

Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four forms that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the cited federal requirements. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p>Self-Review Rating</p> <p>1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"> <p>Importance to address at this time</p> <p>A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Self-Review Rating</p> <p>1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p>	<p>Importance to address at this time</p> <p>A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Institutional Information</p> <p>Institution _____</p> <p>Type of Review:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive for Reaffirmation <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Accreditation <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p>Date of Submission: ____/____/____ Mo Day Year</p> <p>Institutional Contact _____</p>
<p>Self-Review Rating</p> <p>1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p>	<p>Importance to address at this time</p> <p>A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>		

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives <i>The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.</i>						
Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	1	A		Mission Statement Message House Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction.</i>	

<p>1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2</p>		2	B	<p>While we have a collection of data representing our outcomes, evidence of student learning needs to be more clear and data assessments should be done at more regular intervals with attached concrete actions.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>.</p> <p>Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
<p>1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10</p>	<p>The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.</p>	2	A	<p>Clearer understanding of what academic freedom means must be more widely understood by students and faculty. Lack of understanding has produced classroom and other related issues.</p>	<p>Academic Freedom Statement</p>	
<p>1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1</p>	<p>The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.</p>	2	A	<p>The University has commissioned a Task Force to examine how best to address issues of diversity and inclusion, hired an Interim Director of Diversity, and is in the process of establishing a Diversity Council and permanent Office of Diversity, Inclusivity, and Equity.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10</p>	<p>The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.</p>	1	C	<p>The University maintains productive partnerships and is not overly regulated by the CSU system</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	

<p>1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12</p>	<p>The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Web-based materials, catalogs, and policies demonstrate that we meet this CFR. College Portrait</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review. Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
--	--	----------	----------	--	--	--

<p>Criteria for Review (1)</p>	<p>Guidelines (2)</p>	<p>Self-Review Rating (3)</p>	<p>Importance to Address (4)</p>	<p>Comments (5)</p>	<p>Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)</p>	<p>Team/Staff Verification (7)</p>
<p>1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>There is strong adherence to standard business practices and the University operates within clearly financial parameters.</p>	<p>Audits submitted with Annual Report.</p>	
<p>1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>In all its interactions with WASC, the University has displayed a strong commitment to respond with integrity and honesty to the accreditation process, its standards, and expectations.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction</i>. Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

The institution needs clear alignment of learning goals with outcomes at all levels (e.g., institutional, departmental, and programmatic) and a review of policies and practices for alignment and consistency.

Diversity efforts cannot operate in a silo but should be threaded through the institution in ways that are meaningful and that advance inclusion at every turn and in every interaction on the campus.

There is a need for more real-time access to data and tracking reports that can be pulled down by multiple users. Data actions should be outlined to maximize data usage and implementation of key findings. A revised data governance structure should be considered. (The Office of Institutional Research has recently been reorganized to report directly to the Office of the President.)

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

Critical policies are in place.

The creation of OIR Factbooks.

Our commitment to integrity founded on a strong sense of our mission.

We "know" our weaknesses.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

Improvements are needed in making student achievement data more readily available and accessible to the public and University community. We are working on Institutional Learning Outcomes assessment and to have analyzed data clearly posted, not just raw numbers of tables.

We need to have a better sense of what we do with the data we collect, who the data "belongs" to, and what data would be most meaningful to answer specific questions. A common data dictionary is necessary.

We need more robust student learning outcome data that can be identified more clearly across the institution. We also need to increase our data disaggregation to better pinpoint points of intervention and overall improvement.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

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

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Teaching and Learning						
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	1.5	B	Department, College, Faculty Senate and system Chancellor's Office reviews ensure appropriate program content.	Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist".	
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4		1.5	B	Degree requirements are clear, but campus engagement with the more subtle issues of performance standards and the meaning, quality and integrity of degrees is still emergent.	Program descriptions in Catalog . Baccalaureate Learning Goals Graduate Degree Information Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i> .	

<p>2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).</p>	<p>1.5</p>	<p>AB</p>	<p>GE program assessment and changes to Academic Program Review and Annual Assessment Reports underpin attempt to strengthen alignment of BALGs and University academic programs.</p>	<p>Description of General Education program with reference to Core Competencies.</p> <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	
<p>Criteria for Review (1)</p>	<p>Guidelines (2)</p>	<p>Self-Review Rating (3)</p>	<p>Importance to Address (4)</p>	<p>Comments (5)</p>	<p>Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)</p>	<p>Team/Staff Verification (7)</p>
<p>2.2b The institution’s graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students’ active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.</p>	<p>1.5</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Graduate programs have appropriate faculty, but engagement with student learning outcomes still developing.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	
<p>2.3 The institution’s student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5</p>	<p>The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>BALGs are well-established, but outcomes and performance standards are in early development and will need consistent support to ensure meaningful implementation</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>.</p>	

<p>2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>Faculty Senate policy mandates learning outcomes on all syllabi. Assessment efforts are improving.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	
<p>2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4</p>		<p>2</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>While SacCT allows faculty to easily provide student feedback, many classrooms continue to feel like they are the purview of independent academic contractors. CTL is doing good work to support improvement in this area.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4	The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.	2	A	Hard work by the OAPA team has led to improvements, but greater support is needed and re-envisioning of institutional assessment structure has begun.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> , Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i> , and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6		2	A	APROC has revised process based on pilot program elements, and assessment of the process has revealed some areas of likely action.	Description of Program Review process and calendar for academic and co-curricular units. Academic Program Review Oversight Committee Also addressed during review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> , Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i> , Component 5: <i>Student Success</i> , and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
Scholarship and Creative Activity						
2.8 The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2	Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	1.6	B	System and campus funding support research, scholarship, and creative activity. Promotion and tenure policies must conform with MOU and are overseen by Faculty Senate UARTP Committee.	Policies related to faculty and student research.	

2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. X 3.2		1.3	B	Some departmental variations are accepted that differ from promotion and tenure policies developed and approved by the Faculty Senate. The FPC recently held “dialogues” to gather faculty insights.	Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure .	
Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution’s mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	2	A	Disaggregated data on OIR website; analysis and access to drive decision-making is strengthening. Campus plans for regular climate surveys.	Included in Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students’ personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		1	A	Co-curricular activities are assessed as part of Student Affairs efforts; data and anecdotal evidence are generally positive.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6	Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.	2	A	Information is available and recruiting materials are truthful and accurate. This is an area where there could be improvement for specific populations and transfer students.	Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in “Marketing and Recruitment Review” Checklist.	

<p>2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1</p>		1.5	B	<p>Numerous student support services are in place and of high quality. New recognition of student food insecurity led to organization of Student Food Bank in 2015.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>Criteria for Review (1)</p>	<p>Guidelines (2)</p>	<p>Self-Review Rating (3)</p>	<p>Importance to Address (4)</p>	<p>Comments (5)</p>	<p>Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)</p>	<p>Team/Staff Verification (7)</p>
<p>2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6</p>	<p>Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.</p>	1.5	B	<p>Recent reform of GE pattern better facilitates transfers; policies and agreements are in place and easily accessed.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>. Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist."</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Desire for departmental “home rule” in matters of ARTP conflict with individual faculty and institutional desire for greater certainty and consistency in matters of tenure and promotion and leads the need for greater clarity of role of UARTP—is it simply a procedural/legalistic committee or a true oversight body?

How does academic program review intersect with University resource allocation and future actions and planning? What is done with the reports when they are completed and accepted by the Faculty Senate?

What assessments do we have for evaluating good practices and effectiveness of departmental academic advising?

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

Data is gathered and generally leads to action and efforts to improve educational effectiveness—especially the action-oriented research efforts of SASEEP.

The collaboration between OAPA and the CTL has yielded good results—especially in terms of faculty use of and familiarity with data for educational effectiveness improvement.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution’s data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

What resources (in terms of data gathering and systems) would be most useful to departments, units, etc. as they work to improve? Where would such support be made available and under what circumstances?

How can the data generated in support of the program review process be made more effective and meaningful?

Academic programs need to make the assessment data they’ve collected explicit and demonstrate how it’s been used to “close the loop” (this matter should be part of APROC’s next set of recommendations).

While data on retention and graduation are available through the OIR website, the University could do a better job of showing how the data is used.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution’s educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	2	B	The University has prioritized faculty hiring and even with budget constraints, has increased the number of full-time tenure-track faculty hiring.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4		1.5	B	Collective bargaining and normative Human Resource oversight guide staff and faculty practices.	Faculty Policy Manual or Handbook.	
3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4	The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	2	B	Faculty development opportunities are available to all faculty members regardless of status. For staff, the University created a leadership program for mid-level managers.	Policies, budgets, or other indicators of faculty development programs. CTL Writing Across Disciplines Professional Development seminars	

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

<p>3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7</p>	<p>The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.</p>	<p align="center">1.5</p>	<p align="center">B</p>	<p>Some perceived disconnects between resource allocations and efforts such as program review. By inviting the college deans, and a representative from each of the faculty, staff, and student governing bodies to be part of the budgeting process, budget decisions have become more transparent.</p>	<p>Audits submitted with Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
---	---	---------------------------	-------------------------	--	--	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.	1.9	B	There are University and classroom technology resources available to faculty and students; IRT has student and faculty support services. Colleges also employ IT specialists.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	C		Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	2	B	Leadership team changes since 2009 have created challenges for some organizational structures and decision-making processes.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	C		Position Descriptions for CEO , CFO .	
3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7	The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	1	C		Board members' names and affiliations ; Board committees and members ; Board bylaws ; CEO evaluation process .	
3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.	1	C		Faculty governance committees, bylaws, or similar evidences .	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Long-range and short-range planning needs to survive changes in leadership by ensuring institutional buy-in through sustainability and transparency.

The issue of the seemingly ad-hoc nature of enrollment management tools and plans to influence staffing, hiring, and program offerings needs focused discussion and consultation.

The University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) processes and the principles that guide resource allocation need to be explicit, consistent, and connected to other University activities. Priorities should be principle-based and therefore less vulnerable to changes in leadership.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

The University's Enrollment Management mechanisms are "tight," effective, and consistent.

A number of structures and reporting processes have survived institutional changes and budget restrictions, indicating that the campus culture is committed to improvement and mission support.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

How can data and data gathering improve our communication about our educational effectiveness initiatives—both at the moment of origin, in process, and as information about successes and weaknesses is developed?

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

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

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10		2	A	Standardized program data is supplied to programs through OIR <i>Factbooks</i> . Proposal and approval processes for curricular revisions are clear and available on the web; annual assessment reporting and data collection are improving.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10		2	A	Clarity needs to develop around what data is most useful to whom, what happens to the data we collect and who "owns" what data; increasing recognition that campus needs "call-able" and real time data to support nimble institutional planning.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
Institutional Learning and Improvement						

<p>4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.</p>	<p>2.2</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>MOU and University policy require some student evaluations (not necessarily every course); assessment support structures are improving as are faculty assessment efforts.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>, and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
---	---	------------	----------	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6	Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.	2	B	PEA grants and the CTL actively involve faculty in ongoing inquiry and efforts to improve the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment; the issue of standards of performance at graduation is emerging on campus and will require more extensive conversation.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7		2	B		Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3		1-2	A	The University periodically engages with WASC and makes revisions to the Strategic Plan, but can do more to systematically engage in institutional reflection and holistic oversight of institutional processes and policies.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.		1.4	B	President Nelsen and his leadership team are charting a new direction for the campus which will necessitate programs and colleges to develop new plans for the future.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

A more holistic, everyday oversight structure and set of processes/policies needs to be organized to lead the campus toward more regular opportunities for reflection in order to efficiently and meaningfully align widespread University improvement efforts, educational effectiveness, and shared strategic commitments.

More emphasis on meaningful data gathering and analysis and making these materials available is required to ensure that the campus actually uses data to drive decision-making.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

We use data to underpin some assessment and decision-making activities—in both academic and support services.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

Data reporting, interpretation, and uses are improving, but continue to offer challenges to the University's efforts to marshal its resources and improve its educational effectiveness.

The IPP process suggests that the University should develop and analyze a set of more standardized data to show program effectiveness in both academic and non-academic programs.

Summative Questions

1. Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?

Steering Committee and Working group members were asked to fill in the self-inventory. Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the President's Cabinet were also asked to fill out the Review. Then the Steering Committee and the Core Competency and Student Success Working Groups examined each standard, CFR and supporting evidence in detail, before their responses were calculated and the Inventory form was completed.

2. What areas emerged as institutional strengths that could be highlighted in the institutional report?

Campus-wide commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Assessment support structures are improving and assessment activity is strengthening and becoming more normalized. As a result, data-based decision-making is becoming more commonplace.

The Baccalaureate Learning Goals provide a strong foundation for the meaning, quality, and integrity of our degrees.

3. What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?

There was a general sense from the Steering Committee that campus communication structures and processes should be strengthened. It was clear from various campus conversation efforts and attempts to inform the campus about our WASC review that more opportunities to engage campus and public stakeholders in core issues will improve campus climate and support our mission and values.

Assessment of learning needs to be occurring throughout the University, for students, faculty, staff, and administration in curricular, co-curricular, and professional development in consistent, meaningful ways in order for Sacramento State to truly achieve the status of a "learning institution."

Continued improvements in data access and analysis are vital and are in the development phases.

4. What are the next steps in preparing for the review?

Alerting the campus to the issues which are being raised by the self-study that require deepened reflection and engagement, such as the matter of University standards of performance at graduation and institution-level assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. The Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, and Student Affairs will need to work collaboratively to address some structural and procedural issues raised by the Steering Committee and Working Groups review of the Standards and CFRs.

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal requirements affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
- 3 – Student Complaints Review Form
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Teams complete these four forms and add them as appendices to the team report. They are included here in order for the institution to provide the necessary information for the team. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

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.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

(i) It reviews the institution's-

(A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

(B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

(ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

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

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

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

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

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

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

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

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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located?
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	Type of courses reviewed: <input type="checkbox"/> online <input type="checkbox"/> hybrid
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed?
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These 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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? If so, where? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
If so, please describe briefly:	
Comments:	

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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? 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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§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.