in new facilities is commendable, the anticipated level of borrowing and subsequent debt coverage ratios needs to be monitored closely and regularly.

2. The use of data to inform decisions seems most evident at the highest levels of Chapman's leadership. We encourage broader communication of data, findings, and executive level analyses across campus in ways that encourage use by multiple audiences and greater collaboration in responding to findings.

3. Meeting overall enrollment goals will require careful analysis of data regarding student attrition and effective methods of student support. We encourage monitoring and assessment of recent changes made to support students, particularly in areas such as undergraduate student advising and graduate student support.

4. Faculty and administrators consistently cite Chapman University's commitment to personalized education. Chapman's June 29, 2005 Commission Action letter recommended "that performance goals and benchmarks be set for each aspect of personalized education and that a clarification of the type and level of personalized education expected across the entire University be developed" (p. 2). Although the undergraduate research program is one aspect of achieving personalized education, we urge fulfillment of the recommendation made in 2005.

5. The expressed commitments to community engagement and globalization need to be accompanied by policies, procedures, and curricula that support cultural competence. Similarly, the efforts to create pipelines for diverse

students need to be accompanied by financial, social, and academic support to both attract and retain those students.

6. As the expectations of faculty have evolved to include greater productivity in research and creative scholarship, Chapman has made significant investments in adjusting the Faculty Manual and providing an array of professional development opportunities, including mentoring, workshops, travel support and internal grants. While progress has been made in clarifying faculty evaluation criteria, we recommend continued attempts at transparency in faculty promotion, tenure, and evaluation.

7. Internal research reports suggest that concerns about campus climate need attention from senior leadership at Chapman.

Compliance Checklist for Reaffirmation, Special, and Pathway B Visits (2013 Handbook)

Instructions to team:

Upon completion, please attach this form as an appendix to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report.

Name of Institution: Chapman University

Dates of Visit: 10/21/13 - 10/23/13

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation Special Pathway B

NOTE: Many of the documents requested below will be found in the institution's catalog in its hard copy and/or online edition. For these entries, please note the page number or the specific URL that will take a reviewer to the exact location for the requested entry.

CFR	Documents Required	Links to website or document portfolio	WASC check
1.1	Mission statement		✓
1.2	Public posting of student achievement data (retention/graduation, student learning) if not in Catalog		✓
1.3	Academic freedom policy		✓
1.4	Diversity statements and procedures; policy for disabilities accommodations		✓
1.5	Documents regarding the authorities of a controlling or sponsoring entity with which the institution is affiliated (if applicable)		✓
1.6	Catalog (online and/or hard copy) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies		✓
1.7.a	Student complaint and grievance policies		✓
1.7.b	Grade appeals policies		✓
1.7.c	Faculty complaint and grievance policies		✓
1.7.d	Staff complaint and grievance policies		✓
1.7.e	Employee handbook or equivalent		✓
1.7.f	Redacted examples of student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, degree levels, and related interpretive information		✓
1.7.g	Policies for changing grades		✓
1.7.h	Tuition and fee schedule		✓
1.7.i	Tuition refund policy		✓
1.7.j	Policy on credit hour calculations and on award of credit; processes for reviewing the assignment of credit; examples of reviews of syllabi to ensure equivalency among the institution's similar types of courses		✓
1.7.k	Policies on human subjects in research, if applicable		✓

CFR	Documents Required	Links to website or document portfolio	WASC check
2.1	List of degree programs offered, showing required courses and units assigned for each		✓
2.2	For associate and bachelor's degrees: general education requirements (in credits and/or in competencies)		✓
2.6	Placement data, if available		✓
2.7	Program review process and schedule/calendar		✓
2.8	Policies regarding faculty scholarship and creative activity		✓
2.10	Policy on student evaluation of faculty		✓
2.12	Academic calendar		✓
2.13	Examples of recruitment and advertising material		✓
2.14	Posted policies on receiving transfer credit, criteria for determining acceptance, and list of institutions with articulation agreements		✓
3.1	Staff development policies		✓
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program as relevant		✓
3.3.a	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures		✓
3.3.b	Faculty handbook or equivalent		✓
3.3.c	Faculty development policies		✓
3.3.d	Faculty orientation policies and procedures		✓
3.3.e	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty		✓
3.4.a	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates		✓
3.8.a	List of governing board members with their qualifications		✓
3.8.b	List of governing board committees, with members		✓
3.8.c	Minutes of board meetings for last two years (where located; not the actual minutes)		✓
3.8.d	Governing board bylaws and operations manual		✓
3.9.a	CEO biographical information		✓
3.9.b	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO		✓
3.10.a	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority, if applicable		✓
3.10.b	Faculty governance organization chart, if applicable		✓
4.1	Staff list and qualifications for Quality Assurance committee or office		✓
4.2	Description of institutional research function and staffing		✓
4.4	Program Review handbook, process, templates, or links to documents from a recent review		✓
4.5	Strategic plan and related documents		✓
4.6	List of major industry, professional, or other advisory committees		✓
4.7	Persons or office tasked with anticipating how the institution discerns and responds to changes in educational environment		✓

Team Comments:

Accuracy and Availability of Records: Team Only	
Policies and procedures for students, faculty, and staff are stated consistently in all places where presented	Yes
Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	Yes
Records appear accurate and up to date	Yes

Team Comments:

Documentation full & complete

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution:

Date:

Overview:

Under federal regulations, WASC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? <i>Curriculum Handbook</i>
	Comments: <i>Clearly stated as part of process for approving new courses, practice, internships, and independent work</i>
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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: <i>All courses meet 15 weeks - final exam in 16th week</i>
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 8 <i>9</i>
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? <i>both</i>
	What degree level(s)? <i>Undergrad & grad</i>
	What discipline(s)? <i>English, Japanese, Ford Chemistry</i>
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
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) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? <i>internships 6</i>
	What kinds of courses? <i>internships</i>
	What degree level(s)? <i>Undergrad, grad</i>
	What discipline(s)? <i>Marketing, Writing, Media Production</i>
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? <i>5</i>
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? <i>grad & undergrad</i>
	What degree level(s)? <i>grad & undergrad</i>
	What discipline(s)? <i>History, Economics, Religion, Art, Physical Therapy</i>
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution:

Date:

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team 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? <i>Various Websites</i>	yes
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: <i>Several offices handle this</i>	yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	yes
	Comments: <i>When a student doesn't know where to file a specific complaint they are advised to go to Dean of Students.</i>	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? <i>Various offices as appropriate</i>	yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	yes
	Comments: <i>Complaints are tracked through a student complaint system called Advocate.</i>	

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution:

Date:

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

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:	
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:	
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:		

*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.