

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

To California Lutheran University

April 14-16, 2015

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Gretchen M. Bataille, President, GMB Consulting Group, Chair

Teresa M. Shaw, Special Assistant to the President and Secretary to the Board, Pomona College, Assistant Chair

Ming Tung (Mike) Lee, Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer, California State University, Sacramento

Hanna S. Spinosa, Chief Institutional Research & Planning Officer, Amherst College

Lorraine Williams, Provost, Ashford University

Maureen A. Maloney, Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

The Team 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. 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 WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	2
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	2
B. Description of Team’s Process	3
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	4
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	5
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	5
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards	9
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees	16
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	20
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	21
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	23
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment	26
H. Component 8: The integration of California Lutheran University student learning outcomes into the co-curriculum	31
I. Component 9: Reflections and plans for improvement	33
SECTION III: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
SECTION IV: APPENDICES	38
A. Federal Compliance Checklists	38
1. Credit Hour Review	
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	
3. Student Complaints Review	
4. Transfer Policy Review	
B. Off Campus Locations	43
C. Distance Education	49

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

California Lutheran University (Cal Lutheran or CLU) is a private, non-profit institution with its main campus in Thousand Oaks, California. Founded in 1959 as California Lutheran College, Cal Lutheran is affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Approximately 10% of its students identified as Lutheran in 2014 (from 13.4% at the time of the previous review in 2007). With the establishment of the School of Management, the Bachelor's Degree for Professionals program, and the Graduate School of Education in addition to the College of Arts and Sciences, the institution became California Lutheran University in 1986. Since that time, the Graduate School of Psychology was founded in 2013, and the university's merger with the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary (PLTS) in Berkeley was approved by the Commission in 2013. In the fall of 2014, Cal Lutheran enrolled 2,808 undergraduate students and 1,352 graduate students, and employed 190 full-time and 253 part-time faculty members, for 35 undergraduate majors, 16 master's degrees, 13 credential and certificate programs, and three doctoral degrees. Instruction and programs are delivered in Thousand Oaks and at satellite facilities and campuses in Woodland Hills, Westlake Village, Oxnard, Santa Maria, and Berkeley.

The appendices to this report include evaluations of two locations geographically apart from the main campus (PLTS and Oxnard), as well as distance education programs, and reviews of four areas of compliance with federal expectations.

B. Description of Team's Process

The evaluation team reviewed all materials provided by the university along with the Institutional Report, Commission action letters, materials from the previous Capacity and Preparatory Review (2005) and Educational Effectiveness Review (2007), and supplemental materials requested after the team's Offsite Review (OSR). The team found the institution's staff to be responsive to requests for information. During the campus visit (April 14-16, 2015), the team reviewed communications sent to the confidential e-mail account established for the purpose of the review, and team members met with multiple constituencies in order to explore further the issues raised in the institutional report and those identified for further inquiry in the December 2014 "Lines of Inquiry" document produced during the Offsite Review. The lines of inquiry were:

- a. Diversity planning
- b. Program review
- c. Graduate-level programs
- d. Assessment of co-curricular programs and "high impact" activities
- e. Faculty staffing
- f. Student retention
- g. Role of the Educational effectiveness and Institutional Research (EEIR) office and staff
- h. Capital planning and master planning for increased student population
- i. Administration and governance
- j. Student grievance process

C. The Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

The team found Cal Lutheran's institutional report to be well-organized and thorough, presenting a fair representation of the current condition of the university, including strengths and challenges. Responsibility for preparation of the report, including the Self-Review Under the Standards, was divided among multiple committees and existing administrative and faculty groups; thus there was wide campus participation, at least at some stages of the process. The written report was supplemented by evidence to support the report's analysis. All requests for additional information and data, including requests coming out of the Offsite Review and the "Lines of Inquiry" document, were addressed in a thorough and timely manner.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In its communications following California Lutheran University's Capacity and Preparatory Review (2005) and Educational Effectiveness Review (2007), the Commission raised several issues for the university's attention and action, primarily in the areas of assessment of student learning and performance standards for graduation, program review, and planning (including strategic and academic planning, enrollment management, faculty recruitment, staffing, and retention, and financial planning). In addition, the July 2007 Commission action letter highlights the need for "a more formal plan to increase student, faculty, staff, and Board diversity."

As will be elaborated in the following pages, Cal Lutheran has made real progress in many of these areas. In particular, the university's planning process links strategic, financial, and academic planning in a transparent fashion that seems widely understood. The assessment of student learning has advanced on the programmatic and course levels and is strengthened by an effective institutional research staff and strong program review process. The university's financial health has strengthened since 2007, and additional resources have been used to meet priorities including faculty compensation, more full-time faculty appointments, and facilities improvements. In addition, the institution has responded to specific recommendations related to substantive change proposals.

Cal Lutheran has made less progress, however, in nearly all aspects of institutional diversity (CFR 1.4). The team previously identified diversity as one of its lines of inquiry for the campus visit, and so asked many questions and spoke to multiple groups. In its review of the

university's materials, and even more during the campus visit, the team was struck not only by demographic data, but by the mood and culture around diversity. In conversations with both faculty and staff, the team noticed both a general affirmation of the importance of diversity and a strong sense of how a vitally diverse community would connect to the university's traditions, history, and culture. At the same time, there is almost a paralysis and lack of clarity about how to define the goals, how to measure success, how to support and understand the experiences of diverse faculty, staff, and students, where to apply resources or change structures in order to make progress, or even what constitutes "diversity." For example, the team heard more than once that while Cal Lutheran has not significantly improved the racial diversity of the faculty, the diversity of religious affiliation and sexual orientation, as well as the numbers of international students and faculty, have increased. We were encouraged by the president's successful addition of women to his senior administrative team, replacing what had previously been an all-male leadership group. Certainly these are important aspects of diversity and of a healthy campus climate, and increased diversity in these areas is not to be disregarded. But this cannot deflect from the expectations, even urgency, around improving U.S. racial and ethnic diversity—particularly among faculty and students—and addressing issues of student success among different groups of students, as well as faculty retention, satisfaction, and climate.

In particular, the team notes the following examples of Cal Lutheran's challenges regarding diversity:

Faculty Diversity:

Faculty ethnic diversity has not improved as a percentage of overall full-time faculty positions. In 2007, 18.2% of the full-time faculty and 15.3% of adjunct faculty in all schools were identified as under-represented minorities. In 2014, the percentage is 17.4% of full-time

faculty and 19.4% of adjunct faculty identify as underrepresented minorities. During the campus visit the team heard from several members of the administration and the faculty about what is essentially a passive, even anemic approach to faculty recruitment and hiring, in spite of good intentions. There are issues in both the administrative and faculty arenas. The team noted an overall search process that does not take advantage of best practices in recruiting for a diverse faculty or set appropriate expectations, as well as department and program faculty cultures that tend toward the status quo in the face of the very real effort required and resentment toward the administration's attempts to question faculty hiring decisions. As a result, the twenty-one faculty searches conducted last year resulted in twenty new white faculty members. Eleven searches for full-time faculty this year has shown progress with the hiring of two African American and one Hispanic faculty member. (CFR 1.4, 3.1).

Student Success and Disaggregated Data:

According to the Cal Lutheran Institutional Summary Report, based on 2012 student data, the six-year graduation rate for full-time freshman undergraduate students was 60.94% for white students, 60.61% for Hispanic students, 52.63% for Asian students, and 35.29% for African-American students. For African-American males, the rate is 28.57%. The achievement gap is a problem across higher education to varying degrees, and along with a national focus on the issue, multiple models for addressing the challenge have emerged and are being applied. At Cal Lutheran, while the team was impressed by a general commitment to student success and aggressive programs and outreach that support persistence and graduation (as will be discussed further below), there appears to be a minimal attempt to target specific student groups, but there is no overall focused effort to understand the experience of students from under-represented

groups, in particular African American students, though the team heard about a new program for African-American male students (CFR 1.4, 2.10, 4.7).

Campus Climate and Vitality:

Finally, the team heard anecdotal accounts about the climate for under-represented faculty, including lower faculty retention, experience of micro-aggressions, and concerns about a lack of support for new faculty of color. Together these suggest that, even when Cal Lutheran is successful in hiring new under-represented faculty, the community has a challenge in assuring that those individuals will thrive—and stay. Several people mentioned the possibility of a faculty ombudsperson as one solution. While the team has no specific view on this, and indeed there seems to be some misunderstanding about the role of an ombudsperson, these conversations point to the larger climate issues, and a general lack of common purpose around diversity or sense of how to move forward (CFR 1.4, 3.1, 4.3, 4.7).

In sum, California Lutheran must take steps to fulfill the 2007 Commission recommendations around diversity. More fundamentally, the university community must act bravely and boldly to realize its own best vision of itself. This involves not only renewed commitment on all levels, and a purposeful focus over the coming months and years, but also a review and assessment of structures, processes, and resources that will move the university forward, as well as the curriculum and co-curriculum, access and success among all groups of students, and campus climate.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards

This team report will address the Standards and Criteria for Review in multiple ways and in detail according to the themes of the Components below. Here the team offers general observations regarding the Cal Lutheran's fulfillment of the Standards, as reflected in its

institutional report and accompanying materials as well as the team's visit to the Thousand Oaks campus, PLTS, and the Oxnard facility.

Standard 1:

The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.

The mission of Cal Lutheran is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice. Cal Lutheran is one of 26 colleges and universities affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA).

The Cal Lutheran 2012-2017 Strategic Plan contains five goals:

- Guide students to discover and live their purpose with real-world learning experiences, excellent academic and career mentoring, and a campus environment that promotes inclusion.
- Continue to set high institutional academic standards with distinguished faculty who embody and embrace diversity and with widely respected academic programs.
- Support student achievement across all programs with equitable treatment for all students, by enhancing student services and by utilizing the most pedagogically appropriate delivery methods for student learning.
- Build and modernize sustainable facilities for an environment that sustains social, cultural, and intellectual activity while respecting and protecting the planet.

- Attract students of high ideals and promise by enhancing regional and national awareness of CLU's mission by raising the profiles of students drawn to our mission, and by offering new programs and scholarships to attract these students.

The five strategic goals are widely shared and monitored through the 2012-2017 Strategic Plan website and the action plan correspondent to each of the goals. With recognition that progress on diversity goals must be strengthened, Cal Lutheran is otherwise making substantive progress on all the goals and the efforts have been systemic, intentional, and meaningful (CFR 1.1).

Cal Lutheran has clearly and publicly defined its values and priorities that are appropriate for a higher education institution. The mission statement and strategic goals are widely shared among the campus community members and embedded into the institution's formal decision-making processes and its student learning goals. Since the last comprehensive review, CLU has significantly improved its data collection and analytical capacities. The staff of the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research (EEIR) regularly collect, analyze, and share valuable data on student retention and graduation, student learning outcomes, assessment, program reviews, course evaluation, and surveys. Various faculty committees and the administration are able to monitor and evaluate student outcomes in comparison with the institution's established goals. We found the information and data sets provided by EEIR to be thorough, insightful, and meaningful (CFR 1.2).

Faculty and staff rights and academic freedom are clearly stated in the Faculty Handbook. The Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs specify the rights and responsibilities of students. In published policies and practices, Cal Lutheran has appeared to adhere to its core mission as a higher education institution dedicated to advancing the pursuit of educational goals. The institution has a long tradition of embracing the shared governance concept. Faculty members are

expected to participate in curricular and important university decision-making processes through various committees and consultative procedures (CFR 1.3).

Hispanic students accounted for the largest percentage increase among the ethnic groups, and based on the available six-year graduation rate data, have performed at or above the aggregate graduate rate. This is a commendable outcome and particularly important because of the rapid increase of Hispanic students entering California higher education institutions. Cal Lutheran has more work to do in relation to its overall goals of diversity and student success especially among African American students, as described above (CFR 1.4).

Standard 2:

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship, and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

Cal Lutheran has a committee of faculty and administrators that ensure educational programs are appropriate in the content, delivery, and integrity of the degrees (CFR 2.1). The degree programs are clearly articulated in catalogs for both undergraduate and graduate programs and the credit hours adhere to federal policy (CFR 2.2). The university has developed a clear set of learning outcomes for the institution and has mapped programs, degrees, and co-curricular activities to these goals (CFR 2.3-2.6). There is also a rigorous and well-defined program review process (CFR 2.7), and scholarship, teaching, and creativity are at the center of the life of the university (CFR 2.8-2.9). The institution has invested many resources and programs to ensuring

student success as demonstrated by the student success team and first-year programming efforts (CFR 2.10-2.14). The student success efforts are ongoing and the institution is committed to supporting each student academically and socially.

Cal Lutheran has also provided a clear policy and articulation agreements for their transfer students (CFR 2.14). Those policies are easily accessible and documented in the Student Handbook as well as the website. Cal Lutheran is also tracking academic outcomes as demonstrated by program review (CFR 2.7), institutional assessment of core competencies (CFR 2.4, 2.6), and indirect measures for understanding the student experience, engagement, and satisfaction through national surveys.

Standard 3:

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.

Responding to increased enrollment, Cal Lutheran has increased the number of full-time faculty members from 166 in 2012 to 190 in 2014. This change is also reflected in the increased number of sections taught by full-time faculty (49 percent to 57 percent) and the percentage of student units taught by full-time faculty (53 percent to 60 percent). Cal Lutheran currently has 190 full-time faculty members and 253 part-time faculty members for 35 undergraduate majors, 16 masters degrees, 13 credential and certificate programs, and three doctoral degrees. In response to previous WSCUC substantive change reviews, CLU has focused its faculty-related

efforts on limiting faculty overload and mentoring faculty engagement in online teaching. The number of full-time faculty was significantly increased from 2009 to 2012 along with an increase in salaries (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

Cal Lutheran has also made significant improvements in its financial picture, seeing improvements in resources, financial data such as ratios, and student enrollment. A number of facilities projects have been accomplished and are in planning stages, with careful benchmarks and analysis. The university has a clear, widely-understood process for budgetary planning and resource allocations that is linked to strategic priorities and program review (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 3.7).

The Cal Lutheran faculty, in particular the full-time faculty, takes a high level of responsibility for academic governance and decision making, as well as advising, program assessment, and assurance of quality assurance and educational effectiveness, and operates in a “high touch” culture. In general the faculty operates as “a whole,” across locations and degree programs and levels. The team found that while the faculty is proud of its collective identity and responsibility, in some ways the faculty governance structure reflects single-campus, undergraduate institutional structure and may not serve the current reality of the university. For example, some decisions that have primary impact on one location or one program are long in coming due to a centralized, common committee structure, which does not necessarily include representation from the unit in question. The team encourages the university to consider its faculty governance structure, in light of expansion in graduate programs, the dispersed locations for delivery of programs, and multiple academic units, in order to strengthen and enhance a focused faculty role (CFR 3.2, 3.7, 3.10).

The Board of Regents of Cal Lutheran is a group of highly devoted and engaged supporters of the institution. Their dedication is clearly demonstrated in the commitment to

improve the Board's functions through regular participation in the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) conferences. The Board committees are also closely engaged in the strategic planning, program reviews, learning outcomes assessment, and other student success initiatives (CFR 3.9).

Standard 4:

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Cal Lutheran has established processes to assess curricular programs as well as administrative functions to assure quality and provide documentation to support any curricular changes (CFR 4.1). The university has adhered to the WSCUC substantive change review process when making larger changes in structure, services, pedagogy, and curricula, and followed up appropriately to recommendations (CFR 4.1). Cal Lutheran systematically reviews academic programs and degrees in a cycle that is appropriate and thoughtful (CFR 4.1, 4.3), and deploys its institutional research and planning resources throughout the university for the purposes of decision support and academic planning. Leading these efforts is the Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research office with a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) of four administrators who champion the assessment efforts for all divisions. The EEIR team is effective and valued across campus (CFR 4.2).

The team observed a clear culture of collaboration and investment of all members of the Cal Lutheran community, as evidenced in our conversations with the Board of Regents, alumni, and faculty (CFR 4.3-4.5). Cal Lutheran regularly engages multiple constituencies in strategic and academic planning processes that result in meaningful and transparent guidelines for the institution within the larger context of higher education (CFR 4.6-4.7).

Federal Compliance Checklists:

See appendices.

C. Component 3: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree

The meaning of a California Lutheran degree is fixed in the university's Christian, Lutheran heritage, traditions, and values. The university's mission is: "to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice" (CFR 1.1, 1.2).

Its values are evidenced through its core commitments to liberal learning, professional preparation, and character and leadership development. The meaning of the undergraduate degree at Cal Lutheran is not only reflected in the university's mission and values, but also in its alignment of mission with institutional-level learning outcomes, its Student Learning Outcomes, or SLOs. These SLOs are creative and critical thinking, information literacy, communication (written and oral) skills, quantitative literacy, interpersonal and teamwork skills, principled leadership, cross-cultural competency, and identity and values (CFR 1.2, 2.2-4, 4.3).

The quality is defined by its measurement of the Cal Lutheran Core General Education outcomes, its First Year Experience Seminar and indirect measures from student surveys

(National Survey of Student Engagement, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, and Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement). In addition, the university has defined the quality of its General Education curriculum through its Core-21 requirements, which are, according to the website, “designed to prepare students for the 21st century” by enabling them:

1. To become proficient in analytical and critical thinking and to be able to process, transform and communicate information;
2. To be able to comprehend issues from a variety of perspectives and to understand how different academic disciplines ask questions about the world;
3. To understand themselves as both heirs and creators of history; to understand the forces that have shaped their cultural heritage and appreciate the diversity of values and viewpoints in the United States and the world;
4. To be able to integrate information and moral reflection in order to develop creative solutions to new problems (www.callutheran.edu/admission/undergraduate/academics/; CFR 2.2-4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

Integrity is “ensured through peer review, multiple levels of curricular oversight, and an external program review (Essay 3, page 2).” Although WSCUC does not require use of resources like the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) or the American Association of Colleges and University’s (AAC&U) Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP), these are in evident in Cal Lutheran’s set of clearly-articulated principles for evaluating student achievement. The Cal Lutheran Core General Education outcomes largely adhere to the measurements of student achievement in in the five core competencies: written communication,

oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy. In addition, although Cal Lutheran does not mention explicit use of the LEAP standards, examples of nearly every rubric were drawn from the AAC&U rubrics.

The team observed that California Lutheran has demonstrated major progress in identifying the learning outcomes unique to the university and the degree programs; clearly describing the meaning of a Cal Lutheran baccalaureate degree as its admission standards, general degree standards, general education, and graduation requirements for majors and minors; and offering multiple reviews of the curriculum through peers, faculty curricular oversight, and external reviews (CFR 2.2-4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

Progress in creating unique learning outcomes at the institutional level and program level is evidenced through curriculum maps and assessment documents available on the university web site. Admission standards, general education requirements, and graduation requirements are clearly articulated in the course catalog and posted on the university web site. In the team's meeting with Cal Lutheran academic leaders, individuals shared in some detail the process of ensuring that signature assignments are identified and used to measure SLOs in programs. Through interviews with deans and program chairs, as well as a review of multiple sample program reviews, the team discovered that the Cal Lutheran program review process includes standard and thorough processes and procedures, and that curriculum is reviewed internally and externally, with clear and recorded action items leading to curricular change. Program review is discussed in more detail below (CFR 2.2-4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

Moreover, the leadership's commitment to continuous questioning and renewal of the university's Lutheran heritage was evident in several discussions during the campus visit. For example, members of the WSCUC Steering Committee described their goal to be at the frontier

of “what it means to be Lutheran,” embracing “otherness,” and “struggling with answering the question of how to be Lutheran” at this moment in the history of the university and the United States (CFR 1.1, 4.6).

The team suggests that Cal Lutheran continue to improve its communication and dissemination of information about the system of assessment and quality assurance that informs the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degrees (MQID). The university might benefit from building on its early work and consider adopting or adapting an institution-wide framework for understanding the meaning, quality and integrity of its degree programs.

Cal Lutheran should continue its progress in the assessment of student learning with a consistent practice of including institutional level learning outcomes (ISLOs) and program level outcomes (PLOs) into course syllabi. The team found in interviews that this practice is currently inconsistently applied across courses and programs. This practice raises awareness of the need for tying course level outcomes (CLOs), to PLOs and ISLOs in an intentional and purposeful way, rather than the current practice of “infusing” courses and programs with learning outcomes (CFR 2.3-4, 2.6).

Finally, the meetings with the Core-21 Committee suggested that there is interest in assessing the general education curriculum and requirements. The team encourages the faculty to lead these discussions and map the institutional learning outcomes to the general education experience. The team was not able to meet the taskforce for Core-21 but the team was aware that a structure existed with the charge of reflecting and analyzing the future of the general education. The team would also encourage this taskforce of faculty to benchmark and articulate a clear timeline for completing this effort to the campus; as the future of Core-21 is at the core of understanding the Cal Lutheran academic experience for all undergraduates (CFR 2.2a).

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

The institutional essay on Component Four discusses the methods the university uses for direct measures, including institution-level SLOs, signature assignments in each course that map to SLOs, General Education Core outcomes, program reviews, and multiple indirect measures such as the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Through evidence provided in appendices to the self-study, as well as probing in interviews with faculty and program chairs, the team was pleased to see that the university has embedded Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) into program requirements and courses; ensured that assessment of SLOs for 2000-2006 was done in a comprehensive manner; and mapped SLOs to WSCUC core competencies (CFR 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

Nearly 15 years ago, Cal Lutheran began collecting data as evidence to demonstrate student achievement of learning outcomes through the Written Communication, Information Literacy and Critical Thinking (WIC) project. The institutional report presents strong evidence and a detailed description of the focus on information literacy. With respect to the areas of written communication and critical thinking, the team learned during our campus visit that the faculty have recognized that the Core-21 is due for an “overhaul” and that the faculty who initially oversaw the Core-21 creation are largely retired, and many newer faculty members do not feel invested in the framework. The faculty is now planning a task force to revisit the Core-21 and its associated core competencies (CFR 2.2a).

To date, signature assignments to demonstrate this achievement have been identified and mapped to SLOs in some, but not all programs. The team encourages Cal Lutheran to continue

its work to ensure ongoing and consistent attention to measuring the five core competencies – writing, oral communication, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and information literacy. Cal Lutheran graduates demonstrate having met the core competencies through the SLOs described above, through successfully completing the required Core-21, and through triangulation of SLO signature assignment scores with National Survey of Student Engagement data. In addition, each CLU student is expected to graduate with a clear sense of vocation in that they know how they will use their educational experience to have a positive impact on society. The demonstration of having met this graduation requirement begins with the First Year Experience course, continues in faculty advising, and is reinforced in multiple co-curricular activities that are indirectly assessed through surveys (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6).

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

The collaboration among a number of dedicated offices and individuals has contributed to the significant overall progress of student success at Cal Lutheran in the last few years. Under the leadership of the provost, the offices of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research, Student Success, the Registrar, and various colleges and programs coordinated their plans and provided information and guidance to faculty and students. The well-coordinated efforts resulted in improved student success and better assessment of student learning outcomes, retention, and graduation. The outstanding work of the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research was particularly commendable. This team of professionals provided the leadership and expertise that were instrumental in spearheading the learning outcomes assessment and program review processes, and the university has made significant progress since the last comprehensive

review. The office also collects comprehensive data sets on student retention and graduation that were valuable for outcome assessment and academic planning (CFR 1.2, 2.7, 2.10).

Cal Lutheran defines student success as the students' ability to persist, make continuous progress toward and complete a credential, certificate or degree program. For traditional undergraduate students, student success includes continuous enrollment and degree completion. Recognizing that non-traditional undergraduate and graduate students may experience family and career demands that require non-enrollment for a short period, the university defines success as maintained enrollment within an academic year rather than continuous, semester-by-semester enrollment.

The institution appointed a Director of Retention in 2007 and formed a team of key administrators and faculty members to focus on a comprehensive student success study. The resulting Cal Lutheran Retention Reports "One Student at a Time" and the "Student Achievement Report" offered the staff, faculty, and decision-makers an insightful data source to plan for improvement. To improve the four-year graduation rate among students in the traditional undergraduate programs, Cal Lutheran introduced the "4 to Finish" Graduation Guarantee Program to motivate and assist students to complete their programs in four years. This is a relatively new program but some early outcomes have demonstrated its potential effectiveness. The program provides motivation and planning assistance to students, even in the situation wherein the students were not able to complete their degree in four years. It is commendable that Cal Lutheran has taken a comprehensive and focused effort to measure and share student success rates. The student success team has learned from many of its past and ongoing initiatives and continues to explore multiple ways to improve the outcomes (CFR 2.10, 2.12, 2.13).

The institution reported a second-year retention rate of 85 percent and an overall six-year graduation rate of 70 percent for 2013. The four-year graduation rate increased from 58 percent in 2013 to 67 percent in 2014, reflecting a multi-year effort to improve the four-year graduation rate. The overall retention rate and graduation rates are not significantly different from the institution's comparison group; however, there was noticeable deviation among subgroups of students. The most significant gap exists between the overall rates and those of the African-Americans and Pacific Islanders, as demonstrated in the Institutional Summary Report. There is no clear evidence that the offices in charge of the student success efforts have identified specific factors contributing to the lower success rates among the African-American and Pacific Islander students, or are engaged in a targeted approach to their retention and success. Although efforts to analyze the needs of African American male students have begun, it is critical for Cal Lutheran to study this significant achievement gap and establish a measurable goal and timeline to narrow the gap (2.10).

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

California Lutheran has been able to improve the program review process with the integration of action plans into the budgeting and planning requests (CFR 2.4, 2.7, 4.1, 4.6). The availability and standardization of data that are presented to programs has helped inform the planning and review process for departments at all levels of institutional planning (CFR 4.2). The process and structures are clearly articulated to the faculty, which is a necessary condition for sustained assessment efforts (CFR 2.4, 3.3, 4.5). During the visit, many faculty members expressed support for and endorsed the role of the program review in making programmatic,

curricular, and strategic decisions for their individual programs. They expressed a deep appreciation for the expertise and support of the EEIR staff and were genuinely enthusiastic about the transformative experience in preparing the self-study as well as the external visit itself.

The assessment of the program review process has resulted in tangible, demonstrable changes for all constituents including, but not limited to: adjusting program review schedules, adding meetings with key administrators, updating guidelines and forms, and having a more formalized process for departments that request postponements (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7). Raising awareness of outcomes and assessment through poster sessions and campus-wide development opportunities are also noteworthy and creative.

In deeper examination of program review samples, however, the team noted the wide range in terms of the quality and depth of these reviews in informing curricular and programmatic changes. The program review process is an intensive one, and there is a delicate balancing act between the current state and assessment culture within any specified department and/or program and the openness of faculty to change. Continued training and preparation, along with sharing of best practices and support from the EEIR office and widely-communicated expectations for review standards and follow-up, will go far to enhance consistency, and the university is doing much in this regard. The process may also benefit from expanding the single external reviewer to a team-model allowing for multiple perspectives. If the cost is too prohibitive, the institution may consider a team made up of one external member and two other internal faculty members from different but related disciplines. Departments may also want to consider how to include their adjunct faculty members in the program review process to ensure full participation – at least for those who have served in the department for an extended time period.

Finally, many faculty members expressed concerns regarding the follow-through and action plans that conclude the program review process. They supported the idea of having progress reports annually or bi-annually where they could revise, update, and modify the action plans to best reflect the actions taken and changes made since the initial draft. A formalized, systematic process for preserving this type of institutional memory and conversations within a department could be helpful to all involved. In general, there was great enthusiasm for the program review process and for the impact the process has on the learning and shaping of the student experience (CFR 2.3, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Cal Lutheran has clearly shown an institutional commitment to centralizing the institutional research capacity within the senior ranks of the administration (CFR 4.2-4.7). The stability and expertise of the EEIR staff is one of the most notable strengths of the institution. Relying on the expertise of a well-staffed, knowledgeable, and intentional EEIR for data-driven decisions is important, as referenced by various university constituents. For example, faculty and chairs described a very responsive EEIR team that assisted faculty in the program review process by monitoring progress, providing structure and data analysis, explaining and analyzing relevant data points (e.g. enrollment patterns, major demographics, graduation rates, etc.) and ensuring compliance with state and federal requirements for each individual program and degree. The EEIR team also provides consulting to individual faculty on a wide variety of research needs and provides access to the data warehouse for self-service. In all of the meetings, all constituents knew where to go to request institutional data and the EEIR staff's reputation as being responsive, professional, and timely were touted as their greatest strengths.

All higher education institutions are being affected by "survey fatigue" and the reliance on indirect evidence to satisfy assessment efforts. Like other institutions, Cal Lutheran would

benefit from an assessment of the usefulness of the data that are being collected through the surveys at Cal Lutheran. Consistently low response rates seem to suggest there may be room for the campus to be more strategic and thoughtful about sampling, coordinating, and marketing the various surveys, forms, and/or other requests for student, faculty and staff input and opinion. Furthermore, many constituents on campus are not aware of the results from these surveys. The team heard several suggestions for dissemination of results, including: a presentation and forum where the audience is able to interact with the findings, infographics and other summarized reports, mechanisms for self-service data access, and a careful consideration of how various populations might engage with the results. Faculty members shared that, while these data are available to them, they would value more assistance from EEIR in making better use of the data in order to triangulate their own program review results. One staff member recommended that the EEIR team revive a past practice of large meetings to review and discuss surveys, so all could better understand and determine how best to use the results.

The EEIR staff has a firm grasp on short- and long-term projects and priorities for the campus. These range from developing more effective dashboards to streamlining data collection, analysis, and reporting efforts. The office has also begun planning for an office program review and is modeling for administrative assessment cycles and processes.

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Based on the most recent audited financial statement (for the year ended May 31, 2014), the institution's financial viability has improved significantly in the past five years. Cash and cash equivalents increased from \$13.4 million to \$48.2 million, net assets increased from \$114.1

million to \$215.3 million, and endowment grew from \$41.8 million to \$86.2 million. The more favorable economic and market conditions in California have contributed to the improved financial position; additionally, the institution's efforts in new program development and student recruitment have yielded higher student headcounts and higher tuition revenues over the past five years. Tuition rate increases and an increase in student enrollment have resulted in a significant increase of net revenues and improved the financial viability of the institution. Thanks to the capable fiscal and budget management, Cal Lutheran is financially sound and well positioned to sustain its quality educational operation (CFR 3.4, 3.5).

Responding to higher enrollment, as mentioned above, Cal Lutheran has increased the number of full-time faculty members as well as the overall increased number of sections and percentage of student credit units taught by full-time faculty.

Cal Lutheran currently has 190 full-time faculty members and 253 part-time faculty members for 35 undergraduate majors, 16 master's degrees, 13 credential and certificate programs, and three doctoral degrees. In response to previous WSCUC substantive change reviews, Cal Lutheran has focused its faculty-related efforts to limit faculty overload and mentor faculty engagement in online teaching. The number of full-time faculty was significantly increased from 2009 to 2012, along with an increase of salaries (CFR 3.1).

A noticeable fact is that these improved financial outcomes and investment in faculty and staff were achieved without significant incurrence of long-term debt. While the combination of a high growth of revenues and limited increase (or decrease) of long-term debt yields a positive financial position, it is critical that Cal Lutheran continues to invest in infrastructure and educational facilities to sustain and support the student population growth and changing modes

of education delivery. Since 2006, Cal Lutheran has improved and added a number of facilities, including a sport and fitness center, a baseball field, a new facilities building and yard, and stadium and gallery, and the Swenson Center for Social and Behavioral Sciences. The team also learned about plans for future program space and new buildings for art and art history as well as the sciences.

The main campus in Thousand Oaks is approaching its capacity to accommodate the increased student enrollment and the associated increases in numbers of faculty and staff. It would be difficult for the university to continue the enrollment growth in its traditional, on-ground programs without a significant investment in academic facilities and offices for faculty and staff (CFR 3.1, 3.4, 3.5).

To cope with the increasing need for classroom space, Cal Lutheran revised its class schedule to introduce more flexibility, which resulted in increased classroom capacity by over 100 class slots, without building additional classrooms. The arrangement has provided more flexibility to scheduling and relief to the need for classrooms. The university has also significantly strengthened its online and offsite education program offerings through the Bachelor's Degree for Professionals and a number of graduate programs.

To improve pedagogy and educational quality, in light of the increased online and hybrid courses, Cal Lutheran has expanded its instructional mentoring and support for faculty. The team observed that the institution has expanded services of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) by appointing a full-time CTL director, a director for distance learning, two instructional designers, and an instructional tech support. Well-qualified leaders and competent staff of these offices have provided systematic and comprehensive training to all faculty members engaged in

online and hybrid teaching. Based on observation and review of the course training materials, the team concluded that faculty members have received adequate preparation and qualification before the assignment to teach online or hybrid courses. The CTL and the Director of Distance Learning regularly monitor instructional activities online to assure educational quality and to provide needed assistance to instructors. University curriculum and course oversight committees, such as the Educational Effectiveness Committee, also rely on the CTL's expertise to evaluate new course proposals and monitor educational effectiveness through the assessment and program review processes (CFR 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7).

Cal Lutheran also offers graduate programs at various satellite sites in Oxnard, Woodland Hills, Westlake, Santa Maria, and in Berkeley through the recent merger with the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary (PLTS). These centers are geographically closer to the areas of student concentration to reduce commuting and quicker responses to student demands. Some of these additional locations could also relieve the increasing pressure on space for classrooms and offices on the Thousand Oaks campus. Facilities and services at satellite sites are generally adequate for the programs offered, and the team heard about procedures to assure that faculty members and staff are available to provide services and advisement to students at these locations. The team observed that the university has been responsive to facilities and other support needs at satellite locations. For example, new offices for full-time faculty, student work areas, and classroom facilities have been recently added to the Oxnard campus, and a writing center staff person is available every day to the students who spend most of their time at the Oxnard site. Due to the rapid growth in graduate program enrollment and the expansion into new locations, Cal Lutheran has had to address a number of logistical and facilities challenges associated with newer locations, in particular the Westlake facility (for example, parking limitations). The

institution needs to continue monitoring the support and facility conditions, and to solicit feedback from the students, in order to ensure a safe and effective learning environment for student success (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.5).

The team observes that Cal Lutheran has taken steps to strengthen and realign its graduate programs since the previous review. For example, the Graduate School of Psychology encompasses all graduate programs in the fields of psychology as well as the new Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (Psy.D.), which was established with an emphasis on full-time faculty as well as achievement of accreditation by the American Psychological Association (with a visit scheduled in 2015). Other “orphaned” graduate programs were brought under the leadership and structure of the School of Management. These are significant steps toward assuring the quality and vitality of graduate education at Cal Lutheran, as is the recent merger with the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary.

The rapid growth of the graduate programs through distance education and expansion of multiple sites has created challenges that require a highly coordinated leadership structure. The individuals engaged in the graduate programs are subject experts and very capable in their areas of responsibilities; however, there is a need to fill critical leadership positions to better coordinate among various offices involved in graduate education. Cal Lutheran graduate programs are significantly different from the traditional undergraduate programs, and the growth, success, and quality of graduate education depend on an effective and concerted collaboration among the provost office, facilities, colleges and departments, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and student success offices.

Through its review of materials and conversations on campus, the team concluded that the current structure for graduate education within the university (with the understandable dominance of undergraduate programs) may not fully support the complexity of the graduate offerings, respond to the needs of graduate programs, or promote and enhance graduate education as a hallmark of Cal Lutheran. For example, the Graduate Council and the Graduate and Professional Education Committee (GPEC) have responsibility for the oversight of graduate education and quality assurance. But there is no one office whose purpose it is to advance graduate education as a whole and to represent graduate education in decision making and strategic priorities. A previous associate provost position with responsibility for graduate education no longer exists. The team heard small examples that reflect the larger issue: classrooms often locked on weekends, when graduate instruction may occur; no guarantee of representation from the graduate division (or discipline) on promotion and tenure committees; an emphasis on undergraduate student research with no corresponding broad focus or resources for graduate student research. Several people observed during our visit that while the GPEC functions well and plays a positive role, the structure to advance graduate education has not kept up with the reality of Cal Lutheran in 2015. Based on the growth and diversity of graduate programs, California Lutheran should reconsider the structure and leadership that supports and promotes graduate education at a high level at the university, in order to raise its profile, capacity and visibility (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).

H. Component 8 Response: Co-Curriculum

As a residential university, the student co-curricular experience is an equally important component to assess in the overall well-being of the student and his or her experience. Many

offices at Cal Lutheran have demonstrated their commitment to contributing to the institutional learning outcomes through the alignment of program goals (CFR 2.11). These efforts seem to be at the beginning stages of the assessment cycle as they rely primarily on self-reflection and surveys (for example, pre-post designs and other evaluation forms to measure satisfaction). The co-curricular directors expressed a commitment to assessment, data-collection, and reporting. Some steps for systematizing assessment efforts for the co-curricular programs could include: Collecting and analyzing information for attendance and/or participation in key signature student affairs events and programming, reporting on goals and highlights for each of the co-curricular units in a collective annual report; and triangulating survey data, academic performance measures, and co-curricular participation.

There is an opportunity to move beyond the pre-post-survey design and self-evaluations and be creative in the type of direct evidence being collected within the co-curricular offices. Student affairs leaders mentioned their interest in engaging with a more rigorous program review model for co-curricular units. Triangulating these data to truly understand student success at Cal Lutheran will enhance the institution's ability to make strategic and impactful decisions (CFR 2.10-2.12).

First-year programming remains at the forefront of the programmatic concerns within student affairs. Ranging from orientation to the first-year retreat, students are well prepared to transition into college life. The first-year retreat, where 15-30 students are identified as needing more intentional space for building community and connecting with other students, is a unique effort to target disengaged first-year students. Initial anecdotal evidence suggests these students have been retained and are engaging both academically and socially. This type of intensive experience is meaningful and should be thoughtfully assessed. These cohorts can be followed to

understand outcomes beyond the first year. In general, the team's conversation with the student affairs staff suggested that there is an opportunity to think about programming for students beyond their first year. For example, some highlights of the co-curricular include a thoughtful assessment of international study abroad programs, the participation of over 50% of students in internships, and the sharing of information utilizing "The Hub" and other social media outlets.

There was some evidence to suggest that the evaluation forms resulted in informed decision-making. One staff member commented that the move-in date was changed after realizing the need to separate orientation programming days with the logistics of moving into residence halls. Students involved in the meeting reported that they understand the purpose of the events that are hosted by the institution as well as the overall learning outcomes associated with those events. They also reported that they feel that they have a voice in the co-curricular programming.

The team would have benefitted from hearing from more students in terms of their co-curricular and academic experiences. Unfortunately, only four students (three of whom are also staff members) attended the student forum, and thus we could not gauge the anecdotal evidence of the student experience at Cal Lutheran. Echoing the findings from the self-study, more documentation of the continuous assessment conducted within each unit would support the integration of institutional learning outcomes within the co-curricular sphere.

I. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The concluding essay of the California Lutheran University *Institutional Report* highlights progress since the 2007 review, in particular in the areas of the assessment of student learning (including the articulation and measurement of program learning outcomes and student

learning outcomes), the development of student success initiatives, co-curricular learning, financial stability and facilities improvements, and diversity. As areas for continued improvement identified through the review process, the essay mentions clarification of the student grievance and student petition processes, refinement of processes and responsibilities for measuring attainment of core competencies, and continuing improvement on measuring student learning outcomes, for example in course-level signature assignments and development of course assessment rubrics.

The team agrees in general with the report's summary, though—as described above—the team concludes that Cal Lutheran must make more substantial, measurable, and cultural progress on diversity at all levels and in all areas of the institution.

SECTION III: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

California Lutheran University is a relatively young academic institution, with a rich heritage, a strong sense of mission and community, and committed leadership. One of the themes emerging from the campus visit, in multiple conversations and setting, was a sense that, in spite of growth in size, diversity, degree programs, locations, methods of delivery, and resources, the university is “catching up with” the reality of what it is, “managing the change that has already happened,” or “growing up.” Of course there is much evidence that the university is responding and managing change quite effectively, even commendably, especially though its strategic planning process and transparent financial planning priorities, as well as the development of academic assessment, efforts to strengthen graduate programs and schools, and attention to student success and completion.

Still, the team would highlight three areas in particular in which Cal Lutheran should bring its structures, process, and resources in line with both the current reality of the university as well as the wider higher education environment: diversity, faculty governance, and graduate education. These issues are described more fully above. Here the team offers the following commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

Based on the team’s review of California Lutheran’s accreditation history as well as the institutional report and supporting documents, and our meetings and conversations during the on-site visit, the team has developed a set of commendations and recommendations. The team commends California Lutheran University for:

- A commitment to the Lutheran tradition that supports education in its broadest sense, resulting in interfaith dialogue, inclusion of multiple faith traditions in courses, and openness of the University chapel to all groups.
- A strong culture and identity that is recognized by constituents across the university.
- A focus on student success, exhibited by faculty and staff at all levels, and demonstrated in initiatives and interventions that have resulted in increased four-year graduation rates and overall improved student outcomes.
- A recent history of financial sustainability and a thoughtful budget process that is transparent.
- A living strategic plan that is key to program reviews and budget requests.
- Thoughtful commitment to changing modes of delivering courses: off-site, hybrid, and online.
- The instrumental role of the office of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research in providing data and consultation necessary for program reviews and other campus-wide efforts for improvement.
- An engaged and supportive Board.

Recommendations

- California Lutheran must operationalize the 2007 WSCUC recommendations to diversify the faculty, staff, students and board by creating policies and processes that meet measurable expectations (CFR 1.4, 3.1, 4.6, 4.7).
- To further develop the diversity imperative for the institution, the California Lutheran community should engage in a broad and deep discussion of the institutional mission and

culture, and review data about representational diversity among students, staff, administrators, faculty, and board members, the role of the curriculum, the co-curricular environment, and the processes in place to achieve diversity in its broadest definition (CFR 1.4, 2.10, 3.1, 3.7, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).

- California Lutheran should review best practices in shared governance and consider the university's faculty governance structure, in light of expansion in graduate programs, the dispersed locations for delivery of programs, and multiple academic units, in order to strengthen and enhance a focused faculty role (CFR 3.2, 3.10, 4.6, 4.7).
- Based on the growth and diversity of graduate programs, California Lutheran should reconsider the structure and leadership that supports and promotes graduate education at a high level at the university, in order to raise its profile, capacity and visibility (CFR 2.2b, 3.1, 3.10, 4.7).

APPENDICES

Federal Requirement 1: Credit Hour and Program Length Review

Materials Reviewed	Questions/Comments	
Policy on credit hour	<p>Is this policy easily accessible? Where is the policy located?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registrar - Graduate: http://www.callutheran.edu/registrar/graduate/#course_load • Registrar - Undergraduate: http://www.callutheran.edu/registrar/undergraduate/#course_load • Carnegie Hours definition and application: http://www.callutheran.edu/assessment/resources/assessment_tools.php • University Catalog: http://catalog.callutheran.edu/grad/academicpolicies/ • Resources for faculty and for adjuncts – Syllabus template: http://www.callutheran.edu/academic_affairs/faculty_resources/NEWfacultyresources.php http://www.callutheran.edu/academic_affairs/adjunct_resources/AdjunctResourcesandForms.php <p>Comments:</p> <p>Over the last four years, Cal Lutheran did a comprehensive review of the courses for how they demonstrate compliance with the standards for Carnegie Instructional hours. Cal Lutheran asked faculty to provide, in every syllabus, a formal explanation and details about how the course meets the university credit hour policy. Credit hour issues are addressed by the following groups: department chairs; deans and program directors; the General Education Committee reviews syllabi for proposed changes to courses for meeting general education (CORE 21) credit requirements.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Committee reviews all new undergraduate course proposals and the Graduate and Professional Education Committee reviews all graduate course proposals.</p> <p>Administratively, the university Registrar’s office reviews each individual proposed course scheduled for meeting the university credit hour policy before publishing that course in the course schedule.</p>	Yes
Process(es)/ periodical review of credit hour	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for periodical review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable?</p> <p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>See above. In addition, Cal Lutheran requires departments, as part of their program review self-study, to reflect on and show evidence of how courses meet the university credit hour policy. Deans and the Director of Educational Effectiveness assure that the program review documents and course syllabi address the credit hour policies at the time departments submit the program review self-studies. Course change proposals now receive additional scrutiny at multiple layers for adherence to the university’s credit hour policy (via the “course leaf” software -- specifically: proposing faculty, chairs, deans, university level committees, and the provost).</p>	Yes Yes

Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	<p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Most of the traditional undergraduate courses are on-ground courses with some components of instructor-led activities delivered through Blackboard or other hybrid methods.</p>	Yes
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? <u>60</u></p> <p>Type of courses reviewed: <u>Online and hybrid</u></p> <p>What degree level(s)? <u>Undergraduate, Masters, and Doctoral</u></p> <p>What discipline(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bachelor's Degree for Professional • Master of Business Administration (MBA) Online • MBA in Financial Planning • Doctorate in Clinical Psychology • Ed.D. in Education Leadership <p>Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</p>	Yes
Sample program information	<p>How many programs were reviewed? <u>5</u></p> <p>What kinds of programs were reviewed? <u>Online and hybrid</u></p> <p>What degree level(s)? <u>Master's</u></p> <p>What discipline(s)? <u>Business Administration, Education, and Psychology</u></p> <p>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Program requirements are available at http://catalog.callutheran.edu/; http://www.callutheran.edu/admission/undergraduate/majors/; http://www.callutheran.edu/admission/graduate/</p>	Yes

Federal Requirement 2: MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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: California Lutheran University follows all federal regulations and abides by the National Association of Collegiate Admission Counseling's Statement of Principles of Good Practice.	
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: Graduation rates are actively published in recruitment collateral and on the University's website www.callutheran.edu/factbook Cost of Attendance figures, including a calculator into which students may input their financial aid and calculate their balance and payment options, are on the website.	
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: Cal Lutheran posts survey data of graduates on the admission web pages (http://www.callutheran.edu/admission/ ; http://www.callutheran.edu/admission/undergraduate/ ; http://www.callutheran.edu/admission/graduate/) and in collateral recruitment materials. Students may browse by major to research how their degree makes them qualified for specific jobs. The University has embarked on delivering additional survey results on employment outcomes for specific programs (this includes post-baccalaureate programs).	

*§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: Lori Williams

Date: April 13, 2015

Federal Requirement 3: Student Complaints Review

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments	
Policy on Student Complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?</p>	Yes
	<p>Is the policy publicly available?</p>	Yes
	<p>http://www.callutheran.edu/student_life/student_handbook/ See specifically, http://www.callutheran.edu/student_life/student_handbook/documents/Student%20Grievance%20Procedures.pdf and http://www.callutheran.edu/student_life/student_handbook/documents/Residence%20Life%20Grievance%20Procedures.pdf</p>	Yes
	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:</p> <p>There are detailed steps and explanations of how the university must respond to each student complaint in the documents listed above. While the specifics are confidential, past student grievances have resulted in swift and decisive correctional steps (e.g., formal reprimand, additional training, and in a few extreme cases invitations to resign or face dismissal. The campus security personnel handle all required reports of potential criminal behavior.</p>	Yes
	<p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</p> <p>There are regular sessions at the Fall and Winter faculty retreats on appropriate and professional standards. See also the Faculty Handbook https://currentcatalog.callutheran.edu/handbook/ The Center for Teaching and Learning provides training for general issues related to compliance with professional behavior in the classroom The Counseling Center, the Student Life offices, and the Veterans Affairs coordinator provide training to assure equality and justice on campus All faculty and staff complete required sexual harassment training. The Faculty Affairs and Development Committee review and approve potential disciplinary action policies for grievances against faculty.</p>	Yes
	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Cal Lutheran affirms the housing of all records of student grievances in the Academic Affairs office.</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: The Academic Affairs and the Student Life personnel annually review the student complaints to assess patterns and trends.</p>	Yes

Review Completed By: Hanna Spinosa

Date: April 27, 2015

Federal Requirement 4: Transfer Credit Review

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments	
Transfer Credit policy(s)	<p data-bbox="581 306 1203 363">Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit?</p> <p data-bbox="581 396 1255 453">Is the policy publicly available? http://catalog.callutheran.edu/undergraduate/academicpolicies/</p> <p data-bbox="581 487 1268 575">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?</p> <p data-bbox="581 609 708 636">Comments:</p> <p data-bbox="581 669 1255 726">The transfer policy is available at http://catalog.callutheran.edu/undergraduate/academicpolicies/</p> <p data-bbox="581 760 1281 816">Transfer Credits and Limitations on Credit. It is also available at http://catalog.callutheran.edu/grad/academicpolicies/</p>	<p data-bbox="1308 306 1357 333">Yes</p> <p data-bbox="1308 396 1357 424">Yes</p> <p data-bbox="1308 487 1357 514">Yes</p>

Review Completed By: Mike Lee

Date: April 20, 2015

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary

Type of Visit: Offsite Review of California Lutheran University - New Merger

Name of reviewer/s: Mike Lee & Lori Williams

Date/s of review: December 3, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. 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.

1. Site Name and Address

Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary
2770 Marin AVE
Berkeley, CA 94708

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

Programs Offered:

- Master of Divinity — 4 years of preparation for ordination, including one year of internship.
- Master of Divinity, non-ordination track — 3-year program that does not include a year of internship or other contextual education requirements.
- Master of Theological Studies — 2 years of graduate theological study for a wide range of personal and professional purposes.
- Certificate of Theological Studies — 1-year individualized program for lay church occupations or life enrichment.
- Certificate of Advanced Theological Study (Lutheran Year) — An individualized program beyond the M.Div. or other professional ministry degrees.
- Theological Education for Emerging Ministries (TEEM) Certificate — 3-year program leading to ordained ministry, involving distance education and intensive short courses at the seminary.

FTE faculty = 5

Total enrollment = 60

PLTS was founded in Portland, Oregon in 1910; relocated to Seattle, WA for a number of years; and relocated to its current location in Berkeley, CA in 1952. In 2014, PLTS merged with California Lutheran University. The Masters of Divinity and Masters of Theological Studies degree programs are blended programs in which a portion is completed online, with instruction in these courses through the Moodle learning management system.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

On Wednesday, December 3, 2014, Mike Lee and Lori Williams met with the Director of the Graduate Theological Union's Flora Lamson Hewlett Library and toured the library. Meetings at Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary included the PLTS Interim Dean, Associate Dean, Admissions Director, faculty, and three students, as well as a tour of the campus and its buildings. Also the Provost and Director of Educational Effectiveness and Institutional Research met with Lori and Mike; the President, the VP Administration and Finance, and VP Advancement joined by video conference. Those we met with described the affiliation with the Graduate Theological Union and the recent merger of PLTS with CLU.

By the criteria on the appendix form below, there are no concerns; but the financial viability of the Berkeley campus is a question, and how much CLU can continue to support PLTS.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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 and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)	In complete alignment with mission. Operations and administrative structure nearly completely integrated.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> 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)	Both visible and integral. Administratively consolidated and legally one entity.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> 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)	Beautiful campus – well maintained and managed	
<i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)	Support services well provided for students	
<i>Faculty.</i> 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)	Combination of FT, Part time, and Adjunct faculty teach PLTS students. Faculty have aligned tenure, salary, structure. Faculty work together via video conference and visiting Thousand Oaks and Berkeley.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Programs and courses are designed by PLTS faculty. They differ from those on campus because they are specifically theological.	

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Retention and graduation seems dependent upon continued participation in the GTU for shared courses, faculty research, and library resources.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)</p>	<p>Student learning assessment is well developed and integrated into the CLU system of assessment.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)</p>	<p>PLTS's assurance of the quality of its degrees is integrated into CLU's processes as well.</p>	

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California Lutheran University

Type of Visit: Off Campus Review Visit for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Name of reviewer/s: Teresa Shaw

Date/s of review: April 13, 2015

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed². One form should be used for each site visited. 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.

4. Site Name and Address

California Lutheran University
2201 Outlet Center Drive # 600
Oxnard CA 93036

5. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

The site has been recently remodeled with added facilities.

Degrees Offered:

School of Management

- Flexible MBA
- Full-time MBA
- Master of Public Policy and Administration

Graduate School of Psychology

- M.S. in Counseling Psychology (MFT)
- Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.)

Graduate School of Education

- M.S. in Counseling and Guidance
- M.Ed. in Teacher Leadership
- Multiple Subject (Elementary) Credential
- Single Subject (Secondary) Credential

Bachelors Degree for Professionals

Faculty Headcount (fall 2014): 17 full-time; 21 part-time

² See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

6. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Teresa Shaw visited the Oxnard facility on April 13, 2015, from 12:00 to 4:00. She met with:

- Katherine Gottesman, Site Supervisor
- Bryan Rupley, Site Coordinator,
- Janice Aharon-Ezer, Clinic Director
- Faculty Panel (7 faculty members)
- Student Panel (4 students)

I toured classrooms, student study and lounge areas, and the on-site clinic.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	NA	NA
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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 and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	The site is in keeping with the mission and serves not only the Oxnard community but also graduate and professional students with need for afternoon and evening courses. Some programs delivered exclusively in Oxnard.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> 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)	The people I met with commented that there are meaningful and intentional efforts to connect Oxnard to "Cal Lutheran," to make faculty and students feel connected to the whole university. Administrative connection is strong.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> 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 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The classrooms, technology, and student areas are well-maintained and some recent upgrades include faculty offices and new classrooms. Clinic technology is also being upgraded. The clinic site is attractive and functional.	
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Two regular full-time staff members, one of whom rotates to the Woodland Hills site. Services are offered on-site, including daily writing center staff, and others (e.g. registrar) on a regular schedule. Librarians are very responsive to needs of students at separate facilities, with individual librarians "assigned" to each facility.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is 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, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	The faculty members I spoke with spoke in detail about their role in academic oversight and assessment of student learning. For example several are involved in the APA accreditation process	

	for the Graduate Psychology program. Others spoke about the integration of state-level as well as institutional-and program-level learning outcomes in the organizational behavior and education programs. The IR staff regularly meet with faculty to discuss data and research questions.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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)	The courses and programs are overseen by respective deans and faculty committees, and ultimately by the core faculty governance committees of the university. Most are available at more than one facility, with the exception of the PsyD program, which is offered only in Oxnard. As such they are integrated into the fabric of broader university offerings, oversight, and quality assurance.	
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	We reviewed retention and graduation rates for all locations. The overall retention rates at Oxnard are comparable to total Cal Lutheran figures, with some variation (higher and lower) by program and cohort year, e.g. SOM. Likewise the overall graduation rates are comparable, if somewhat lower for graduate programs (again with variation by program and cohort year). The 4-yr graduation rates for the bachelor's degree for professionals program are higher at Oxnard in recent years than main campus rates.	
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	See above. The assessment of student learning at the Oxnard site is integrated into the larger Cal Lutheran programs. The PsyD program, offered only at Oxnard, has been designed from inception around APA expectations for assessment.	
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Quality assurance related to the off-campus locations, including Oxnard, is integrated into central programs, faculty governance committees, institutional research, etc.	

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: California Lutheran University

Name of reviewer/s: Lori Williams

Date/s of review: April 14-15, 2015

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs³ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

MBA in Financial Planning

Online MBA

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

Programs and Degree Levels - The School of Management offers fully-online General MBA and MBA in Financial Planning degrees. The Bachelor's Degree for Professionals offers a fully-online Organizational Leadership degree. Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary (PLTS) offers partial fulfillment of its Masters of Divinity and Masters of Theological Studies degree programs online.

History of Distance Education – The MBA in Financial Planning degree was the first fully online program at Cal Lutheran (2005). The General MBA was offered fully online in 2008. The Org Leadership program was first offered fully online in 2010. PLTS offered online courses in Fall 2013, after approval from the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools.

Percentage Growth in Offerings and Enrollments – The MBA in Financial Planning Program has grown by 86% since it first started (59 students in 05-06 vs 110 students in 13-14). The online MBA program has also grown tremendously since it was first offered (324% increase). Between both programs there was a total FTE of 149 in the 13-14 academic year.

Platforms, Formats and Delivery Method - The fully-online General MBA, MBA in Financial Planning and Organizational Leadership degrees provide instruction through the Blackboard learning management system and conduct weekly live chats via Blackboard's Collaborate. PLTS provides instruction for its online Masters of Divinity and Masters of Theological Studies degree programs through the Moodle learning management system.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

³ See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

Material examined:

Sample online courses

GPEC's Quality Standards for Delivery of CLU's Hybrid and Fully Online Graduate Courses

GPEC's Course Development Process

Blended Learning Guidebook - <http://www.callutheran.edu/ctl/research-scholarship/>

Blackboard Resources for Faculty - <http://www.callutheran.edu/ctl/services/blackboard-faculty.php>

Persons Interviewed:

Harry Starn, Jr., Director of Distance Learning, Director of Financial Planning Program

Dr. Cynthia De Martino, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>2012-17 Strategic Plan states “will add hybrid and fully online programs for graduate students and non-traditional undergrad students and will expand the use of online instruction in the traditional undergrad program as appropriate.”</p> <p>There is a systematic course development process that involves the department chairs, dean, director of distance learning, CTL and distance learning group. The courses are funded from the Distance Learning budget. (Refer to attached course development process doc.)</p>	<p>As enrollments in hybrid and online programs grow, it will be necessary to determine that sufficient additional resources are added in the form of faculty professional development and instructional design staff.</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Local students are encouraged to take a combination of in-class and online classes.</p> <p>All distance-learning students take part in online orientations, invited to attend events at the university and are included in student support services (e.g., career center).</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>The Blackboard and Moodle LMS platforms support high levels of interaction between students and faculty.</p> <p>Technology is supported through Cal Lutheran's Center for Teaching and Learning and ISS Help Desk. The learning management system is backed up off-site.</p>	

<p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>Distant-learning students obtain academic advising and mentoring from program faculty and administrators. Research databases and inter-library loans are available through the Pearson Library; moreover, information specialists are available for consultations.</p> <p>Retention and graduation rates for online students are improving year over year for the MBA program. The BA Professionals online retention rates are lower than their face to face counterparts and year over year are roughly flat. .</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>Courses are taught by a combination of FT, PT and adjunct faculty. The actual percentages vary by program.</p> <p>Local faculty tend to teach a combination of in-class and virtual classes, while faculty living out of state teach only online.</p> <p>Faculty attends orientations and LMS training and program leadership communicate program-specific expectations. Some programs actively mentor new faculty.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>Programs are designed by Program Directors or Department Chairs, under the review of their Dean. Curriculum needs is approved by faculty governance (GPEC or EPPC).</p> <p>Faculty work with instructional designers in mapping course activities to learning outcomes. The Director of Distance Learning or CTL ensures that the course adheres to the quality standards for delivery of an online course.</p> <p>Content and expectations for student learning outcomes are equivalent for classroom and online learners.</p> <p>Carnegie Hour tables are included in syllabi and sample tables are provided in the Quality Standards document.</p>	

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Data is collected for online and on-ground retention and graduation rates. The 4 yr. average 7 year or less graduation rate is 57% for online students. That is a 24% gap with on-ground students who have a 4 yr. average 7 year or less graduation rate of 81%. This is being addressed through expanded academic assistance programs to improve assistance to all students at risk. Developing a readiness self-assessment tutorial to help students prepare for enrollment in online courses.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes are the same online as on-ground. Assessments are mapped to the SLOs.</p> <p>Programs collect evidence and assess during program reviews.</p> <p>Both programs are currently going through their program review cycle. Data is not yet available.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>Technology vendors include: Blackboard, Moodle Rooms and Panopto.</p> <p>All courses are fully developed internally by faculty.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>GPEC adopted minimum quality standards for delivery of hybrid and fully-online graduate-level courses. Programs may elect to adopt quality standards for distant-learning courses that exceed these foundational delivery standards. (Refer to doc)</p>	