

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM
ACCREDITATION VISIT

To California State University, San Bernardino

September 29 – October 2, 2014

Team Roster

Tom Apple (Chair), Chancellor, University of Hawaii at Manoa
Maria Zack (Vice Chair), Special Assistant to the President and Chair of the
Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences Department, Point Loma Nazarene
University
Mark B. Goor, Special Assistant to the Provost, University of La Verne
Elaine A. Sundberg, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, Sonoma State
University
Amy Wallace, Dean of the Library, California State University, Channel Islands
Christopher Oberg (WSCUC Liaison), Vice President, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the **2008** WSCUC Senior College and University Commission Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission.

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process	3
B. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	4
C. Response to Issues Raised in Prior Reviews	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS	6
Standard I: Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives	7
Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions	15
Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability	22
Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	27
SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OFFSITE REVIEW AND THE ACCREDITATION VISIT	32
APPENDICES	
Credit Hour Policy Review	35
Student Complaints Policy Review	37
Marketing and Recruitment Review	39
Transfer Credit Policy Review	40
Distance Education Review	41
Off-Campus Locations Review	46

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) was founded in 1965 and is part of the 23 campus California State University system. CSUSB began as a small liberal arts college and has become a comprehensive university that serves the diverse community known as the Inland Empire. The university established an off-campus center at Palm Desert in 1987. The Palm Desert location was originally created to provide upper division coursework, but it has recently expanded to include all four years of instruction. In fall 2012, CSUSB's total enrollment reached its highest point ever with 18,234 students for (15,959 full-time equivalent students). The campus currently employs 831 faculty members and 936 staff. CSUSB offers bachelors and masters' degrees as well as a limited number of doctorates.

The university vision statement is:

California State University, San Bernardino will be a leading contributor to the growth and development of the region, in particular, as well as the state and nation.

The university will serve the region, state, and nation by preparing leaders for the 21st century with a global outlook and the skills needed for educational, social, economic, political, environmental and cultural advancement.

The university has worked intentionally to serve and support the learners in its community. Given the demographics of the CSUSB student body, the school has very strong retention and graduation rates.

CSUSB's most recent reaffirmation of accreditation process began with the Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2003 followed by an Educational Effectiveness Review at the end of 2003. Accreditation was reaffirmed in 2004 with the request for an Interim Report to be filed in 2008. The Interim Report was accepted in the Spring of 2011. During this period there were also a number of substantive changes for specific programs.

CSUSB entered into a new cycle of review with the Offsite Review in the Fall of 2013 and the Campus Visit in the Fall of 2014. As part of the current review, the team reviewed progress on

the trailing concerns from the CPR, EER and Interim Reports. The team also visited the one offsite location in Palm Desert and the relevant review is attached as an appendix.

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

CSUSB's institutional report was carefully written and supported with evidence. The university's review process was wide-ranging and engaged a large number of faculty and staff in the process. The internal review looked at the institution broadly and considered both its strengths and weaknesses. The report was honest and transparent. After the Offsite Review, the committee requested additional information related to:

- The assessment cycle with a particular interest in:
 - Program Review
 - Assessment of general learning
 - Assessment Working Group
- Data-informed decision making with a particular interest in:
 - Decision making and budgeting
 - Prioritizing projects
 - Institutional identity
 - Strategic planning

The university replied thoroughly to the team's request for further information. Based on the team's visit to CSUSB, it is apparent that over the last two years, the university community has become much more actively engaged in discussions related to assessment and planning.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Prior Reviews

CSUSB's recent accreditation history shows progress on several issues, but also indicates that there have been a few key areas of persistent concern. The 2004 reaffirmation of accreditation letter asked that the 2008 Interim Report focus on:

- Strengthening the linkage of strategic planning with budget allocations, prioritizing of programs, and developing measures of success; and
- Progress toward institution-wide responses to the challenges of diversity, student advising, and learning assessment.

The 2008 review of the Interim Report and requested Addendum requested a second Addendum to the Interim Report which should address the following aspects of strategic planning:

1. Specific goals and objectives, prioritized;
2. Measurable criteria against which progress toward each goal and objective will be determined, and clear processes and methods of assessment for evaluating progress toward meeting goals and objectives;
3. Proposed action steps, lines of responsibility and a timeline for implementation and periodic review of each of the goals and objectives;
4. Clear linkages between the strategic plan and the budget process; and
5. Articulation between the CSU system-wide strategic plan, the university strategic plan and the unit plans within the university's decentralized planning model.

The Committee also asked for an explanation of how the loop is closed with respect to evaluating the success of planning outcomes.

The second Addendum to the Interim Report that was due in November 2009 was submitted by CSUSB in May of 2010. In October of 2010 the Interim Report Committee deferred acceptance of the Interim Report stating that they did not feel that the five specific components mentioned in their

2008 review had been fully addressed. The Committee requested an additional report to be submitted in May of 2011. The Committee letter states that “the committee is not wanting a lot more pages of information but a succinct focus on the strategic plan with the explicit components requested.” In May of 2011, the report was accepted with a recommendation that CSUSB develop a strategic plan that incorporates the five criteria first mentioned in the 2008 response to the Interim Report.

The report submitted by CSUSB for this current WSCUC accreditation review demonstrates that the school has worked to address some of the previous concerns. They have made progress in student advising and in issues related to diversity. The university has also revised its program review processes and created the Assessment Working Party (a committee) to support university-wide assessment efforts. In 2012, CSUSB inaugurated a new President who has recently restarted strategic planning processes.

However, as can be seen in this report, this WSCUC team is concerned that the momentum surrounding issues of strategic planning and assessment of student learning be maintained after the Accreditation Visit is concluded. In order for CSUSB to maintain long-term health it is important that the university community continue its good work in the areas of planning and assessment of student learning.

SECTION II – EVALUATION UNDER THE STANDARDS

The WSCUC visiting team made use of the four standards as an organizing principle for its evaluation of the CSUSB self-study report.

Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with its purposes and character. It has a clear and conscious sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in the higher education community, and its relationship to the society at large. Through its purposes and educational objectives, the institution dedicates itself to higher learning, the search for truth, and the dissemination of knowledge. The institution functions with integrity and autonomy.

CSUSB's institutional report, offsite review, requested follow-up materials, and the Accreditation Visit (AV) show that the campus has defined purposes, established educational objectives, has evidenced distinctive elements, and maintains strong relationships with the students and community it serves (CFR 1.1). During the visit, the team was repeatedly impressed with the shared sense of CSUSB's mission to serve the significant needs of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. While CSUSB clearly has the shared value of "student success," certain questions remain regarding educational quality and learning outcomes. Evidencing essential values and character, mission, and educational objectives is not new to the WASC standards, but the process has shifted from checking off standards boxes with disconnected pieces of evidence to a process that uses the standards as a way to evaluate the university's assessment loop. As a pilot campus for the past two WASC revisions of the process for reaffirmation of accreditation, CSUSB has had the extra challenge of interpreting new standards and processes, and has been handicapped by the inability to apply lessons learned from the experience of others.

The evidence provided by CSUSB shows most Standard I criteria are being met individually, but the team is left to ponder how they fit all fit together to form a coherent whole. The question remains: *What makes a CSUSB graduate a CSUSB graduate?* The lack of a clear and concise answer to this question has made reviewing the use of assessment techniques, learning and student success data, continuous improvement efforts, resource alignment, and planning processes considerably more difficult.

During the visit, the team met with a number of students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The team also met with groups that are tasked with moving the university forward in the areas of learning outcomes, assessment, program review, enrollment management, general education, and institutional research. All spoke passionately about their commitment to the students and community, as well as their commitment to student success. However, the team noted that the essential question of the meaning of a CSUSB degree continues to elude definition (CFR 1.1, 1.2).

Institutional Purposes Rooted in the Mission Statement

CSUSB has a mission, Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), program learning outcomes, and has introduced a number of high impact practices (HIPs), but each has been considered and assessed independently from one another. In its Institutional Reaccreditation Self-Study and Report (September 9, 2013), CSUSB discusses in Essay 1 (Defining the Meaning of the Degree) how they are defining the meaning of their degrees and ensuring their integrity, quality, and rigor. In opening the essay, CSUSB undertook an analysis based on the university's mission statement, which is posted on the President's website as part of CSUSB's strategic plan (CFR 1.1). Each component of the mission statement is analyzed, and the university provides evidence to support that the various components of the mission are being achieved.

CSUSB states that it “offers a challenging and innovative academic environment” and then provides a list of programs, centers and institutes that support “innovation.” The list, while comprehensive, is descriptive rather than analytical of how these various innovative programs contribute to the meaning of a CSUSB degree. The university also provides data from the CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment) and the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) which are used to illustrate CSUSB educational rigor and quality. The CLA results place the university at an impressive 96th percentile in value added, and the NSSE results reveal that

CSUSB “students feel that they are challenged in increasingly greater numbers.” The university, however, cautions that the CLA results represent a small sample size, and NSSE results are survey data of student attitudes and opinions and are not actual measures of student achievement (CFR 1.2). The WASC team visit confirmed that outcome measures and collection of student learning assessment is still in its infancy in many programs and department. Individuals interviewed characterized this work as gaining momentum and intentionality and that the university is on a trajectory to achieve these goals.

CSUSB’s mission also addresses the importance of providing a “supportive and welcoming social and physical setting” for students, faculty and staff, and of fostering a sense of “belonging.” This sense of belonging was palpable during the team’s interviews with students, faculty and staff. Also in Essay 1, CSUSB affirms the importance of diversity and its commitment to creating an “inclusive and pluralistic environment” for its highly diverse community (CFR 1.5). The importance of and attention to diversity in all of its aspects is an area of strength at CSUSB and was seen and experienced throughout the team visit. Section 3 of their mission statement continues to emphasize the importance of engaging students in the “life of the campus” and to “interact with others of diverse backgrounds and cultures.” Of particular note is CSUSB’s designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and as a non-majority campus. Their residential life, student leadership, and orientation programs all include components that emphasize the value of diversity and provide students with programs that honor and celebrate it. Clearly, CSUSB has a historic and proud commitment to the “increasing diversity in society” (CFR 1.5). In particular, during the visit, the team explored the value of SOAR and its importance in the retention of students, particularly those from diverse backgrounds and low socio-economic and historically disadvantaged communities.

CSUSB is justly proud of its retention of students, particularly low income, first generation, and underrepresented minority (URM). The university has a very high rate of first generation (70%) and Pell-eligible (65%) students. Yet the university boasts the third highest rate among the CSUs in first- to second-year retention of students. It also ranks first in the nation in awarding bachelor's degrees to Latino students. It has the second highest African American and Hispanic enrollments of all public universities in California. These numbers testify to the impressive diversity of the student body and reflect CSUSB's commitments to this population (CFR 1.4). The team saw firsthand the lived experience of a community committed to diversity in every meeting and encounter during the visit.

The final goal of CSUSB's mission is to serve as a "preeminent center of intellectual and cultural activity in Inland Southern California," which positions the university in relationship to the "society at large" (Standard I). The essay provides no discussion of CSUSB's role in the community, but provides a list of initiatives in an Appendix. During the visit, many examples of CSUSB's involvement in community were presented, including student internships, community engagement, and service learning. Faculty members engage with students in the community in such areas as tutoring and social work. Some staff and administrators expressed that CSUSB is a "hidden gem" and that many outstanding programs, such as the new program in cybersecurity are not sufficiently recognized for their excellence in the community. The Enrollment Management Team is hoping to create a "brand" that would be instantly identifiable as CSUSB.

CSUSB has a clear sense of identity as a regional, public university committed to "student success in a culturally and economically diverse educational environment." Its location in the San Bernardino/Riverside County region of Southern California clearly aligns with its stated mission in serving its over 18,000 students, most of whom reside in the area. Given the low socio-economic status – one of the poorest regions in the state – and low educational

attainment of residents in the region, CSUSB has made remarkable strides in the retention and graduation of its students. While its identity in this regard is clearly articulated, CSUSB is just beginning to link its mission, strategic vision and planning to its newly defined ILOs (still in the vetting and approval stage). This work will allow the university to better understand how its mission can be achieved and how it can measure progress towards its goals. CSUSB needs to link the discussion of the distinctiveness of a CSUSB education to its recently drafted Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). As it turns out, several of their ILOs do map to the discussion of distinctiveness. These ILOs were drafted in the 2013-2014 Academic Year and still need to be adopted by CSUSB (CFR 1.2). A plan for university wide assessment of the ILOs has yet to be developed, but program learning outcome appropriateness is examined as part of the program review process (CFR 2.4, 2.7). The university will need to move quickly to conducting these assessments in order to better understand the achievement of their students in order to engage in improvement of academic quality.

Defining Institutional Purposes

Following the Offsite Review (OSR), the team requested that the university provide an update on its progress in defining the distinctiveness of the CSUSB education. Citing its uniqueness as an urban university situated in the Inland Empire with “one of the lowest educational attainment rates in the country and the highest unemployment rates,” CSUSB has situated itself against this regional background.

In defining its purposes, the university states: “CSUSB has gradually created for itself the identity of student success in a culturally and economically diverse educational environment, with a clear focus on community engagement and service learning, through a rich set of co-curricular activities and a robust system for student advisement. These features form the essence of a CSUSB educational experience and distinguish the university from its peers.” What seems

lacking in this definition is mention of the quality of the educational mission of the university and achievement of educational objectives (CFR 1.1, 1.2). The focus on community engagement, service learning, co-curricular activities, and student advisement, while laudable, does not address the core mission of the university to “offer a challenging and innovative *academic* environment.” Community engagement, service learning and involvement in co-curricular activities are methods by which students learn, gain knowledge, gain experience, and achieve educational goals, but are not educational objectives nor quality indicators in themselves.

Student advisement is an important component of student success, but again is not a quality indicator or particularly a “distinguishing” feature that separates CSUSB from its peers, as many higher education institutions have robust student advising. However, CSUSB should be justly proud of its work in enhancing student advisement through the implementation of peer advising, professional advisors in the Colleges, and greater focus on career and postgraduate advising. CSUSB has developed a Four Year Degree Pledge Program that allows entering freshmen who have a declared major to graduate in four years. This is an innovative approach to a guaranteed four-year degree and demonstrates that, for at least a subset of CSUSB’s students, academic degrees can be completed in a timely fashion (CFR 1.7). In conversation with students, however, the team heard that classes are often full, and students who do not have priority or early registration are unable to take the classes necessary for timely graduation. Recognizing that CSUSB is only just emerging from several years of serious budget constraints coupled with a larger student body, the team understands the realities of class scheduling and capacity. However, by utilizing scheduling tools and analytic capacities in the common management system and other programs, such as My Planner, the university can begin to provide better access to bottleneck and gateway courses necessary for students to make progress toward degree.

To support achievement of CSUSB's mission statement regarding providing "learning opportunities driven by teaching and research excellence, intellectual interaction and creativity," CSUSB has created a new Office of Student Research and engages students in research projects through a variety of centers, institutes and academic programs. The university awards outstanding teaching and service awards to faculty, and provided a "sampling" of student awards. However, in Essay 1 there is little discussion of how "close student contact" occurs in other settings, such as through mentoring and advising, and it is unclear how many students at CSUSB are afforded opportunities to engage in research, scholarship and creative activity with faculty members.

Measuring Quality

The final section of CSUSB's Essay 1, "Defining the Meaning of the Degree," addresses the quality and rigor of its academic programs, stating "student learning outcomes are at the core of our degree programs." The university states its commitment to improvement and to the evaluation of degree programs and "closing the loop with appropriate changes and adjustments aimed at improvement" (CFR 1.2). Evidence to support this claim includes a listing of accredited programs, stating the goal of CSUSB "to achieve national accreditation in every program with a national accrediting body." CSUSB has begun improvement of the organizational structure for assessment and the program review process, as well as looking at assessment in General Education. An Assessment Working Party has recently been created (2013-2014), and the new program review process was implemented in Fall 2013 (CFR 1.2). However, these initiatives are relatively recent, so little data on student learning, feedback, and improvements are available. Essay 2 of CSUSB's self-study discusses further the assessment of student learning and is covered in the team's review of compliance with Standard II.

Reporting and Integrity

CSUSB subscribes to the AAUP's Statement on Academic Freedom and has other policies and procedures to ensure appropriate practices and procedures are in place. (See [http://senate.csusb.edu/FAM/Policy/\(FSD88-06.R.1\)Ethics.pdf](http://senate.csusb.edu/FAM/Policy/(FSD88-06.R.1)Ethics.pdf), the Faculty Senate's Statement Concerning Professional Ethics and Responsibility.) (CFR 1.4). As one of the 23 campuses of the California State University (CSU), a public system of higher education, the university must maintain public transparency and integrity. CSUSB does make publicly available its retention and graduation rates both on its website and on the CSU Chancellor's Office website. As a campus of the CSU, the university publishes its retention and graduation rates, information on student learning, and other data on the Campus Portrait as part of the Voluntary System of Accountability. This data is prominently displayed on CSUSB's Admissions webpage at <http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/CSUSB>. (CFR 1.2).

Furthermore, as a campus of the CSU, CSUSB is committed to truthful representation (CFR 1.6) and honest and open communication with WASC (CFR 1.8).

Based on its review of CSUSB, the visiting team suggests that the CSUSB community consider taking the following actions:

- Continue the important work of defining the quality and meaning of a CSUSB education.
- Pursue the answer to the question “what makes a CSUSB graduate a CSUSB graduate” in all of its dimensions. Work has been done on the “student success” piece, but work needs to be done on the academic and educational quality.
- Develop a brand for the university, based on the distinctive identity of a CSUSB graduate.

- Tell the story of CSUSB in order to celebrate the successes, to highlight the quality of the academic programs, and to share lessons learned with other universities throughout the region and nation.
- Continue to enhance the student advising model and create four-year pathways to the baccalaureate for increased numbers of CSUSB students.

Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The institution achieves its institutional purposes and attains its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. It demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively and that they support one another in the institution's efforts to attain educational effectiveness.

The Offsite Review identified the areas of assessing student learning and making use of those data for program improvement as an important focus of the site visit. During the site visit the team met with many committees that are actively engaged in moving the assessment agenda forward. In this section, the team addresses the assessment cycle, student learning outcomes, HIPs (High Impact Practices) and how they are assessed, the Assessment Working Group, and the impact of program reviews on decision making and resource allocation.

Program Review:

Based on the initial documents provided, the team had concerns about the program review process. This concern was three fold:

- The role of assessment in program review;
- The connection between program review and decision making; and
- The fact that the program review process appears to have been stopped for some time during the season of significant financial challenges (CFR 2.4, 2.7).

After the offsite review, the team asked CSUSB to submit five sample program reviews done under the previous program review protocol, and at least two program reviews conducted under

the new model. The following five reviews conducted under the prior model were provided: Business, Educational Counseling, Biology/Bio Chemistry, Psychology, and MA Composition. These reviews contain some assessment data and the analysis of those data. The reviews varied in terms of the use of tests, grades, and student work. The reviews also varied in the use of data analysis and reflection to develop recommendations (CFR 2.6, 2.7).

The Business and Education programs have national accreditation which has guided the development of robust assessment protocols which can be seen in their program reviews. However, Education might consider making use of a wider sampling of student work beyond competency exams. The MA English review had a full cycle of assessment, feedback and improvement. Chemistry had a clear set of learning goals and good measurement tools. The Chemistry program was honest in presenting poor assessment outcomes but did not indicate how these outcomes are being used to formulate a comprehensive plan for improvement. The Psychology program had a well-developed curriculum map aligned with university goals. However, they may need to revise their learning outcomes so that they are easier to measure.

In general, the five sample program reviews conducted using the old protocol appeared to be assessment reports rather than reflective reviews of the purpose, success, and continual improvement of programs. The linkage between program review and implemented changes was also unclear. While some narratives indicated that program-level changes were made, the connection to resource allocation was difficult to follow. It is hoped that the new outcomes-based program review process will lead to the development of action plans and recommendations that are clearly aligned with assessment results and best practices in the field (CFR 2.7, 4.3).

Arabic, Physics and Sociology are three programs that have undergone a program review using the new protocol. These three reviews were read by the visiting team. The Arabic program review did not contain assessment data beyond standardized language tests. The Physics report

contains more detail and data, but this data is mostly input information and survey results rather than direct assessment of student work. The Physics review indicates that using direct assessment to gather student learning outcome data is part of their future plans. The Sociology program review has learning outcomes but no learning outcome data. This review did do a careful job of discussing the progress made on the recommendations from Sociology's previous program review.

The newly adopted Senate policy on Periodic Program Reviews and Preparation of a Self-Study Report does require that programs address student learning outcomes; however, there is little guidance or direction on how these might be assessed or any requirement to indicate how assessment results are utilized to make improvements to programs, curriculum, or pedagogy. Additionally, there appears to be support from Institutional Research to conduct indirect surveys of student learning, but no mention of support for direct, authentic assessment. Finally, there is no guidance on the development of action plans. The addition of templates or guides for these crucial sections of the review could strengthen the self-study process and result in actionable items that could be undertaken at the program, school and university levels. It could also serve to provide greater uniformity across self-studies at the college level, which in turn could assist the College Deans in their analysis of needs and allocation of resources.

Data Informed Changes

The team asked for the university to identify program modifications based on the analysis of student learning data. One example given that was clearly based on learning outcomes data was the business writing example using a rubric and creation of a new course. In this program goals were set, attempts to measure student's ability to achieve them were designed, and the program has modified what they do based upon an analysis of their outcomes, and they are now getting better results. They also implemented a writing center. This process may serve as an

exemplar for other units in the university. Additional examples included composition stretch program, residential life retention initiative, career conference, and undergraduate research.

While data informed change has been happening in a variety of places across the university, it is not clear to the team that CSUSB has been using systematic assessment of student learning throughout its degree programs to ensure that the university ensures the meaning, quality and integrity of its degrees (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4).

However, the new program review process indicates the expectation that all programs will engage in the full cycle of assessment. The new process also requires the program review to have an external reviewer. Each external review is accompanied by written responses from the deans (CFR 2.7). For example: external reviewers recommended that the Arabic program should work with the Advancement office to raise money. The specific target of this fundraising is to increase the number of people teaching in the department. The Dean's response to the program review indicated that the Dean's office will consider and make recommendations for potential changes in staffing in the Arabic program. Similarly, the external reviewer for Physics agreed with the program review that a new faculty member needs to be hired. The response from the dean indicates that the program review is only part of the consideration for hiring new faculty, but that the information from the review would be considered. Sociology's program review demonstrated that bottlenecks in student progress could be alleviated by hiring faculty. Faculty lines were authorized by the Dean. So it is clear that the new post-review process is trying to establish clear linkages between resources and program review recommendations.

While the new program review holds promise to allow programs to close the loop on student learning and achievement, it remains to be seen how the results of program review will be widely disseminated and will influence decisions in changes in curriculum, faculty hiring, and resource allocation. In the team visit with the deans of the Colleges, several deans expressed that

as more of the program reviews are completed, they anticipate using the self-study and learning outcomes assessment to support and inform decision making at the College level. This would include resource and hiring needs, as well as support for curricular and pedagogical innovation and change. With only a few programs having completed the self-study cycle, the deans felt it was premature to evaluate program needs based on the program reviews. What remains unclear is how the new model of program review will support institutional efforts to attain educational effectiveness throughout the university (Standard II).

Support for Learning Outcomes Assessment

The Assessment Working Party (AWP) was formed to create, promote, and foster campus-wide institutional goals. The AWP began as a grass-roots group that gained legitimacy among faculty and then was officially recognized by the president in October 2013. The AWP has reported making solid first steps toward developing a list of ILOs and getting community buy in. However, the university has yet to adopt and finalize these ILOs (CFR 1.1, 2.1, 2.3). The next step involves working with GE learning outcomes to determine where ILOs align and how they will be assessed. The AWP reports making progress toward creating a university-wide culture of assessment. Conversations were planned for spring 2014 to focus on the meaning of the degree which resulted in the proposed ILOs. This will be followed by an assessment of the alignment of ILOs with PLOs. Each member of the working group has activities to build awareness and ownership of learning outcomes and assessment.

The AWP and the WASC Steering Committee expressed enthusiasm for the momentum that they feel based on recent progress and a new pattern of conversations about assessment across all units. There is evidence that data are beginning to be examined and actions being taken that will improve student success. For example, when IR compared the persistence rate of students who attended SOAR with those who did not, the data indicated the attending SOAR

improved retention rates. The following year, SOAR was required. The team strongly encourages academic and non-academic units to collect data on programs and activities, to assess their effect and impact on success, and to take action based on those findings.

General Education Assessment

At CSUSB, General Education learning outcomes are in transition. Currently there is a long list of outcomes that are not yet fully aligned with the newly developed institutional learning outcomes. There is a great deal of work to be done to focus the list and get faculty ownership. In addition, much of the assessment of general education and institutional learning objectives is based on indirect data – such as surveys of students and alumni – particularly for writing and oral skills. While the general education goals are enumerated and most goals are mapped onto the curriculum, there is little evidence of direct measures of learning outcomes for general education. The samples of assessment provided were mostly based on survey data or other “intuitive” tools, not on specific learning outcomes data. While these are starts, direct measures such as portfolio analysis, summative evaluations, and other techniques must be found.

A working group is engaged in this project, and the team suggests that they work hard to align their GE objectives with their ILOs. The GE committee stated that over the next year, they will sponsor university-wide conversations designed to refine the current GE outcomes and to work toward alignment with ILOs. The president, provost and AWP are encouraging the GE committee to make progress in refining the GE and building its assessment. Once the new list is developed, a plan for assessment will need to begin anew. It will be important to identify the types of assessment or artifacts to be considered for GE assessment (CFR 2.2, 2.2a).

Concerns about the rigor of general education were raised by Physics in their self-study, and these concerns deserve careful consideration. An assessment cycle which truly measures student learning outcomes would go a long way in either confirming this belief in a lack of rigor

or dismissing it as unfounded. We see great opportunities for the use of the GE Capstones for assessing student learning through the early GE curriculum (CFR 2.6, 4.6).

Assessment in HIPs and the Co-Curricular

CSUSB has clearly invested a great deal of energy in High Impact Practices because HIPs have been shown to be particularly effective with the type of student served by the university. One result of the implementation of these practices is improved retention and graduation. However, CSUSB still seems unclear about which of these practices are leading to improved learning and whether student attainment is a result of one or more of these HIPs. There are data that show the impact of Community Engagement on student success and the GPA data of students who participated in SAIL. There is also evidence of the positive effect of the Peer Lab and Student Assistance. However, CSUSB needs to leverage more of the survey data that it is collecting (NSSE, CSU 4B, and Student Orientation) and link that information to student success and learning outcomes achievement. Being able to quantify which HIP's are most effective with CSUSB's student body would be of benefit to the university and contribute to the national conversation about what programs to undertake in a resource constrained environment (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4).

Student Affairs and non-academic units have embraced assessment. Over the last year, there has been continuous training in groups and one-to-one tutoring. As a result, these units are able to identify measurable goals and procedures to assess performance. It is important to note that all committees that are critical to advancing the improvement of student learning university-wide representation that included academic and non-academic units (CFR 2.5, 2.6).

CSUSB has made good progress in improving its system of program review, developing support for campus-wide assessment efforts, and beginning the process of a more effective GE assessment. The team commends the school for its hard work and encourages the maintenance of

the momentum towards building a strong culture of assessment which includes outcomes-based program reviews. Based on the visit, the team suggests that the following items will help CSUSB realize its desire to use best practices in assessment of student learning:

- Complete the approval process of ILOs for the university;
- Establish refined GE outcomes through a process of university-wide conversations;
- Align GE learning outcomes with ILOs;
- Create assessments for ILOs and GE outcomes;
- Continue to develop Program Reviews that are learning outcomes-based and that are used in closing the assessment loop; and
- Provide greater guidance to programs engaged in program review self-studies, for example, creating templates for reporting on assessment activities, results, and improvements, and a template for creating action plans that are focused in three areas: actions that can be achieved at the program level, such as curriculum development and revision; actions that require College support, such as resources for laboratories or faculty hires; and actions that require university discussion.

Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, 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.

CSUSB is clearly committed to delivering educational opportunities in a diverse region with an eye to student access, retention, and graduation. The university's curricular and co-curricular programs advance the California State University's system-wide mission and goals. In addition, CSUSB has begun to reflect on the many things that have made it unique within its

large system. The needs of its region as well as the interests of students, faculty, and community partners are apparent in its mission, courses, and co-curricular programs, and have been incorporated into tactical decision making over the years (CFR 3.8). The recent reflections on student success and areas of distinction before embarking on the process of strategic planning should provide a good basis for more inclusive and intentional decision-making to ensure sustainability, but there is still a need to reflect on the meaning of the degree to insure a common understanding of what CSUSB students will know and do before they graduate in order to put into place methods that will insure the measurement of degree quality (CFR 3.8). Out of these discussions will no doubt come additional distinguishing traits that stem from student learning.

The institutional report as a whole evidenced that student success is a priority for CSUSB and that the campus has key structures in place to ensure this priority (CFR 3.8). The checklist provided evidence that the CSU Board of Trustees is the independent governing board which provides appropriate and transparent oversight (CFR 3.9); there is a clearly established hiring and evaluation process for CSUSB's President (CFR 3.9); the President is full-time and has a cabinet which includes a CFO, Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Advancement as well as the Dean of the Palm Desert Campus, diversity officers, and Director of Institutional Effectiveness (3.10). The on-site visit confirmed that academic leadership is provided via a shared governance model with faculty participating on committees and bodies that recommend and make decisions such as the Academic Senate Chair serving on the Budget Committee, a senate committee driving educational policies, and a number of faculty serving on the WASC Steering Committee and Assessment Working Group. (CFR 3.11). More impressive was the inclusion of students on every committee mentioned, and the examples of how their voices inform decision making at all levels of the university. There was a clear desire to get a wide range of student perspectives and the expectation that students will be full partners in

decision-making. Community stakeholders were represented on the Foundation Board, college level advisory boards, and as a result of countless curricular and co-curricular partnerships. The evidence provided following the Offsite Review, which was affirmed by the on-site visit, showed that the clear and consistent processes for decision making being developed include faculty and staff from across campus (CFR 3.8).

Faculty and Staff

The institutional report indicates that overall CSUSB has qualified personnel for operations and academics (CFR 3.1). The faculty and staff are qualified and diverse (CFR 3.2), and there are clear faculty policies, practices, and evaluations to ensure quality and diversity in the future (CFR 3.3). The AV and CSUSB's designation as a "Great College to Work For" evidenced the respect that colleagues have for one another's work at all levels. With that said, the institutional report noted that the economic downturn and cuts to the CSU system required the institution to make tough decisions in order to maintain operations and quality academics with fewer faculty and staff (CFR 3.1, 3.2). The college Deans spoke eloquently to the team regarding the dedication of faculty to mentor students and to engage with them in research and scholarship, as well as mentoring them in community engagement and internships. However, the reduction in tenure-track faculty has resulted in less time for the faculty as a whole to participate in student mentoring, planning, governance, scholarship and professional development. CSUSB is addressing this need by adding ten new faculty lines each year 2013-2015 (CFR 3.1) as well as recruiting faculty to fill retirements and resignations.

Similarly, the reduction in administrator and staff increased the emphasis on maintaining academic operations at the expense of planning and professional development. These findings were confirmed by the AV. There is clearly a need for additional tenure-track faculty lines to insure that can meet teaching, service, and research expectations as well as student engagement

expectations. There is a need to alleviate perceptions and realities of salary inequities and compression that have resulted from economic pressures. There is need to add staff positions across the university that were lost during the economic downturn. University-wide planning for hires and to rectify compensation issues, as state or non-state revenue becomes available, will be needed to move the campus beyond day to day tactical concerns that were made more intense by the economic recession, as well as to meet student engagement goals and maintain/expand high impact practices (CFR 3.11, 3.1).

Resources

The institutional report and AV provided evidence that CSUSB is financially stable and makes sound decisions to ensure its viability in the future (CFR 3.5). The economic downturn has meant that the campus has not had consistent and desired revenue to support all that it hopes to accomplish. However, the institutional report demonstrates that CSUSB understands its system's financial realities, develops realistic plans and budgets, can make tough choices to reduce expenses when needed, and has begun to think about ways to enhance revenues apart from enrollment growth and state dollars (CFR 3.5). The campus was able to reduce costs through energy and water conservation, utilizing shared services, position consolidation, and outsourcing where feasible. The campus was able to enhance revenues through increased non-state resident and international enrollments; expanded online, extended university, and summer session offerings; targeted student fees; and focused fundraising and grant development.

The AV confirmed that staff and faculty feel that the library programs and information resources are adequate and well aligned to the curriculum, faculty and student research, and campus initiatives (CFR 3.6). The institutional report describes the Library as forward thinking and progressive, considerate of stakeholders' needs and continually surveying users' satisfaction with resources and services. The Library is integrated into the larger academic culture with

speaker series, collaborative spaces for students, multimedia equipment available for student projects, and opportunities and spaces to show student research and creative activities (music, poetry). It was also noted that a Library expansion is one of two facilities that are priorities for the campus, and library faculty have seats on planning and assessment committees that will be key to them furthering their information literacy efforts.

The AV also confirmed that staff and faculty feel that the campus plans for, implements, provides training on, and supports the needed technologies to advance teaching, learning, and campus initiatives (CFR 3.7). The institutional report noted that the campus instituted the “Vital Technology Student Fee” to continue to support technology in the midst of budget cuts, and that care was taken to work with key stakeholders across all aspects of the university and consider online and offsite operations in their decision making on how to allocate those new funds. Limited resources focused recent efforts on teaching and learning technologies such as assistive technologies and smart classrooms and strategies to move away from time consuming maintenance by utilizing virtual desktops and outsourcing student email. There is also evidence that there is a desire and plan to employ technology to enhance student success as funds become available, such as an Early Warning System for advising.

There has also been much success is using non-public funds to expand the Palm Desert Campus and Student Success fees to enhance services for students. These services are now being examined in light of retention and gradation. The next step may be to look into how many of these co-curricular services might help students meet or excel at institutional learning, general education learning, and program learning outcomes.

Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

The institution conducts sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. 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 at different levels of the institution and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work.

California State University San Bernardino is, by a number of measures such as the CLA and persistence/retention data, doing an excellent job of educating a culturally and economically diverse body of students, many of whom need remediation. CSUSB is doing so in a difficult, resource-constrained environment. Their student persistence rates have reached their highest levels ever.

These remarkable results are a testament to a very committed faculty and staff who take on additional responsibilities for the benefit of the students. It is also due to a dedicated leadership team, headed by the President and Provost, but including a large number of others leaders, who have been working very hard to move the university forward.

The university has laid the infrastructure for assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes through investment in Institutional Research(CFR 4.2). The Office of Institutional Research has been increased two hundred and fifty percent and has expanded its capacity for institutional self-study to include assessment and survey research such as NSSE and the CSU Campus Quality assessment. They have formulated a data warehouse, and web interface. They also participate in the Collegiate Learning Assessment and iSkills, an online data mining tool has been created to add demographic analysis. Many innovative approaches are being tried, and recently several working groups have begun institutional-level sharing of information and best practices. While overall impacts of approaches such as SOAR, and HIPs on student success, as defined by retention, are being studied, direct evidence of student

achievement and learning are not yet being measured and then acted upon coherently and pervasively across the entire university (CFR 4.2).

The Office of Undergraduate Studies has likewise been strengthened to use data to design programs to target specific groups of at-risk students (CFR4.1). It will be important for these efforts for at-risk students that a full assessment cycle be employed to gauge the effectiveness of these programs. The Institutional Effectiveness Associate under Institutional Research is assisting co-curricular programs to create assessment plans and ensure the transition of assessment plans into practice.

Strategic Planning

We believe the university will be greatly enhanced by engaging in a strategic planning process(CFR 4.6, 4.7). The current plan which was developed in 2009 is, by their own admission, too diffuse and lacks metrics and an implementation plan. The lack of an active strategic plan appears to inhibit a strong, university-wide sense of the meaning of the degree and the uniqueness of CSUSB. The development of a strategic plan will be crucial going forward. The plan should include goals, means to achieve those goals, metrics and measures to ascertain success and processes that will be in place to use the results of data to improve the institution. The process for developing that plan should be open and involve all stakeholders. The planning process holds promise of providing unifying approaches to assess effectiveness and getting universal buy-in and commitment to a shared vision for the university. It will also be essential in garnering resources for success. The committee is optimistic based upon our meetings with various groups, including the Strategic Planning Committee, the Deans, the AWP and the executive leadership that a robust thoughtful plan will emerge. We have evidence of a timeline for seeking input from all stakeholders and a plan for the formulation of the plan to be completed by May 2015 (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

Assurance of quality at CSUSB is good in most areas and will certainly be improved with the creation and adoption of a strategic plan. The actions taken by the University Budget Advisory Committee during a time of significant budget cuts is an example of strategic decision making which protected the mission of the university and prioritized the needs of Academic Affairs over other units. Decisions regarding new faculty were also made strategically, considering a wide range of key stakeholders. The decision making process seems appropriate and involves both ‘ground up’ ideas and vision and ultimate decision-making from above (CFR 4.5, 4.6). Good tactical decision-making occurs commonly and local decisions, those at the department level, are made based upon the best available data. Much of those data today are indirect and survey-based, but there appears to be new vigor in obtaining direct evidence of student learning (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

Academic Data Available for Planning and Learning Improvement

CSUSB has an academic program review process that has been dramatically improved in recent years. The current examples of review appear to be rigorous, and the university appears to be taking a more uniform and rigorous approach to academic program reviews (see further comments in Standard II). The most thorough and recent examples of academic review are reviews conducted for units which undergo discipline-specific accreditation, such as education and business. The standards of review imposed upon nationally-accredited units might help those with less-strict requirements to better design their reviews. Resource allocation that is based upon the findings of reviews appears to be the responsibility of the Dean of the college, but with the heightened standards for review, reviews may impact garnering or reallocation of resources at a higher level (CFR 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

The self-study states, “Although methods of assessment and provision of improved services has been in existence for many years, unique characteristics are emerging today in that

more individuals are reliant on data, decisions by key offices and departments are more data-driven, and assessment is linked to funding.” The university has formed an Assessment Working Group, and the team applauds this development. Going forward it will be important to see clear evidence that this group is furthering the development of an assessment culture at CSUSB. Assessment is being more fully embedded in the culture across campus. There are many areas of success, but the broad dissemination of best assessment practices, and the acceptance of assessment as a necessary thing across the whole campus, remains elusive. The team strongly encourages CSUSB to do as they suggested in their Worksheet for Preliminary Review (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

The institution needs to review its system of measuring student achievement, and where data are lacking, to establish at an institutional level, a strategically aligned, systemic and systematic way of defining indicators, measuring student achievement, and managing data for dissemination and use by programs for course design/re-design, curriculum/program development and institutional reports. The expertise for this exists on the campus and a dedicated group is working on establishing the assessment culture. The team wants to encourage those efforts.

Data-Informed Planning

CSUSB has responded well tactically to the challenges faced by higher education in California and the country (CFR 4.7). The biggest challenge has been in funding, and they have implemented well-conceived revenue generation ideas, including recruitment of out-of-state students, greater summer enrollments, and new fees especially for student services. They have held academic and student service programs harmless in these cost-cutting measures. They have outsourced some services and focused on cutting utility costs.

After meeting with the various units, working groups and leaders it is clear that the university is developing a process for data-informed institutional planning and decision-making. In the report the university described several significant initiatives that the institution would like to undertake. The report states that the university wants to increase the number of full time faculty members. The team applauds the decision to hire new tenure-track faculty members (CFR 4.6, 3.1).

CSUSB hopes to meet the targets set by the system in 2009 for increasing six-year graduation rates and eliminating the achievement gap between under-represented minority and other students. The decisions to increase advising, encourage and strengthen HIPs, and work on an improved 12th grade are all examples of ideas that hold great promise (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.7). Crucial will be efforts to assess which of these programs is working, and assessment will lead to ways in which to improve them to get better results. With good assessment CSUSB could become a model university for others facing the need to educate less well-prepared students successfully.

Based on the visit, the team suggests that the university continue its good work to:

- Develop a strategic plan;
- Build a robust set of academic and institutional assessment data for decision making;
- Identify the key factors in their success with the student population that they serve; this information would prove invaluable to other institutions of higher education.

SECTION III – RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE REVIEW

The WASC review team thoroughly enjoyed the visit and the opportunity to meet with the CSUSB community. The team is extremely impressed by what they have observed. The team wants to express their great appreciation for the warm hospitality and for the work and efforts to prepare for the visit.

Commendations

The team commends the university for its remarkable work in improving the lives of its students and ensuring that students are retained and persist through graduation. The university has done this excellent work in demanding economic times. The impressive jump in retention and graduation rates is no accident! The implementation of an excellent orientation program, intrusive advising, innovative remediation programs, and new approaches to writing and other high-impact practices are having a marked effect on student success. But these improvements would not be possible without the great efforts of many people.

The team commends the passion and caring of the faculty. As student numbers have soared and more has been asked of the faculty, they have stepped forward and contributed their ideas and their energy to improving the student experience. This is more remarkable in that it occurred in times of tight resources and the inability to financially reward the faculty for their efforts.

The team commends the passion and caring of the staff. The commitment by this group is palpable. Their concern and love of the students comes through loud and clear. Many of them are alumni themselves, and the team heard from them many testimonials of the great impact that CSUSB has had on their own lives and those of their sons and daughters.

The team applauds the new efforts to increase the size of the faculty and staff. Feedback from students confirmed the outstanding work of both faculty and staff in helping nurture the

student's development. The sustainability of the good efforts at CSUSB will require further investment in faculty and staff and we hope that more resources can be found to fuel this expansion as well as to increase the compensation of faculty and staff who have toiled long without raises.

The team commends the Palm Desert Campus for their remarkable success with their first freshman class and for their commitment to the students and community in the Coachella Valley.

The university is fortunate indeed to have visionary and effective leadership in President Morales and Provost Bodman, as well as a strong group of Cabinet members and Deans. The leadership has provided a clear path for ensuring student success and student learning. It has catalyzed an excitement for institutional renewal.

Recommendations

The team's meetings with the leadership, the strategic planning group, the assessment working party, the program review committee and the General Education committee convince it of the strong intent by the university to create a strategic plan that will establish a culture of continuous improvement and assessment that will lead to the attainment of the desired student success and student learning outcomes. Thus the team recommends:

1. That the university follows the strategic planning process timeline created by the Strategic Planning Committee. Following this timeline will allow CSUSB to produce a strategic plan, and the associated implementation plan with measures of progress by the summer of 2015. The completion of the implementation plan will provide a framework for the continuation of the university's excellent work with students in the coming years.
2. That CSUSB faculty and staff continue to work to create a fully developed culture of evidence at CSUSB. CSUSB has built a capable Institutional Research team and has made significant progress by creating a draft set of Institutional Learning Outcomes and a

new Program Review process. It is important for the university community to refine the learning outcomes for general education and begin to measure those outcomes. CSUSB has an excellent resource in the Assessment Working Party, and that team is capable of assisting CSUSB in creating a robust university-wide system of continuous improvement based on the assessment of student learning.

2014-15 will be an exciting year for CSUSB as the strategic plan and its implementation strategy is developed. Likewise the adoption of institutional learning objectives and the examination of general education objectives are necessary to continue the improvement of CSUSB. The successful implementation of the strategic plan and the adoption of an assessment culture with regard to student learning and program effectiveness could make CSUSB a model for other institutions in the US, whose clientele will more resemble CSUSB's in the future. The team very strongly suggests that these activities be given the highest priority in the coming years.

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California State University San Bernardino

Date: September 30, 2014

Overview:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note that the California State University system has a system-wide policy on the credit hour and length of the degree. The monitoring of these policies is done on a system-wide basis.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Website: http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>This is a CSU system-wide policy that conforms to the federal policy.</p> <p>In addition, bachelor's degree were set at 120 semester units/180 quarter units minimum, but in 2012, it became exactly 120/180. The intuitive from the CSU was based on EO-1065 as well (http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html). All campuses were required to reduce all BA and BS degrees to 120/180. Exceptions had to be approved by the chancellor's office. CUSB applied for exception for three programs: BS in Administration, Cyber Security, BS and Computer Science, and BS in Computer Engineering. With the CO's approval of them, CSUSB's Bachelors will all be 180 quarter units except these three. The exceptions were granted.</p> <p>Graduate degree requirement is 30/45 minimum, no maximum specified. Policy seen: http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/currentStudents/policiesProcedures/mastersReqs.html</p>
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>This is a CSU system-wide policy and monitored by the system. The university's curriculum policies make the course meeting expectations very clear and this is part of the formal review of a proposed course. See the policy document: http://academicprograms.csusb.edu/curdocs/Curriculum%20Guide%202012.pdf</p>
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The university's curriculum policies make the course meeting expectations very clear and this is part of the formal review of a proposed course. See the policy document: http://academicprograms.csusb.edu/curdocs/Curriculum%20Guide%202012.pdf</p>

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California State University San Bernardino

Date: October 1, 2014

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Website: Academic Grievances: http://academicprograms.csusb.edu/academicGrievancePolicy.html Non-Academic Grievances: http://policies.csusb.edu/studgriev.htm Complaint Procedures: http://ombuds.csusb.edu/genderEquity/complaintProcedures.html Discrimination Policy (Ex Order 1097): http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1097.pdf	
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: The process for academic appeal works up the ladder of authority beginning with the faculty member, department chair, college dean and provost. Grievances that are not resolved through these channels can then be presented to a Grievance Committee. The non-academic grievance procedure has an informal system for resolution (mediation via the ombuds person) and a formal system of complaint filing and hearings. Both the academic and non-academic grievance systems are typical of	Yes

	what is found in institutions of higher education and all policies are tied to CSU and Title IX requirements.	
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: They have a very good team focusing on handling of student complaints as a part of a holistic approach to student success and well-being. They use a nice model for interdisciplinary approach to dealing with issues of confidentiality and student reporting of concerns: http://www.csusb.edu/careteam	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? The data was shared with us via TaskStream, they are clearly keeping records.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: The data is maintained longitudinally.	Yes
	Comments:	

Rev 9/2013

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California State University San Bernardino

Date: October 1, 2014

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Degree roadmaps give a sense of the length of time to degree: http://academicprograms.csusb.edu/degreeRoadmaps.html Costs are show in the tuition and fees area. http://sfs.csusb.edu/tuitionAndFees	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments:	

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

TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California State University San Bernardino

Date: October 1, 2014

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy (s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit?	Yes
	Is the policy publicly available?	Yes
	<p>If so, where? Website http://admissions.csusb.edu/transfer/h_transferstatus.shtml#willcoursetransfer</p> <p>The CSU system also has an extensive directive (policy for all campuses) detailing how to handle transfer credit. See: http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1065.html</p>	
	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?	Yes
	<p>Comments: This is how the policy is summarized on their website: "Generally speaking, baccalaureate-level courses from accredited institutions do transfer."</p>	

*§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.

DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: California State University San Bernardino

Name of reviewer/s: Amy Wallace and Maria Zack

Date/s of review: October 1, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs¹ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Members of the team were enrolled in a wide variety of CSUSB online courses. Classes began the week before the team visit, but a random sample indicates that the courses are constructed and conducted using good practices in course design and pedagogy. The university has a system to assure quality in these areas.

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)

BA	Public Affairs And Services	Criminal Justice (Degree Completion)	Fully Online
MA	Education	Teacher Leadership Option	Fully Online
MA	Public Affairs And Services	Criminal Justice	Fully Online
MBA	Business And Management	Business Administration	Fully Online
MPA	Public Affairs And Services	Public Administration	Fully Online
MSW	Public Affairs And Services	Online Program	Fully Online
BS	Health Professions	RN-to-BSN Program	Hybrid
BS	Health Professions	RN-to-BSN Bridge Program	Hybrid
MA	Education	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	Hybrid
MA	Education	Career and Technical Education	Hybrid
MA	Education	Instructional Technology	Hybrid
MA	Education	Reading/Language Arts	Hybrid
MA	Education	Special Education	Hybrid
MA	Education	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	Hybrid

¹ See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

MS	Health Professions	Population-Based Nursing	Hybrid
MS	Health Professions	Advanced Community/Public Health Nursing	Hybrid

The balance of the information requested can be found in CSUSB's WASC annual report. It is worth noting that many of the programs listed above are relatively new.

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

The team discussed the approval and review process with all of the senior leaders of Distance Education programs. Because online and hybrid programs are generally housed in an academic unit there is a high degree of congruence between the face to face and online/hybrid courses.

Program Approval Process: The normal university curriculum approval process is used for all programs, online, hybrid, and face to face.

Program and Course Review Process: The same course and program learning outcomes are used for all teaching modalities. Assessment of student learning for these programs is part of the departmental assessment process in the unit where the program is housed. The programs are reviewed as part of the overall program review process for the unit where the program is housed.

Modality Review Process: They have a variety of rubrics used to assess the course design for hybrid and online courses. This review is generally decentralized and done by the unit where the program is housed. CSUSB has recently received a grant that will allow them to have some faculty go through the Sloan C Quality Matters training.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Degrees are connected to existing programs and part of the overall plan for the academic unit. Online and hybrid programs are part of their work to better serve the people living in their very large catchment area. Planning, funding and operationalization happen through the normal academic unit channels.	None
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	The programs are using a variety of methods to incorporate distance students into the life of the university community. These methods include on campus orientations, having students use video conferencing (Blackboard collaborate) to connect to lectures and discussions for both face to face and online students, and one program has an on-campus capstone. There appears to be a great deal of focus on the faculty hired to teach these classes and their role in helping the students to become a community (not all programs are built on a cohort model).	None
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	They are using Blackboard for their classes. They have been pleased with the work being done by the new VP for IT to better support the functionality of Blackboard. They are beginning the process of researching other LMS options.	None
<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Use student satisfaction surveys to assess how well support services are working. They are now closing the loop with recent MBA student satisfaction data. They have been using a variety of strategies to help students succeed these include: weekend labs offered by faculty members who are teaching low-success rate classes(students can connect remotely or in person), using skype and other tools for office hours hiring peer tutors. There is also writing support available for distance students.	None

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>Consistent with the practice that distance programs are embedded into exiting academic units, the faculty teaching in these programs are part of these academic units. Many who teach distance classes also teach face to face classes. The academic units as well as the Center for Teaching offer support and training for faculty teaching using technology. A recent reorganization in Information Technology has facilitated more collaboration between the Center for Teaching and Academic Computing to support faculty development for using technology in teaching (hybrid, online, flipped classes, supplemental material, etc.). This has been seen as a very positive change.</p> <p>Note that when faculty are reviewed (review, promotion and tenure) their course evaluations for online and face to face classes are considered and a supervisor may enter the class of a faculty member for evaluation purposes.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>The courses are designed by CSUSB faculty and the learning outcomes and content mirror what is taught in face to face classes.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Several of the programs are new and they are working with IR to gather data for analysis. Limited data shows that the retention in these programs is consistent with face to face delivery.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable,</p>	<p>The learning outcomes for the distance programs are the same as for the face to face programs. Learning is assessed as part of the overall assessment and program review process of the unit that hosts the program. Most of these programs are relatively new and have very limited data. We are told that the</p>	<p>None</p>

or with other online offerings?	GPA of the distance and face to face students in the programs is roughly the same. Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), one of the older programs has some data that shows no difference in learning outcomes data between online and face to face students. All programs indicated that they have plans to disaggregate data between online and face to face learners when their first cohorts are finished (e.g. MBA, Social Work).	
<i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i> ?	No.	None
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	The review process is the same for distance and face to face courses. See discussion in question #3.	None

Rev 8/2013

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2008 Standards)

Institution: Palm Desert Campus (PDC) of CSU San Bernardino

Name of reviewer/s: Mark Goor and Elaine Sundberg

Date/s of review: September 29, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed². One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

California State University, San Bernardino
Palm Desert Campus
37-500 Cook Street
Palm Desert, CA 92211
Phone: (760) 341-2883
Fax: (909) 537-8180

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

The Palm Desert Campus (PDC) of CSU San Bernardino (CSUSB) offers 11 Bachelor's degree programs: Accounting; Art (Graphic Design and Marketing); Career and Technical Studies; Communication; Criminal Justice; English; History; Liberal Studies; Management; Nursing; and Nutrition and Food Sciences. PDC also offers eight credential programs, four Master's degrees (Accountancy, Education, Public Administration, and Social Work) and one Educational Leadership Doctorate. Currently PDC serves approximately 1,000 students (82% undergraduate and 18% graduate students). Traditionally an upper division transfer and graduate student institution, PDC began admitting freshmen in the Fall of 2013. They admitted 106 students and increased that number to 150 freshmen in Fall 2014.

Over twenty-five years ago, Coachella Valley civic leaders began to call for a local public four-year college. The group's efforts lead to California State University, San Bernardino establishing a branch campus on the College of the Desert campus. From the beginning efforts were to serve local Coachella Valley students with programs that met Coachella Valley needs. In 2002, PDC moved to its permanent location on Cook Street. The campus consists of three buildings all constructed with non-state funds. Contributions were from community leaders and the local municipalities in the Coachella Valley. PDC offers its students the resources of a large, comprehensive university through the San Bernardino campus. At the same time, the Palm Desert Campus offers the supportive environment of a small campus with small classes and more opportunities for contact with instructional faculty. Instructional faculty members include CSUSB tenured professors, adjunct lecturers from the Coachella Valley, and faculty who also teach at the local community college, College of the Desert. PDC is designated a regional center by WASC.

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

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

Two WASC team members participated in a one-day visit to PDC and conducted a series of in-person interviews with the following: Assistant Dean, Dean, Dean's Council, faculty, students, staff and community members and donors. Responses from all constituents regarding the institution were consistent and positive. All interviewees felt a shared identity with the entire university and a special identity at PDC.

The facilities were new, high quality and attractive. There was pride expressed that individual and city donors had funded the entire physical structure. PDC is poised to acquire from the state of California an additional 120 acres adjacent to the campus and are beginning planning to determine how to grow PDC.

Students interviewed included Roger's Scholars (upper division, high achieving students) and a group of sophomores who are members of the first freshman class. The students uniformly praised the level of support, both in terms of academic and student services. They noted the availability of events, clubs, and access to local physical fitness facilities. They expressed that they were well served academically and were able to complete their classes at PDC. The new freshmen have an impressive average unit load of 16.5. PDC has excellent advising and counseling available. Their library and computing services are state-of-the-art, and students have full access to CSUSB's services as well. This Fall a new free shuttle service between PDC and CSUSB has been instituted. Two shuttles per day make the round trip 75 mile run.

Faculty members interviewed were very complimentary of the working environment, the quality of their students, and support from the PDC administration. All faculty members are vetted and hired by the "home" departments at the main CSUSB campus. It was clear that there is a strong connection between PDC and the main campus. The new Dean at PDC serves on the President's Cabinet and will be an integral member of the Strategic Planning Committee, which will begin its work October 8, 2014. Clearly, PDC will be a part of the strategic planning and implementation of strategic initiatives as defined by CSUSB.

The curriculum (General Education and major courses) is identical to the main campus; program chairs and Deans at CSUSB provide academic oversight, and programs at PDC are part of the main campus program review process.

The first freshman class began in Fall 2013 and had a most impressive 94% first year retention rate. Students attributed their success to academic support, advising support, and the ability to live locally and still attend receive a CSUSB education. All curriculum and assessment activities follow the policies and processes of the CSUSB main campus.

Administrators at PDC expressed that the President supports the campus and its future, as do the local community, including influential donors and city and community leaders.