REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To   California State University, Fullerton

October 1-3, 2019

Team Roster
Dr. Dorothy Leland, Chair, Chancellor Emerita, UC Merced
Mr. Les Kong, Assistant Chair, Librarian Emeritus, CSU San Bernardino
Dr. Rebecca Hong, Senior Director of Educational Effectiveness
and Assessment, Loyola Marymount University
Dr. Mike Lee, Vice President of Administration & Business
Affairs Emeritus, CSU Sacramento
Dr. Hector Sambolin, Jr., Associate Dean for Academic Affairs,
Academic Success and Assessment, Pomona College

Dr. Barbara Gross Davis, WSCUC Liaison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) is situated on 241 acres in the city of Fullerton, 30 miles southeast of central Los Angeles. Excerpts from its mission statement state:

"California State University, Fullerton enriches the lives of students and inspires them to thrive in a global environment. We cultivate lifelong habits of scholarly inquiry, critical and creative thinking, dynamic inclusivity, and social responsibility. Rooted in the strength of our diversity and immersive experiences, we embolden Titans to become intellectual, community, and economic leaders who shape the future."

Founded in 1957, the institution is one of 23 campuses in the California State University (CSU), the nation's largest 4-year public university system. Its fall 2019 enrollment stood at 39,868, and ranked #1 among campuses in the CSU, in terms of student enrollment (*CSU Factbook, 2019*). Fifty-seven per cent of its students are female. The average age of a student is 24, while the median age is 22. According to the university's student demographic data, 43.8% of its population is Hispanic/Latinx, 20.5% Asian-American, 19.3% White, 2% African-American, and .1% Native-American. Notably 29.9% are first-generation attending students. Primarily a commuter campus, the university has a modest student resident population of 1,980. CSUF has been designated a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). It is comprised of eight colleges -- College of the Arts, College of Communications, College of Education, College of Engineering and Computer Science, College of Health and Human Development, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the Mihaylo College of Business and Economics. The top four colleges in student enrollment are respectively, the

Mihaylo College of Business and Economics; the College of Humanities and Social Sciences; the College of Health and Human Development; and the College of Engineering and Computer Science. It offers 56 undergraduate and 54 graduate degrees, including three doctoral degrees (Education Leadership, EdD; Doctor of Nursing Practice, DNP; and Doctor of Nursing Practice, Nurse Anesthesia concentration, DNP). Undergraduate degree programs predominate, as 87.3% of students are undergraduates (*CSU Facts: Fall 2019*).

CSUF was approved for Reaffirmation in 2012 for eight years. The interim report in 2015 identified the following issues which the institution was to address: strategic planning, assessment, advising, and finances. The CSUF Irvine Center offers mostly upper-division and graduate level courses in a convenient location for students who live and/or work in southern Orange County. Other campus satellite locations include the Grand Central Art Center in Santa Ana; and the CSUF Garden Grove Center. The institution offers thirteen fully online degree programs. The team reviewed the Irvine Center site, and the Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration, Professional Business online degree program.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

After conducting the Offsite Review April 29-30, 2019, the team met with and conducted interviews on campus with the institution's leadership, including the president, his cabinet, the *WSCUC* Steering Committee, deans and associate deans, department chairs, as well as with key administrators from various units. The team also met with the Associated Students Inc. (ASI) leadership, and held open forums with faculty, staff, and students. It also examined documentation provided prior to, and during the visit,

especially the material in the team room. Comments by the campus community via the confidential email account were also reviewed. The team appreciated the technology support, comfortable meeting rooms, and overall hospitality provided by the institution.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The institution's report was clearly written and well organized. It was apparent that the report was the result of months of work and analysis by a broad cross-section of the campus leadership. The report provided an excellent starting point for the team's deeper exploration of key issues.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The *WSCUC* Interim Report Committee letter (June 29, 2015) recounted that the July 3, 2012 Commission letter identified the following areas that required attention and further development by CSUF: strategic planning; assessment; advising; and finances. The Interim Report Committee (IRC) noted "significant and meaningful progress in each of these areas." The panel of the IRC then recommended that CSUF include in its institutional report an update on: a) a plan for deferred maintenance and a current status report; and b) an update on the status of the Irvine satellite location (including the number of degree programs offered at the site, FTE of students and faculty, steps taken to ensure the academic quality of the curriculum, and assessment of student learning for those programs, if any, which all courses required for the major may be taken at the Irvine satellite).

In 2015-2016, an outside consulting firm identified $150 million in deferred maintenance projects that were projected to increase to over $443 million by the year 2027. In its institutional report, the university addresses mission critical projects with one-time annual savings funds. It also relies on system funding from state-wide bond issues.

As far as the update on the status of the Irvine location is concerned, the institutional report pointed to a link which listed the degree programs offered and steps taken to ensure academic quality of the curriculum. Programs are assessed, however, specific Irvine student data are not disaggregated, due to privacy issues cited by the university. The Irvine Center was visited as part of the review of CSUF for reaffirmation of accreditation and the team's report is attached as an appendix.

B. **Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purpose (CFRs 1.1, and 1.2)

CSUF's founding vision of combining the best qualities of teaching and research to provide an affordable, quality education to a diverse group of students has guided the institution since its inception in 1957. The 2016 Academic Master Plan (AMP) operationalizes the institution's purpose and as noted in the most recent university catalog, the institution continues to prepare students with knowledge and skills to be "effective and ethical leaders, and productive members in their local communities and global society." The university mission and the 2013-2018 and 2018-2023 strategic plans were established through institutional participation and reaffirmed the institutional goals and educational objectives. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, and 1.5)

The institution is a Hispanic-Serving Institution and an Asian-American and Native-American Pacific Islander-Serving eligible Institution, with over 40% of students from underrepresented groups. Further, the campus has been noted as the third in the state in awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanics and fourth in the nation for awarding bachelor's degrees to underrepresented students, supporting their vision of educating a diverse group of students.

Student achievement at the institution is framed within the CSU 2025 Graduation Initiative goals. Student achievement data are made public and found under the Division of Academic Affairs' Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness website and provide graduation and retention data from as far back as 2002. As of 2018, the first-time full-time four-year graduation rate was 25.5% and the six-year graduation rate at 67.8%. In 2017-2018, 39% of the degrees awarded were to students from underrepresented groups and 47% were the first in their family to earn a college degree. Additional student learning outcomes by college and programs are also made publicly available and housed within the Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness website. (CFRs 1.2, and 1.6)

Integrity and transparency (CFRs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8)

Student learning objectives and achievement were provided in the institutional narrative and made visible under the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness website. Policies and practices related to faculty academic freedom can be found in the CSUF catalog. (CFR 1.3)

CSUF's recently updated mission centers the strength of diversity and highlights their progress in faculty and staff diversity. The institution has employed multiple structural changes in its diversity efforts. Among several efforts are the Division of Human Resources, Diversity, and Inclusion (HRDI) that provides training for search committees and ensures the hiring practices

fully consider issues of diversity; the President's Commission on Equity and Inclusion; and the Faculty and Inclusion Fellow Program in 2018. Between 2012 and 2018, 52% of new faculty hired were faculty of color, and in the 2017-2018 year alone, 56% of the staff hired into permanent positions were people of color. As the team looked into disaggregated data provided through the institution's dashboards, progress in faculty diversity has been uneven across colleges and departments. While the institution has made multiple investments in the area of diversity, continued efforts that lead to faculty diversification across the institution will yield deep benefits to the institution. (CFRs 1.4, and 3.1)

Recommendation:

The team recommends that CSUF continue to focus on faculty diversity with special attention to units that have made less progress than others. (CFRs 1.4, and 3.1)

Subject to the Commission's review, the team's overall finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Though the institutional report is largely descriptive, CSUF has taken the Commission recommendations seriously and used accreditation as a means to generate ongoing discussion and improvement planning. With the university mission as a starting point, CSUF focused particular attention to evaluating institutional goals and objectives, aligning the curriculum, and establishing institutional priorities as a basis for strategic planning.

Student Learning and Success

The university remains committed to student success as a top priority. It significantly strengthened academic advising and wellness with the development of Student Success Teams (see Component 5) within each college to provide holistic, student-centered academic advising, and support for undergraduate, graduate, transfer, and online students respectively with the understanding that faculty and staff training should be continuously evaluated and modified accordingly. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, and 4.2)

Diversity

The university affirms that more work needs to be done for specific student populations (graduate, online, and transfer students) to better support their success. CSUF has established clear channels of collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs in the areas of academic advising, athletics, veterans, WoMen's Center, and the Male Success Initiative (see Component 5). The Diversity Initiatives and Resource Center have created lesson plans connected to learning outcomes that align with CSUF's strategic goals. (CFRs 1.4, 2.1, 2.8, 3.2, and 3.3)

Teaching and Learning

The university improved assessment and quality assurance processes since 2012 by implementing a systematic six-step assessment process aligned with university learning goals and program learning outcomes with a streamlined review and approval process to ensure that student learning outcomes are found in courses, program proposals and updates to syllabi. These outcomes are further evaluated and triangulated by the use of end-of-course-surveys, pre-post

measures for one outcome in each course, and badging of courses after synthesis. Assessment at CSUF integrates student learning with High Impact Practices and draws upon longitudinal data to develop scholarship of teaching and learning. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6)

The institutional report acknowledges that the university's scale creates challenges for uniform quality and process implementation. It cited that assessment and Program Performance Review (PPR) were implemented across all programs and departments but ensuring quality among them is uneven- particularly in "closing the loop." (CFR 4.1)

Scholarship and Creative Activity

CSUF faculty are active in their publications and leaders in their professional organizations. In response to teaching loads and expectations in scholarship and service, the institution has increased incentives, reassigned time, and established campus recognition programs for faculty excellence. (CFRs 2.1, 2.8, and 2.9)

Data Awareness

The university works closely with IT and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to implement data collection, analysis, and visualization tools (e.g., Tableau, Qualtrics, and dashboards). Every college and division has a dedicated data analyst (e.g., data buddy) to provide customized support. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE) provides data analysts (called "data buddies") for each college that create visual dashboards, perform standard reporting, respond to data requests, and oversee PPR. (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3, 2.8, and 2.12)

Academic Policies

Policies (the attendance policy and transfer policy) are clearly defined and found throughout several university platforms (e.g. faculty, staff, and student online handbooks, website catalogs, and syllabi). Co-curricular policies (e.g. student conduct, Title IX) are defined across platforms as well. (CFRs 1.6, and 1.7)

Subject to the Commission's review, the team's overall finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

CSUF has embarked on an ambitious plan to significantly improve its graduation rates and erase the gap between the success rates of its underrepresented student populations and others. To fulfill the goals established by the campus and the CSU system, the university has focused its resources and organizational priorities on student success and incorporated the goals into its University Strategic Plan 2018 (USP 2018).

The four goals of USP2018 are:

Goal 1: Provide a transformative educational experience and environment for all students;
Goal 2: Strengthen opportunities for student completion and graduation;
Goal 3: Recruit and retain high-quality and diverse faculty and staff; and
Goal 4: Expand and strengthen financial and physical capacity.

The CSU system has had a relatively stable budget in the last few years due to the continuing support from the State of California and a strong enrollment trend. California's 2019-20 budget allocation to the CSU represents a significant financial support to boost the CSU 2025 Graduation Initiative (GI2025). CSUF has received an operation budget allocation of $227M

and a projected tuition and fee revenues of $234M. The combined $461M revenues should provide a solid financial resources base for the university to achieve its strategic goals.

Faculty and Staff (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3)

Standard 3 requires the institution to employ faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity. The institutional report provides information on funding to increase faculty hiring. For the 2018-19 budget year, the university received $15.7M in baseline funding to fully cover the mandatory cost and compensation increases agreed with the unions. There was also $4.3M for GI2025 and $1.2M for tenure-track faculty hiring.

Compared to the faculty and staff hiring in the 2012-13 academic year, the 2018-19 new faculty and staff members are more diverse, with a significant increase in Asian faculty, and the African-American and Hispanic faculty and staff remains at a similar percentage. The university has invested in a number of initiatives to help underrepresented faculty navigate through the tenure and promotion process. Academic Senate committees, the Faculty Development Center, and academic departments have also devoted resources to assist faculty in research and pedagogy improvement. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3) In meetings with staff, the team learned that some staff are more engaged than others in university committees and initiatives, and that in some areas staff committee representation is lacking. The institution would greatly benefit by increased involvement by a representative cross-section of dedicated staff on key committees. At the same time, the institution has in place a very successful shared governance model, and is somewhat unique among CSU campuses, as staff, as well as students have representation on the Academic Senate. (CFRs 3.6, and 3.7)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFRs 3.4, and 3.5)

CSU Fullerton is in a stable and good fiscal position in managing its budget and physical infrastructure. The university is in the process of developing a new campus Master Plan to further address the challenges of a campus in high demand and the shortage of capital funding for new buildings, renovations, and deferred maintenance.

Facing daunting deferred maintenance needs projected to be over $443M by 2027, the university works closely with the CSU Chancellor's Office to strategize plans to maintain its facilities in a safe and functional state. The university managed to refresh and/or upgrade 116 classrooms in 2017-18. The ambitious push of GI2025 has significantly increased the utilization rates of the teaching space. This will result in a higher demand for facility maintenance and renovations. Unless the university has an effective distance education program to relieve some of its demand on the physical space, the university will have to continue to invest in building upkeep and construction. (CFRs 3.4, and 3.5)

Physical Master Plan

CSUF has completed the final draft of a 15-year Physical Master Plan. Built upon a participatory model, the plan was developed with wide participation from all constituencies. With limited funding for capital projects, the university has to cautiously plan the replacement and/or renovation of academic and non-academic buildings. Based on 1% growth per year, the enrollment is projected to reach 32,000 FTEs in the next 15 years. The plan includes additional academic space, new student and faculty/staff housing, a new parking structure, an Event Center, and new amenities for student activities. Implementation of the plan will depend on the

availability of capital funding from the State of California and CSU system, additional revenue sources, and an aggressive capital campaign. The university has embarked on a comprehensive campaign with initial success. Some of the projected buildings appear to be ideal targets for the capital campaign. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7)

Information technology plays a vital role in supporting the university's strategic goals and the Graduation Initiative 2025. Faculty and students have free access to all the major software packages for their research and educational uses. Faculty has also received pedagogical and technical support from the Academic Technology Center (ATC) and the Faculty Development Center (FDC). The leaders and faculty of the two centers are enthusiastic about their roles in nourishing new faculty members and deepening the collegial culture of the campus. Department chairs also play a pivotal role in connecting the faculty members to the available resources.

A number of information technology programs have been implemented to assist the student success and graduation efforts. The Student Success Dashboard combines static census data from OAIE with live data from the system-wide and campus PeopleSoft Data Warehouse. This real-time individual student level data is a very powerful tool for student academic planning, monitoring, and advising. The interface with faculty and students through the Tableau Enterprise (visualization tool) and TitanNet also provides significant tools for academic progress monitoring and possible early intervention. Abundant data is available to the faculty and administration to monitor student academic progress and engage in early intervention when necessary. There is evidence that the adoption and utilization of the data and dashboards are not evenly distributed among the departments and faculty members despite the significant efforts of the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs offices. (CFR 3.5) The team encourages CSUF to

continue to reach out to faculty to make them aware of available data and dashboards that can be

used to improve teaching and learning.

Commendations:

The team commends CSUF for:

1. **the establishment of significant support structures for faculty engaged in pedagogical practices and curricular design that maximizes the potential for effective student learning;**
2. **the management of enrollment targets to effectively align with the university's strategic and budget planning;**
3. **the development of a 15-year Master Plan, along with a comprehensive campaign to assist in the funding of building and infrastructure initiatives;**
4. **the completion of *Strategic Plan, 2018-23*, which involved active engagement of all campus stakeholders, and is effectively aligned with the institution's budgeting priorities; and**
5. **the creation of a robust, collaborative, and successful shared governance model, as reflected by the inclusiveness of the membership and broad engagement of the Academic Senate.**

Recommendations:

The team recommends that CSUF

1. **develop a more systematic means for engaging staff in key university committees and initiatives. (CFR 3.1, and 3.7); and**
2. **carefully monitor data security, compliance, and student privacy rights as the institution deploys digital and online tools. (CFRs 1.7, and 3.5)**

Subject to the Commission's review, the team's overall finding is that the institution has

provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, and 4.2)

The team confirmed evidence that the institution systematically employs a quality assurance process in the academic area. This includes an academic program performance (PPR) review process, which is conducted on a seven-year cycle. Each program also is required, on an annual basis, to assess student learning outcomes and to report these outcomes. Importantly, the institution has also implemented a process for ensuring that learning outcomes assessment is built into every course, course proposal, and update. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, and 4.1)

In addition to the assessment of academic programs, the team found evidence that the institution has implemented assessment processes in non-academic areas as well. Assessment in non-academic areas is particularly robust with respect to the institution's array of student success initiatives, which is a key strategic priority for the campus.

The institution clearly collects data on areas ranging from student persistence and graduation to campus climate and employee satisfaction. Multiple institutional stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the availability of the data they need, as well as its usefulness in assessment efforts. For student success initiatives, relevant data is disseminated at critical junctures to help faculty and staff in their early intervention efforts. Although the institution has made significant progress in building its assessment data infrastructure, work remains to be done to ensure that this data is appropriately managed in compliance with student privacy laws and other regulatory matters. (CFRs 2.4, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4).

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7)

There is ample evidence of the institution's commitment to student success, and the institution is making notable progress in this area. As a member of the CSU system, the institution is participating in a system-wide graduation initiative, and thus it has aligned many of its student success efforts with this initiative. Student success initiatives at the institution are also sustained by faculty and staff who genuinely care about their students and take pride in their accomplishments.

The various student success initiatives at the institution are reviewed and assessed by initiative owners, but there does not appear to be a more global, comparative review that would help the institution to determine which of its initiatives are having the greatest and least impact on the improvement of student retention and graduation rates. Without this information, the institution lacks information needed for making future student success budgetary decisions.
 (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 ,2.6, and 4.3)

The institution has effectively engaged faculty in student learning assessment, and faculty appear to take ownership of their critical role in fostering student learning and student success. For example, the institution has been committed to incorporating high impact practices into teaching and the curriculum, and it has a number of noteworthy examples of the use and success of these practices. The institution has also provided important support for faculty efforts in implementing high impact practices. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, and 4.4).

The institution routinely engages external stakeholders in the assessment and alignment, as appropriate, of educational programs. The primary mechanism for this engagement is through

advisory boards that include community members from professions in relevant fields. Student

internships in the local community also provide a useful mechanism for feedback to the

institution on the knowledge, skills and dispositions that best match the needs of area non-profits,

businesses and industry. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, and 4.5)

The institution has engaged multiple internal stakeholders, through workgroups, town halls, and

electronic feedback in its strategic planning process. This process included reflection on the

institutions alignment with its purpose, and resulted in the identification of strategic goals related

to this purpose. Relevant data is collected and produced for each goal of the plan, enabling the

institution to gauge progress. (CFRs 1.1, 3.4, and 4.6)

Subject to the Commission's review, the team's overall finding is that the institution has

provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

C. Component 3 Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees (CFRs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, and 4.3)

Meaning of the Degree

The institution crafted a "meaning of degree" statement through a qualitative approach of

analyzing each "meaning of degree" statement from each degree program. After multiple

iterations and feedback from faculty, administrators, and President's Advisory Board, a CSUF

"meaning of the degree" was established in the spring of 2018 as "the culmination of enriching

multidisciplinary education where students benefit from experiential learning and vibrant co-

curricular experiences in a culturally diverse environment. With disciplinary knowledge and

critical skills, Titan graduates are well positioned to emerge as effective and ethical leaders, and

productive members of their local communities and the global society." The "meaning of degree" statement is prominently found on the university website and catalog and included on course syllabi and embedded in CSUF's learning management system. (CFRs 1.2, and 2.2)

The newly crafted "meaning of degree" statement is intended to exist in collaboration with the Undergraduate Learning Goals (ULGs) and Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) and developed collaboratively with university stakeholders. In addition, the General Education (GE) Committee developed GE programmatic learning goals (GELG) that reflect the *WSCUC* Core Competencies and guided by the *Association of American Colleges & Universities Liberal Education & America's Promise (AAC&U LEAP)* outcomes. The GELG serves as a guide for course development and program assessment. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.4)

CSUF took a multi-tiered approach to align course objectives, program outcomes, and university goals as a way to embody the expectations of all graduates. From the narrative report, links to program curriculum maps and multi-year assessment plans were provided to demonstrate alignment with program learning outcomes (PLOs). While the team found that every program had curriculum maps, inconsistencies between program curriculum maps were evident. Some curriculum maps were further developed with alignment between courses and indicating where students are introduced, developing, or mastering each PLOs and how University Learning Goals are developed within courses (BS Physics, as an example), while other curriculum maps made no reference to University Learning goals and did not illustrate where students are being introduced, developed, or mastering the PLOs in their courses. Additionally, some curriculum maps were missing how students are introduced to PLOs and only indicated where students are developing and mastering the program outcomes or had one outcome mastered in seven courses.

[19]

The team also found inconsistencies with the multi-year assessment plans. Some programs developed comprehensive assessment plans with courses where evidence would be collected, assessment tool, and the year and semester the PLO would be assessed. Other programs (BS Civil Engineering) had generic "SO assessment exam" coupled with mainly indirect forms of evidence to assess their PLOs. As a result of these inconsistencies, it is unclear how faculty are utilizing these curriculum maps and assessment plans as a way to uphold the meaning, quality, and integrity of the degrees. Furthermore, from the assessment documents provided, the team found that programs may need to further refine how the terms learning goals, objectives, student learning outcomes (SLOs) and PLOs are used.

While the institutional report expressed and illustrated an alignment between program learning outcomes, core competencies, GELG and GLGs, when appropriate, strategic plan goals, it was less clear how those goals and outcomes are operationalized and aligned to support the intentionally crafted "meaning of the degree" statement. Despite the inconsistencies across maps and assessment plans, it is clear that there has been significant engagement and involvement across campus constituencies since the last review in 2012 to develop undergraduate and graduate learning goals and outcomes.

Standards of Performance

The CSUF UPS 300.022 on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes serves as the guide to maintaining the quality of the degree programs at the institution. The iterative Six-Step Assessment Process provides a framework for programs to assess their PLOs and is "faculty-driven and program-controlled," giving programs the freedom to determine criteria for success or expected standards of performance. In a 2016-2017 synthesis of PLOs that addressed ULG 2

Critical Thinking, 88% of the outcomes assessed were "met" and 89% were "met" on the graduate level. Due to the varying standards of performance among programs, it was unclear to the team whether these results were viewed as positive, and whether the level of performance for graduate programs are different than undergraduate programs. (CFR 2.6)

Graduate Programs

Graduate programs at CSUF are guided by two university policy statements that establish the standards for graduate education (UPS 410.106 "Academic Standards for Graduate Degree Students" and UPS 410.170 "Doctoral Program"). The graduate culture is ensured and culminated by a required capstone thesis, project, or comprehensive exam. On the programmatic level, rigor is evaluated through the assessment of PLOs at the individual program level through students' performance on a thesis, project, or comprehensive exam.

According to the 2016-2017 University Assessment Report, all six University Graduate Learning Goals were "Assessed and Met" at the same or higher percentage than the Undergraduate University Learning Goals. However, it is unclear to the team how these GLGs are assessed and how GLGs are aligned to graduate PLOs, seeing the large discrepancies between the number of aligned outcomes among the GLGs with only 13 aligned learning outcomes for GLG6 Global Community, and 97 aligned outcomes for GLG1 Intellectual Literacy. (CFR 2.6)

Irvine Center

University efforts to expand access to students who live and work in southern Orange County led to the establishment of the Irvine Center, a CSUF additional location that offers six undergraduate degree programs and three graduate degree programs. According to the

institutional report narrative, students take courses at both the Irvine and Fullerton location and very few graduate by taking courses solely at the Irvine location.

Degree programs offered at the Irvine location are included in the annual PLO assessment each year and faculty do not disaggregate student learning outcomes data between the Fullerton and Irvine Center location out of concern of "singling out" instructors and the concern over misconstruing the purpose of assessment and evaluation. While the university's concern is understandable, the team also found the value that disaggregating data could provide for a model of continuous improvement at the additional location. The team encourages CSUF to consider disaggregating student learning outcome data at the Irvine Center .

   D. **Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 3.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4)**

As has been previously discussed, the institution uses a "multi-tiered" strategy for assessing student learning that connects PLOs, University Learning Goals, and *WSCUC* Core Competencies. University Learning Goals (aligned with *WSCUC* Core Competencies) define the knowledge, skills, values, and perspectives that students acquire in a CSUF degree program. Since 2001, CSUF has used the *National Survey of Student Engagement* (*NSSE)* survey every other year along with an undergraduate student exit survey. During 2007-2015, it surveyed a sample of freshmen and seniors using the *Collegiate Learning Assessment* (*CLA)* instrument to assist in the assessment of higher-order thinking skills. This practice was discontinued when funding from the CSU system ended. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5)

It is apparent that CSUF has demonstrated a deep commitment to student learning, its assessment, and continuous improvement of teaching and learning. In fact, 100% of its degree programs submitted annual assessment reports since 2016-2017. The institutional report cited examples of programs "closing the loop" (BA American Studies, MS Instructional Design and Technology). It further cited that 81% of its degree programs reported appropriate closing the loop plans/activities (an increase of 45% from the previous two years). Various assessments pointed to a need to strengthening efforts to improve students' quantitative reasoning skills. To that end, three programs were undertaken by the Mathematics Department to focus on this area – 1) in response to CSU Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1110, Math 110 (Liberal Arts Mathematics) and Math 120 (Introduction to Statistics) were redesigned to include more interactive learning with emphases on data collection and interpretation; 2) an artificial intelligent online assessment and learning tool, ALEKS, was implemented in summer 2018 for all business, science, math, and engineering incoming freshmen; and 3) the assessment and grading practices for all multi-section math courses have been more closely aligned to ensure access and equity for all students. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5)

In 2015, the Academic Senate approved the Graduate Education Learning Goals (GELGs). In 2016-2017, CSUF introduced the GE Faculty Learning Community approach to engage faculty to teach GE courses in assessing student learning. Fifty faculty have so far been engaged in this initiative.

CSUF has directed an array of resources towards the improvement of teaching and learning through assessment. These include the Assessment Inquiry Grant (launched in 2016-17) to

encourage broader participation in assessment and to foster a culture of assessment; Graduation Initiative 2025 Innovation Grant; High Impact Practices (HIPS); Course Redesign with Technology (CRT); Supplemental Instruction; and Titanium Engagement. (CFRs 2.4, and 2.5)

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation (CFRs 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2.2, 2.2b, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 4.3)

OVERVIEW

CSUF defines student success as "the timely completion of a rigorous, quality degree in preparation for a lifetime of achievement" (institutional report, pg. 33). In alignment with this definition, the university has aligned assessment initiatives with the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI2025). The university-wide implementation of specific, measurable student learning outcomes, (SLOs) has the potential for the development of meaningful, longitudinal data sets with a healthy feedback loop, provided that the evidence is consistently collected and analyzed. The university implemented several technological platforms to advance assessment efforts. It is important that students are made aware of these different platforms, what data is being collected and that that data is/will be used. Students should also be given the option to opt-out of data collection when appropriate. (CFRs 1.7, and 3.5)

Academic Advising

The institutional report defines academic advising as a core student success initiative that brings together key constituencies on campus, including faculty advisors, Student Success Teams (SSTs) and Student Affairs staff in collaboration with divisions and departments in each of the colleges and the Irvine Center.

Academic Advising Center (AAC)

The AAC provides general education advising for traditional first-year students and undeclared students. Transfer students have the option of academic advising through workshops or individual meetings with their college graduation specialist.

Advising in the Major

Advising pedagogy, staffing, training, and compensation varies by program and department. Some programs and departments have professional advisors, while others have faculty advisors. CSUF offers an Advisor Training Certificate program as an attempt to provide pedagogical consistency among advisors though it is unclear what impact this has on advising as well as how effective this training interfaces with different programs and departments across the university.

Student Success Teams (SSTs)

All eight colleges and the Irvine Center has a SST comprised of an associate dean, an assistant dean, faculty, and staff major advisors, AAC staff, and other specialists. Graduation specialists provide targeted interventions with juniors and seniors to ensure timely completion and graduation. Retention specialists provide targeted interventions for first and second-year students on academic probation or in non-enrolled status. Career specialists work with students in career exploration and preparation. These teams work collaboratively with faculty advisors on student persistence through the major.

Student Success Centers (SSCs)

SSCs are another venue for major advising found in the eight colleges that provide drop-in hours, computer access, printing, student success staff, and study spaces for undergraduates. Some colleges house their specialists within their SSC, while others may have specialized services.

SSC utilization is prioritized by students as a result of mandatory academic advising workshops. Graduating seniors are required to use the SSC as part of their graduation requirements. To date, it is unclear what metrics are assessed other than attendance.

Graduate students have a Graduate Student Success Center that provides tutoring and advising for all graduate students.

Technology for Advisement

Advisors use Titan Degree Audit (TDA), an electronic platform that tracks student academic progress toward degree. In 2018, TitanNet, a system which uses the *Educational Advisory Board's* Student Success Collaborative Campus, was implemented. This new platform allows for a more structured and robust advising notation system that is accessible to campus teams as well as advisors. The new platform also allows advisors to disaggregate student data (e.g., academic standing, units completed, major, GPA).

Student Success Initiatives and Support

Academic Preparation: CSU Chancellor's Executive Order (EO1110) eliminated non-credit and remedial courses in mathematics and English. Multiple competency measures also replaced the proficiency tests in these two subjects before matriculation. As a result, the university changed the mathematics and English curriculum and created academic pathways or proficiency categories for students in Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) and non-STEM. The impact of EO110 was under evaluation at the time of the institutional report.

Freshman, Transfer, and Graduate Student Orientation: The university restructured orientation for first-year students to make for a more interactive and engaging experience. All first-year students attend a mandatory, day-long, in-person orientation whereas transfer students were permitted to attend a free online orientation (that does not include advising) or an in-person orientation for a fee. For summer 2019, each college will have the option of requiring transfer students to attend the in-person orientation though it is unclear if the affiliated fee is required as well.

In 2011, the university created a campus-wide orientation for graduate students through a U.S. Department of Education grant. The orientation workshops are for graduate students and their families and emphasize faculty advisors as key participants.

The university has a First-Year Experience (FYE) course for undeclared students. The curriculum and unit designations for these courses are determined by the individual colleges- some FYE courses are 3-units while others are 1-unit.

Financial Aid and Scholarships: The university offers federal and state grants as well as grants and scholarships that are university-wide and college/program-specific. With over 50% of undergraduate students receiving financial aid, this financial support is critical to their success.

Graduate students receive financial support in the form of travel grants, fellowships, and equity initiatives through the Office of Graduate Studies.

All students have access to the Tuffy Basic Needs Center for financial support for hardships or emergencies (e.g., housing, food assistance). Furthermore, in separate meetings with staff and

students, the team learned that support of the mental health needs of students was an area that merited more attention from the university.

Administrative Policies and Barriers: The evaluation of administrative barriers to student success is on-going. The university recognizes that some policies intended to support student success may be counterproductive. A new technology platform that allows students to manage academic progress is forthcoming. In 2019, the university changed the fall registration policy from July to April in an attempt to decrease attrition over the summer.

Data-Driven Interventions: The university uses Tableau, a data visualization platform, in addition to several dashboards that provide student record-level information to the campus. It is unclear how the data are used to determine whether or not an intervention is necessary.

TitanNet is another platform which allows advisors to contact targeted students that were on probation or at risk of academic probation through email and provide a list of resources as well as a required in-person advising session. In a meeting with the academic success teams, the team learned that this initiative had approximately a 50% success rate for students who obtained in-person advising.

Evidence of Student Success

Commitment to Access: Over the last 20 years, the university made significant improvements diversifying the student body. From fall 2013 to fall 2018, enrollment of Hispanic students rose from 35 % to 41.5 % (a 20% increase). (institutional report, pg. 39)

Retention and Graduation Rates: Since the previous *WSCUC* review, the university has improved retention and graduation rates for all student cohorts. For undergraduate students, the

first time freshmen (FTF) 6-year graduation rate improved from 51.1% to 67.8% between 2012 – 2018. The four-year graduation rate improved from 14.0% to 25.5% within the same timeframe.

Upper-Division Transfer (UDT) Students 2-and 4- year graduation rates rose from 28.9% to 36.3% and from 67.7% to 79.5% respectively.

First-generation and underrepresented students improved between 2012 to 2018 with FTF first-generation students 4-year graduation rates going from 10.6% to 21.6% and 6-year graduation rates going from 47.7% to 64.6%.

Equity gaps also demonstrated improvement between 2012 to 2018 except Pell status, which saw an increase in FTF from 5.0% to 5.3%.

The 2-year graduation rate for graduate students in master's programs improved from 39.2% in 2012 to 52.5% in 2018. Five-year graduate rates improved from 67.8% to 80.2% during the same period. Equity gaps for 2-year graduation rate in master's programs have improved between student demographics (underrepresented vs. non-underrepresented); decreasing from 5.0% in 2012 to 2.4% in 2018.

WSCUC **Graduation Rate Dashboard:** The university concludes that it is in a "steady state" with unit redemption rates (URRs) and absolute graduation rates (AGRs) above the CSU system average. Approximations for both the URR and the AGR are 86% and 75% respectively. The AGR is higher than the average IPEDS 6-year FTF graduation rate of 55%.

Academic Advising Outcomes: The university uses documentation (notes) of advising discussions and the number of visits as an outcome measurement. The graduation and retention specialists use both student contact and student satisfaction surveys as outcome metrics. It is unclear at the time of the report how these data elements are related to the overall assessment of these activities.

Student Satisfaction and Engagement Outcomes: The university reports that it relies on multiple, indirect measures to collect undergraduate and graduate student data (e.g., Undergraduate Exit Survey, *National Survey for Student Engagement* (*NSSE*), and a Graduate Student Survey administered every two years. The most direct observation of how this information is used is in programming for the Student Success Teams. The data collected informs the professional development of these teams as a whole which, in turn, leads to the development of new strategies for targeted outreach and support to students in key areas such as financial aid and advising.

Recommendations:

The team recommends that CSUF:

1. **continue to focus on the most effective methods of delivering appropriate mental health services for students and alternative delivery models (CFRs 2.13, and 4.7);**
2. **undertake a comprehensive, global review of the effectiveness of the university's student success initiatives that leverages disaggregated data to determine differential impact on diverse student populations and the efficiency and longer term sustainability of these initiatives. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.10, 4.1, and 4.4);**
3. **prioritize the use of direct measures in its assessment of Student Success Initiatives. (CFRs 2.10, 4.3, and 4.4); and**
4. **develop appropriate Graduate Program Learning Outcomes, graduate student success initiatives, and aligned assessment processes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6)**

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence (CFRs 1.2, 1.4, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7)

Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Infrastructure

Since the 2012 review, CSUF established the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE), a merging of the former Office of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness and the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies. The OAIE is positioned well, operating under the Office of the Provost and comprising of 10 staff members. With six major areas of oversight (assessment, accreditation, quality assurance, institutional research, analytical studies, and data governance) and an infrastructure that is well-embedded into the campus, the OAIE supports the faculty-owned assessment practice by partnering with assessment leaders, liaisons, and coordinators across program and unit levels at the university to build and foster an on-going culture of assessment. (CFRs 4.1, and 4.2)

The institutional research (IR) arm of the OAIE is comprised of dedicated staff and research analysts that support programs undergoing Program Performance Review (PPR) and units across the university requesting access to data. As mentioned in Standard 2, staff and research analysts serve as "data buddies" to their assigned college, department, or units across campus to provide data and data support to inform decision making. The collaboration between IR and IT in creating public data dashboards for faculty and staff has resulted in an institutional culture that desires and values data. With increasing demand for data across the institution and professionalization of the field of institutional research, it will be critical to establish a data governance policy with clear roles, rights, and responsibilities of data stewards. (CFRs 1.7, 3.5, and 4.2).

Program Performance Review

Program Performance Review *(PPR)* is conducted every seven years for all degree-granting programs that fall within Academic Affairs, with anywhere between 10 and 22 programs undergoing PPR each year. The guidelines for the PPR process were established in April 2018, following the University Policy Statement 410.200 that outlines principles and procedures for PPR. Programs that hold specialized accreditation may request to substitute their accreditation report for PPR upon approval by the dean and the provost.

The PPR is centered around a self-study comprised of eight topics, one internal reviewer, and two external reviewers. With the assistance of OAIE, the complete PPR package that includes the self-study report and dean's evaluation and recommendation goes to the provost, who then conducts a meeting with relevant program representatives to develop a memorandum that outlines program priorities and long-term plans. During the years, 2013-2018, 71 programs completed the PPR process. While the team found the PPR process to be comprehensive, it was less clear whether the PPR process was tied to budgetary and resource allocation or re-allocation, and how engaging in the PPR is informing teaching and student learning. Furthermore, the institutional report mentioned conducting a meta-analysis of programs that undergo PPR each year illuminating strengths and areas for improvement across disciplines. It will be important to use those findings to help guide changes in teaching practices, training, or policies. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5,and 4.6)

Co-Curricular Assessment

Similar to the Division of Academic Affairs, units in Student Affairs follow the same six-step assessment process for quality assurance and continuous improvement. The majority of data

collected to assess co-curricular units are through indirect assessment methods such as pre/post surveys.

Similar to academic programs, it was unclear how co-curricular assessment findings have been used to foster a posture of continuous improvement. While the team found assessment coordinators and liaisons from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to be highly engaged and collaborative with one another during the visit, it was unclear how Student Affairs assessment is collaborating or sharing data with the Division of Academic Affairs to gather a more robust picture of the student experience and how curricular and co-curricular assessment is integrated or bridged at the institution beyond examining data provided through existing dashboards. (CFRs 2.11, and 4.3)

Culture of Assessment

The OAIE has been critical to promoting and fostering a culture of assessment at CSUF. The number of workshops and attendance has signaled a need on campus that the office has been diligently fulfilling. The office has also promoted findings through the University Assessment Report that is disseminated to all employees and posted on the OAIE website. The OAIE also provides assessment resources on its website, coupled with evidence of the university's commitment to student learning and quality assurance and has been featured by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. Further, the effort to engage students in assessment through the Student Assessment Scholars program that was launched in 2017 demonstrates a commitment engaging all stakeholders on campus to improve student learning and success. (CFRs 4.1, and 4.2)

CSUF has employed a "distributed leadership model" comprised of various stakeholders taking ownership of assessment across the university. This model is comprised of assessment liaisons and the Academic Senate Assessment and Educational Effectiveness Committee. Assessment liaisons review annual assessment reports through *Compliance Assist* and provide feedback to programs, encouraging programs to use the feedback as part of their continuous improvement. Assessment liaisons are referenced as "key decision-makers for assessment initiatives" that support assessment activities and guide assessment efforts on campus. This distributed model comprised of wide-spread representation aligns well with the campus culture of shared ownership for student learning and student success and lends itself to a sustainable model for assessment. However, the team could not substantiate how assessment liaisons are serving as decision-makers, nor hold decision-making authority as mentioned in the institutional narrative. Assessment liaisons have the potential to step into a more critical role in developing, sustaining, and leading an emerging culture of assessment. (CFRs 4.5, and 4.6)

Use of Data and Evidence: Closing the Loop

The "CSUF Six-Step Assessment Process" has served as the foundation for assessment at the institution since 2014 and was widely referenced by academic affairs and student affairs representatives during the team's visit. The increase in units engaging appropriately in the Six-Step Process has more than doubled over the past four years. The institution, with the support of OAIE, has demonstrated a commitment to student learning through established assessment processes, as evidenced in ongoing annual assessment reporting, engagement in PPR, and the dissemination and sharing of reports. A careful analysis of how these assessment findings are being used to improve the teaching and learning environment and how data is used to across

programs will be critical to a vibrant assessment culture. In addition, faculty engagement and participation in the last steps of the assessment process that are critical to closing to loops will be essential.

The institution's commitment to continuous improvement is evident through the resources committed to the OAIE and investment in faculty development. As the institution continues to codify their assessment processes and commitment to assessment, continued focus on full participation in the assessment process and utilization of assessment results will be germane to institutional learning and improvement. (CFRs 2.4, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6)

Commendations:

The team commends CSUF for:

1. **A genuine institution-wide commitment to student success, as demonstrated by its investment of resources, array of student success initiatives, course redesign, and improvement in student retention and graduation rates; and**
2. **the collaborative work of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness and the significant progress made in building the university's assessment infrastructure and processes.**

Recommendation:

The team recommends that CSUF continue to focus on program assessment to ensure full participation in the six-step assessment process and the utilization of the results to improve teaching and learning. (CFRs 2.4, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6)

G. **Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment (CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 2.10, 2.13, 2.14, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 4.2, and 4.4)**

The transition to the current president has been smooth and has allowed the university to continue its focus on student success endeavors and meeting the strategic goals established by the campus and the CSU system.

Enrollment Growth and Budget

As one of the most popular destination campuses of the CSU system, CSUF experienced a significant enrollment growth from 2012 through 2016, wherein the percentage growth of its student population was much steeper than the growth of its budget allocation. During this time, the State also changed the way it funded capital projects of the CSU system by folding capital funding into the CSU budget allocation instead of listing it as a separate line item in the State of California budget. This has resulted in a larger state allocation but the actual allocation per student did not increase sufficiently to provide adequate resources to the campuses.

CSUF in coordination with the CSU Chancellor's Office, managed to maintain its enrollment growth at a much smaller percentage after 2016. The slower growth allowed the university to focus its resources on the Graduation Initiative 2025 and the various student success initiatives. Other lower-enrolled CSU campuses in the Los Angeles area increased their enrollment growth and partially fulfilled the strong student demand for a CSU education.

The Planning, Resources and Budget Committee (PRBC) plays a pivotal role in the university's budget process and its members represent all constituencies. The budget process is transparent with a strong focus on meeting strategic goals of the university. The Division of Administration

and Finance has taken an active role in educating the budget decision-makers about the mechanism and key factors to consider for planning. The university's central budget planning office also worked closely with the budget offices of the divisions and colleges to ensure better monitoring and control of the budget.

The university has achieved a plausible outcome in improving the graduation rates and narrowing the achievement gaps. This initial success relied heavily on the additional state allocation through the GI 2025 funding for the hiring of additional faculty members and offering of more class sections. This increase in funding also allowed the university to support a large number of student success initiatives. It is imperative for the university to continue its good budgeting practices and to systematically review the effectiveness and efficiency of its various student success initiatives. The state allocation may not continue its generous path in the following years so the university will have to focus its limited resources on truly high impact efforts to sustain the graduation rate improvement and to erase the achievement gaps.

The modest enrollment growth rate of 1% a year (as projected in the Physical Master Plan), combined with a good budgeting discipline and focus of resources, will allow the university to navigate through future budget uncertainties and continue its achievements in student success.

H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

Due to the brevity of the conclusion to the institutional report, it was difficult for the team to judge the level of self-reflection, learning, and future commitments based on this learning merely from reading the report and its conclusion. However, through multiple interviews with different institutional stakeholders during the campus visit, the team was provided with ample evidence to

conclude that the self-study process was remarkably collaborative, and undertaken in the spirit of learning and improving. Stakeholders easily produced examples of things they had learned during the self-study process and actions taken based on that learning. For example, during the self-study process the institution learned that it had given insufficient attention to appropriate learning outcomes for graduate programs, the difference in the meaning of a graduate as distinct from an undergraduate degree, and graduate student success programs. A focus on graduate programs is now part of the institution's new strategic plan.

Many of the team recommendations reflect issues already highlighted by the institution either in its self-study or during the campus visit. Additionally, in most instances, efforts are already underway to address these issues. The team was impressed by the institution's commitment to continuous improvement and is confident that it will receive the team's recommendations in this spirit.

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

The team commends CSUF for:

1. a genuine institution-wide commitment to student success, as demonstrated by its investment of resources, array of student success initiatives, course redesign, and improvement in student retention and graduation rates;

2. the collaborative work of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness and the significant progress made in building the university's assessment infrastructure and processes;

3. the establishment of significant support structures for faculty engaged in pedagogical practices and curricular design that maximizes the potential for effective student learning;

4. the management of enrollment targets to effectively align with the university's strategic and budget planning;

5. the development of a 15-year Master Plan, along with a comprehensive campaign to assist in the funding of building and infrastructure initiatives;

6. the completion of *Strategic Plan, 2018-23*, which involved active engagement of all campus stakeholders, and is effectively aligned with the institution's budgeting priorities; and

7. the creation of a robust, collaborative, and successful shared governance model, as reflected by the inclusiveness of the membership and broad engagement of the Academic Senate.

The team recommends that CSUF:

1. undertake a comprehensive, global review of the effectiveness of the university's student success initiatives that leverages disaggregated data to determine differential impact on diverse student populations and the efficiency and longer term sustainability of these initiatives (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.10, 4.1, and 4.4);

2. continue to focus on program assessment to ensure full participation in the six-step assessment process and the utilization of the results to improve teaching and learning (CFRs 2.4, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6);

3. develop appropriate Graduate Program Learning Outcomes, graduate student success initiatives, and aligned assessment processes (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, and 4.1);

4. continue to focus on faculty diversity with special attention to units that have made less progress than others (CFRs 1.4, and 3.1);

5. develop a more systematic means for engaging staff in key university committees and initiatives (CFRs 3.1, and 3.7);

6. continue to focus on the most effective methods of delivering appropriate mental health services for students and alternative delivery models (CFRs 2.13, and 4.7)*; and*

7. carefully monitor data security, compliance, and student privacy rights as the institution deploys digital and online tools (CFRs 1.7, and 3.5).

APPENDICES

A. FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM
Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	If so, where is the policy located?
	Comments: CSUF policy on credit hour is in the catalog. CSU definition of https://pstat-live-media.s3.amazonaws.com/pdf_cache/policy/6646281/eed9f202-7fd6-45a7-a87d-babb2b53fe9a/CSU%20Definition%20of%20Credit%20Hour-%20AA-2011-14. in coded memorandum AA-2011-14.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Departments review credit hour assignments and staffing formula every semester when class schedule is developed. The formula is determined by the CSU Chancellor's Office (CO), and provided locally by the Office of Academic Programs. This review is summarized in the Faculty Assignment by Department (FAD) report, required by the CO. The same information is also reviewed by external accreditation agencies for programs that have discipline-based accreditation (e.g. Art, Education).
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Meeting times are provided in the course schedule, available on the website: *Course schedule website*
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	How many syllabi were reviewed? Three
	Type of courses reviewed: XX❏ online ❏ hybrid
	What degree level(s)? ❏ AA/AS XXX❏ BA/BS XX❏ MA ❏ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology, Literacy and Reading Education, Civil and Environmental Engineering
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: CSUF has established a policy on online instruction: CSUF policy on online instruction UPS 411.104. Sample syllabi of online/hybrid courses were provided as part of the institutional report: Sample syllabi of online/hybrid courses (Appendix 2.1.3).
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	How many syllabi were reviewed? Two
	What kinds of courses? Internship; field camp
	What degree level(s)? ❏ AA/AS XX❏ BA/BS XX❏ MA ❏ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Public Health Internship (HESC 595- 1

	unit and HESC 595 - 5 units), Geological Sciences Field Camp 481A (4 units)
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: CSUF provided sample syllabi of non-typical courses as part of the institutional report: - Sample syllabi of non-typical courses (Appendix 2.1.4).
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Two
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Traditional degree programs
	What degree level(s)? ❑ AA/AS X❑ BA/BS X❑ MA ❑ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Public Administration, Economics
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? XX❑ YES ❑ NO In addition to the degree requirements for each major in the catalog, CSUF also has descriptions of degree requirements for Bachelor's and Master's degrees: - Graduation requirements for the Bachelor's Degree in the catalog. - Graduate degree requirements in the catalog. - Students can use the "Print degree planner" feature on each degree program's page to view and track the list of courses needed for graduation.

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Outreach, recruitment and orientation website.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Information is provided on the website and in the catalog: - Time to degree information. - Information on student fees in the catalog. - Cost of attendance information. - Office of Financial aid also provides information on cost of attendance, with a Net Price calculator.

Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? XX☐ YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? XX☐ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: - Many departments list the kinds of jobs suitable for its graduates (e.g., English, Engineering, Philosophy, Women and Gender Studies, etc.) - Career center provides information and guidance on employment. The Career Center conducted an alumni survey in 2014 to track post-graduation employment. - CSUF participates in a CSU collaborative project that tracks student earnings after graduation, CalStatePays.

**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 requirements do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.
(See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? XX❑ YES ❑ NO If so, where? On the web by type of complaint (e.g., sexual harassment, discrimination, student conduct)
	Comments: In addition, CSUF provides information and training to students about academic dishonesty, sexual misconduct, discrimination, domestic violence, harassment: - University Policy Statement 300.030 on "Academic Appeals". - CSU Executive Orders and university policy related to Title IX. -The University annually emails to all students at the start of fall the CSU policy prohibiting discrimination, harassment and retaliation, sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, and stalking (CSU Executive Order 1097). This Executive Order is also available on various campus websites such as Title IX and Gender Equity and Human Resources, Diversity and Inclusion. In addition, all incoming students are required to complete an online training about sex and gender-based discrimination and harassment, which includes sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, and stalking, within the first few weeks of their enrollment at the University. This training also provides them with a copy of CSU Executive Order 1097.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? XX❑YES ❑ NO If so, please describe briefly: -The procedure for addressing complaints of discrimination, harassment and retaliation, sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, and stalking is included in CSU Executive Order 1097. Briefly, the procedure includes both an Early Resolution Agreement and formal investigation processes. All parties are consulted for implementation of any necessary interim measures during any related process.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? XX❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: CSUF provides information to students and staff about procedures for complaints: - The Dean of Students website lists procedures for student complaints. - Page 61 of the student handbook contains information related to campus procedure for responding to complaints (Appendix 2.1.5). - Complaint process for incidents that fall under Executive Order 1096 and 1097. - To ensure student complaints of discrimination, harassment and retaliation, sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, and stalking are addressed in a proper manner, all University employees are trained and required to provide notice to Title IX and DHR (Discrimination, harassment and retaliation) if, and when, knowledge of possible violation of CSU Executive Order 1097 is known.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? XX❑ YES ❑ NO If so, where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? XX❑ YES ❑ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	Comments: Record keeping is decentralized. The Title IX and Gender Equity office utilizes an online database (Maxient) to track and monitor all reports of sex and gender-based discrimination and harassment, which includes sexual misconduct, dating and domestic violence, and stalking that are received by the department. The DHR Administrator utilizes an internal case management database to track and monitor all complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation not based on sex or gender that are received by the department.

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	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? XX❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Information is provided on the website and in the catalog: - Transfer requirements are listed in the university catalog. - The Office of Admissions provides information on transfer requirements. - The Office of Admissions also provides information on articulation agreements.

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

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Forms Completed by: Les Kong
Date: October 2, 2019

B.   OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW

Institution: California State University, Fullerton
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Dr. Hector L. Sambolin, Jr.
Date/s of review: April 25, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[1]. 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**

  CSUF Irvine Center
  3 Banting
  Irvine CA, 92618

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 branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)**

  California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) began its South Orange County presence in modest accommodations, starting in "temporary buildings" at Saddleback College in 1989. A rapidly increasing number of CSU-eligible students in the CSUF service region led to a search for a larger alternative location. After nine-years in a leased building at the former El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, the university purchased the current Irvine facility in August 2013 along with the adjacent Banting 1 Building (leased to the Western State College of Law until 2020). Since the 2012 WSCUC review, the Irvine Center has been re-envisioned to better support the university mission and strategic plan. In addition to offering courses and services that provide convenient access to students in South County, the Irvine Center also serves as a hub for innovation and entrepreneurial activities and a location to promote workforce development and training.

  At the Irvine Center, CSUF consistently offers courses in six undergraduate programs (*B.A. Business Administration, B.S. Child and Adolescent Development, B.A. Communications, B.S. Health Science, B.A. Psychology, and B.A. Sociology*) and three graduate degree programs (*Fully Employed MBA, Master of Social Work, and M.S. Taxation*) to support students from local community colleges transferring to CSUF and to take advantage of relevant business opportunities in the area for students. The FTES generated by course offerings at the Irvine Center has increased steadily from approximately 1,000 in AY 2014-15 to nearly 1,300 in 2017-18.

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

  CSUF Institutional Report
  CSUF Strategic Plan
  University catalog, on-line course schedule, CSUF Website, Course syllabi

---

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

Irvine Center Website on mission, policies, online resources
ITS website
Assessment Data
BA Business Administration Assessment Reports
BS Child And Adolescent Assessment Report
MBA Assessment Report
MSW Assessment Report

Interviews:

Meeting with the Provost [Dr. Pamella Oliver]
CSU Irvine Center Leadership Team [Chair: Dr. Steve Walk]
Small Business Development Center and Center for Entrepreneurship
[SDBC Director: Mike Daniel], [Center for Entrepreneurship Director: John Bradley Jackson]
Extension and International Programs (EIP)
Meeting with Student Success Team
Open meeting with faculty
Open meeting with students
Lab visit [Associate Professor of Kinesiology, Dr. Daniela Rubin]

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A	
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	The CSUF Irvine Center continues a 30-year presence of the university in South Orange County, advancing its founding mission of providing access to students throughout the Orange County service area. It also addresses regional workforce and community needs, and engages in self-support and entrepreneurial activities. The Center's location in the rapidly developing Irvine Spectrum commercial sector allows students to avoid commuting to Fullerton and have access to high-demand academic programs and courses, internship and community engagement activities, and on-site immersive experiences.	

	The Associate Vice President for South County Operations and Initiatives oversees the operations at the Irvine Center. Academic program and course offerings are the responsibility of the university's colleges. Similarly, administrative oversight of the majority of operations and entities located at the Irvine Center (e.g., University Police, the Irvine Center Library, Titan Shops Bookstore) is the responsibility of the respective divisions and auxiliaries on the Fullerton campus. The majority of the 21-member Irvine Center staff is composed of individuals who report to units on the main campus, either fully or in dual-report fashion. The Irvine Center staff work collaboratively to advance annual goals for the Irvine Center, which are aligned with the University Strategic Plan.	
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The presence of CSUF is highly visible at the Irvine Center. A number of elements at the Irvine Center work to assure students that they are at a CSUF location, examples of which include visibility of familiar CSUF signage and branding elements, availability of a number of academic and other support services found on the Fullerton campus, and ability to buy textbooks, supplies and Titan apparel at the Titan Shops store. Students who do not take courses at the Irvine Center also often come to Irvine for its smaller scale atmosphere and services, including academic advising, Library resources, and quiet study spaces. Associated Students, Inc. provide a steady schedule of activities, services and events at Irvine that parallel many of those provided to students on the Fullerton campus. Many student academic societies recruit and hold events at Irvine as well. It should be noted that the number of students who graduate by taking courses at Irvine only is small. The vast majority of students who take courses at Irvine also take them at the Fullerton location. However, the parallel offerings of student support services and activities at both locations help ensure that students are integrated into the CSUF campus life no matter where they take courses.	

Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Responsibility for operations at the Irvine Center is assigned to the Associate Vice President for South County Operations and Initiatives (AVP), who is a member of the Academic Council and reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The AVP is also responsible for helping to advance initiatives that further the work of the colleges, centers and other campus entities that link the university to opportunities in South County. The building at Banting 3 has instructional and support spaces that include 17 traditional classrooms, 5 computer classrooms, 26 faculty offices, a library, a TSU lounge, a bookstore, and multiple quiet and group study spaces. Each of these spaces is equipped with the same "smart classroom" technology used in classrooms at the Fullerton campus. Instructional space at the Irvine Center has a capacity of approximately 880 seats, and is scheduled through the university scheduling system (25Live). Decisions on allocation and ongoing use of non-instructional space at Irvine is administered by the AVP. All space at Banting 1 and 3 is maintained by Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC) via contract, and it is the joint responsibility of ASC maintenance staff and the Irvine staff to alert ASC to issues needing attention.	
Student Support Services. 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)	Advising, counseling, library, computing and other services have been part of the Irvine Center location since its establishment. Student Support Services provided by the Irvine Center Student Success Team are offered in a "one-stop shopping" space on the first floor of the Banting 3 building. The team parallels those found in the colleges, and works in an integrated way to provide holistic support to students. The Student Success Team advising has been assessed via an annual student survey for several years. The results from the AY 2017-18 survey suggested that overall students had a positive experience and received advising that assisted in their educational, career, and personal success. The University Library offers library services at the Irvine Center as part of its operations. The library space at the Irvine Center functions with librarian	Not clear on what support systems are in place for students enrolled in online courses only.

	support and oversight, and integrates IT services as appropriate. Data on these services were collected via surveys of both students and faculty in AY 2016-17. The results showed that 75% of student and faculty respondents were satisfied with their experiences at the Irvine Center Library. The Division of Instructional Technology (IT) provides a variety of student services including a 24/7 IT Help Desk, software free of charge, short/long term use equipment (e.g. laptop). IT also provides services that directly support students, faculty, instruction and events at the Irvine Center. Faculty were surveyed in 2016-17 about their experiences with technological and multimedia instructional resources and support, with 70% being satisfied or very satisfied with their experiences.	
Faculty. 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)	Both full-time and part-time faculty teach at the Irvine Center. The assignment of instructional faculty to teaching and other activities at the Irvine Center is the responsibility of the university's colleges as aligned with their respective academic missions and assessment processes. As such, the involvement of faculty who teach at the Irvine Center with program oversight, curriculum development, and assessment follows the processes within their respective colleges.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	As mentioned above, the university's colleges oversee all programs and courses offered at the Irvine Center. As such, the colleges – working with the faculty – develop the program/course offerings, including content, outcomes and quality measures. These programs/courses are required to go through the same university curricular review process for approval at the department, college and university levels, which is facilitated by the Office of Academic Programs. All courses at CSUF receive a mandatory student evaluation (Student Opinion Questionnaire), which collects anonymous student feedback on the quality of course content and faculty instruction. The evaluation results are shared with the course instructor and the corresponding department chair to foster continuous improvement. As such, the offerings at	

	the Irvine Center are comparable to those at the Fullerton campus. The colleges have increasingly sought to leverage the Irvine Center as a site for providing immersive experiences to students. One example is the PRactical ADvantage Public Relations firm, a student-run integrated marketing agency located at the Irvine Center in which students undertake public relations campaigns for businesses and other firms as part of a cumulative experience in the COMM 474 and 475 courses. Two more recent developments include the Center for Entrepreneurship, an outreach center and a business incubator that supports students who wish to bring their ideas to fruition through advising, interactions with industry professionals, and guidance from successful entrepreneurs; and the Orange County Inland Empire Small Business Development Center Network that employs student interns to both observe and do work on behalf of clients seeking marketing research and other business services.	
Retention and Graduation. 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)	CSUF tracks retention and graduation rates of student cohorts regardless of the location of the program offerings. As mentioned earlier, the number of students who graduate by solely taking classes at the Irvine Center is small. Two programs that have a substantial number of students who complete the program entirely at Irvine are *Fully Employed MBA (FEMBA) and Master of Social Work (MSW)*. For the FEMBA program, the average 1-year retention rate is 92.6% and the 3-year graduation rate for the Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 cohorts is 94.8%, both are higher than the on-ground program (88.4% retention rate, 53.8% graduation rate). Many students in the on-ground MBA program are part-time. For the MSW program, the average 1-year retention rate is 92.2% and the 3-year graduation rate is 82.9% for the same two cohorts, both are slightly lower than the on-ground program (96.1% retention rate, 94.7% graduation rate).	Need further disaggregated retention data (race, gender, ethnicity, hybrid-courses)

Student Learning. 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)	All programs at CSU, regardless of location of instruction, follow a six-step assessment process to assess student learning. The programs are required to assess at least one student learning outcome (SLO) per year, and report their assessment activities and results annually. The courses offered at the Irvine Center are included in the appropriate programs' annual PLO assessment effort, i.e. the programs report the *exact* Irvine courses/sections included in their annual PLO assessment each year. For example, the *B.S. Child and Adolescent Development* program included the Irvine sections of every course used in their 2016-17 PLO assessment. Faculty intentionally do not disaggregate student learning assessment data from the Fullerton campus and the Irvine Center, in part because of the cohesion of the programs and in part because of the lack of anonymity due to the smaller number of course offerings at the latter. Disaggregation could "single out" instructor(s) and blur the boundary between assessment and evaluation the university has carefully and intentionally established.	
Quality Assurance Processes: 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)	In addition to the ongoing student learning outcome assessment process described above, all programs at CSUF are required to complete a Program Performance Review (PPR) at least every 7 years. The PPR guidelines include a section dedicated to assessment of student learning, which asks specifically for how student learning is assessed at offsite locations. This information helps the university ensure that learning is consistently monitored and quality is maintained at the Irvine Center.	

C. **Distance Education Review**

Institution: California State University, Fullerton
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Hector L. Sambolin, Jr.
Date/s of review: April 25, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs 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**

Bachelor of Art - Business Administration:
ISDS 361A: Business Analytics I
ECON 315: Intermediate Business Microeconomics
MGMT 449: Seminar in Strategic Management

Master of Science in Nursing - Nursing Leadership:
NURS 507 Advanced Decision Making: Nursing Issues
NURS 508 Advanced Nursing: Vulnerable Populations
NURS 515 Nursing Service Administration Practicum

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)**

California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) offers 19 programs by distance education (fully online and hybrid), including 3 at the Bachelor's level, 15 at the Master's level, and 1 professional doctoral degree. The FTEs for these programs increased 13% from 982.7 in 2015-16 to 1114.2 in 2017-18. CSUF also offers many distance education courses (fully online and hybrid), the number of which has grown from 289 in 2015-16 to 342 in 2017-18. The FTEs enrollment in these courses also have increased 23% from 3432.52 to 4215.32 during the same time period.

Specific information for Bachelor of Art - Business Administration (BABA):
The online BABA program is a degree-completion program developed to support the need for students who are fully employed or have to travel often and are unable to attend the on-campus program. The program is designed to be a cohort-based, consisting of 57 units over

three years. Given the target student population, the program is designed to be taken part-time. Each course is for an eight-week period. Students only take one class each period, except for one period in which they take two GE classes.

Specific information for Master of Science in Nursing - Nursing Leadership (MSN):
The School of Nursing (SON) is a leader of distance education at CSUF, with a long history of offering distance education programs starting in 2001 with the undergraduate RN to BSN program. The courses were offered in collaboration with Kaiser Permanente via a blend of interactive televised video broadcasting, face to face, and online courses. In 2006, the School of Nursing received funding from Kaiser Permanente to offer distance-based MSN concentration in Leadership/Administration with an optional 6-unit instructional design and technology (IDT) certificate component. Core courses in the Leadership/Administration concentration included management/leadership theory, research, decision making, economics, organizational behavior, practicums, seminars, and thesis/project courses totaling 42 units to be completed in 2 years. The optional IDT courses included hardware and offering environments, instructional design issues, and planning, designing and evaluating technology-based instruction.

The online MSN, Leadership/Administration program was launched in 2008 to meet the need for graduate education in leadership and management, and to serve working nurses who could not attend a campus-based program. The program platform was the Blackboard LMS at the time. The university has subsequently switched to Moodle. The program has always been 100% online except for the practicum courses.

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

CSUF Institutional Report
Irvine Center Enrollment Data
Assessment Data
BA Business Administration Assessment Reports
BS Child And Adolescent Assessment Report
MBA Assessment Report
MSW Assessment Report

Interviews:

Meeting with the Provost [Dr. Pamella Oliver]
CSU Irvine Center Leadership Team [Chair: Dr. Steve Walk]
Small Business Development Center and Center for Entrepreneurship
[SDBC Director: Mike Daniel], [Center for Entrepreneurship Director: John Bradley Jackson]
Extension and International Programs (EIP)
Meeting with Student Success Team
Open meeting with faculty
Open meeting with students
Lab visit [Associate Professor of Kinesiology, Dr. Daniela Rubin]

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. 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?	Consistent with the University mission, CSUF continues to expand offerings in online and hybrid delivery to meet the needs of a diverse student population and to provide access to a variety of immersive learning experiences. These offerings often exist in multiple formats, thus allowing students to engage with learning opportunities at the time and in the format that works best for their academic pathway. The planning and operationalization of the distance education offerings are driven by faculty and managed by the corresponding appropriate departments/colleges. The student learning outcomes of these programs are aligned with the University Learning Goals. The funding is based on the student enrollment (FTEs) generated through these offerings. Students also pay a distance education fee per unit for courses taught in a distance format.	
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Distance education students receive the same support and services as the students on campus. All campus announcements and portal messages are sent to all students enrolled at CSUF. For example, all Nursing students, including the MSN students, are invited to a program orientation and are enrolled in a TiTANium (CSUF's Moodle learning management system) community, where they receive ongoing announcements about School of Nursing events.	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive	CSUF uses Moodle as its learning management system, which is called TITANium on campus. Through this system, students access their course work, upload homework, and get online	

to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	resources for their classes. TITANium is maintained weekly, updated annually, and backed up regularly to ensure smooth operation. Each TITANium course site includes a Student Services "block" that describes and links to a variety of student support services (e.g. advisement center, disability support, IT help desk). Multiple types of activities and external tools (e.g. assignment, attendance, feedback, survey) are integrated into TITANium for faculty to fully engage students online.	
Student Support Services: 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?	CSUF provides a wide range of student support services to ensure high quality learning experiences for distance education students. Below are a few examples: 1. IT support: IT 24/7 Help Desk; software free of charge; short/long term use equipment (e.g. laptop) 2. Tutoring: Online writing support is provided by the University Learning Center and Graduate Studies Center 3. Advising: Distance education students, same as their on-campus counterparts, receive timely and customized advising, either in person or via Zoom sessions. For the MSN program, the School of Nursing Advising Center manages most of the admission and advising for baccalaureate and master's students. The Graduate Advisor is responsible for admission and advising for all of the MSN concentrations. She works with prospective graduate students through their application and throughout their enrollment. The SON also has a Clinical Placement Coordinator. The BABA program has two dedicated academic advisors - one for prospective students, and one for existing students to provide support and guidance. The advisors develop individual study plans for the students and also help students	Data in the form of student surveys or campus studies that address the effectiveness of different programs (such as advising) and student success initiatives.

	resolve any issues they encounter. 4. <u>Library</u>: The library has 400,000 ebooks, millions of full-text online articles, subscription to approximately 200 databases, and thousands of hours of streaming media. The interlibrary loan service is available for all students; Librarians (designated to specific disciplines) offer virtual/remote library instruction sessions, as well as asynchronous interactive tutorials and digital research guides. The library also offers 24/7 research assistance via live online instant messaging. 5. <u>Graduation application process</u>: Graduation application is entirely online, and the associated fee can now be paid online.	
Faculty. 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?	At CSUF, faculty who teach online courses are selected for expertise in the content and not solely to teach in distance education modality. Faculty typically teach across the full continuum of program offerings, including face-to-face, hybrid and fully online. Upon hiring, all faculty are included in an onboarding orientation, offered both on-ground and online. In addition to the support services provided to all faculty from the Faculty Development Center, distance education faculty are also supported by the Department of Online Education and Training (OET), whose mission is to train and support online education. OET supports faculty in the use of TITANium and associated technical products, advises faculty in the use of instructional technologies, develops tools to assist faculty in the design and delivery of online education, assists in the production of instructional media components, promotes best practice in online teaching, and consults in the implementation of online instructional activities and the creation of new online	

	courses and programs. OET also offers resources for online teaching and learning for faculty and students, as well as 3 online certificate programs for Teaching Online and Accessible Instructional Materials. CSUF participates in the Quality Matters program, which provides training and certification to help faculty deliver high quality online courses. For the BABA program, the majority of the courses are taught by full-time faculty. Only 2-3 courses (depending on the semester) are taught by part-time instructors. Faculty participate in an orientation on how to design courses in the online environment, and they worked closely with the university instructional designers to develop and refine course materials. For the MSN program, all faculty are invited to the SON faculty orientation, faculty meetings, and faculty retreats. Faculty members who are experienced in online teaching also serve as key resources for the distance educators in the program. The MSN Lead maintains ongoing communication during the semester and de-briefing upon course completion with the faculty to communicate information related to the effectiveness of the curriculum (e.g., the MSN Educational Effectiveness Plan outcome reports) and suggestions for continuous improvement.	
Curriculum and Delivery. 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.)	Faculty in their corresponding departments and colleges design the distance education programs and courses. These programs/courses are required to go through the same university curricular review process for approval at the department, college and university levels, which is facilitated by the Office of Academic Programs. For distance education offerings, the curricular review process includes evaluation of the courses' adherence to UPS 411.104. Policy on	

[60]

	Online Instruction. All courses at CSUF receive a mandatory student evaluation (Student Opinion Questionnaire), which collects anonymous student feedback on the quality of course content and faculty instruction. The evaluation results are shared with the course instructor and the corresponding department chair to foster continuous improvement. For the BABA program, the courses are designed by faculty who teach the same courses for the on-ground program. These faculty are recommended by the department chairs, with several of them being the course coordinators for the on-ground course offerings. This arrangement is intentional with the goal of ensuring that the content for each course is consistent with on-ground offering. For the MSN program, the curriculum for the online program is the same as the on-ground program, except for the modality of instruction. Instructional faculty are closely involved in the development of the courses and programs. Every four years, the courses are reviewed by the Graduate Program Committee. Both on-ground and online versions of the course are reviewed simultaneously to assure ongoing similarity of content and outcomes.	
Retention and Graduation. 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?	CSUF tracks retention and graduation rates of student cohorts regardless of the modality of the program. For the BABA program, the average 1-year retention rate is 73.2% and the 3-year graduation rate is 53.5% for the Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 cohorts, both are lower than the on-ground program (86.5% retention rate, 70.7% graduation rate. The enrollment size for the two programs varies greatly, with approximately 20 students in the online program and nearly 1,100 students in the on-ground program. For the MSN program, the average 1-year retention rate is 74.4% and the 3-year	

[61]

	graduation rate is 75.0% for the Fall 2014 and Fall 2015 cohorts, both are comparable to or higher than the on-ground program (65.0% retention rate, 75.0% graduation).	
Student Learning. 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?	All programs at CSU, regardless of modality of instruction, follow a six-step assessment process to assess student learning. The programs are required to assess at least one student learning outcome (SLO) per year, and report their assessment activities and results annually. For the BABA program, the SLOs are assessed primarily using course-embedded assignments or exam questions, same as the on-ground program. The assessment results of the two programs are comparable as well. For the MSN program, the SLOs are assessed using a third party assessment entity called SkyFactor that surveys students (online and on-ground) based on the *CCNE* standards of accreditation. The assessment results of the online program are comparable to the on-ground program.	Comparable data between the off-campus site and the main campus on student learning outcomes.
Contracts with Vendors. 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 *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	CSUF uses Moodle as the learning management system, locally known as TITANium. The system is hosted in the university datacenter, and is managed by the Division of Information Technology (IT). All courses are delivered through this system. The Online BABA program uses *ProctorU* as the online proctoring service. However, the vendor doesn't perform any evaluations. All student evaluations are done by CSUF faculty. IT has a review process for all IT resources and services to ensure CSUF abides with federal and state laws and standards.	

Quality Assurance Processes: 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?	In addition to the ongoing student learning outcome assessment process described above, all programs at CSUF are required to complete a program performance review (PPR) at least every 7 years. The PPR guidelines include a section dedicated to assessment of student learning, which asks specifically for how student learning is assessed in online modalities. This information helps the university ensure that learning is consistently monitored and quality is maintained in distance education offerings.	