REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

DATE OF THE VISIT:
FEBRUARY 26, 2018 – MARCH 1, 2018

TEAM ROSTER:

Alexander Gonzalez, Chair
President Emeritus, California State University, Sacramento

Larisa Genin, Assistant Chair
Associate Dean, Faculty, Accreditation and Undergraduate Programs, Saint Mary's College of California

Anatole Bogatski, Member
Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer, Life Chiropractic College West

Maria Pallavicini, Member
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of the Pacific

Stephen Schellenberg, Member
Assistant Vice President, Educational Effectiveness,
Division of Student Engagement and Academic Achievement, San Diego State University

Tamela Hawley, WSCUC Visit Liaison
WASC Senior College and University Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process

Background Information

California State University Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) is one of the 23 campuses that comprise the California State University System (CSU). Originally founded in 1960 as the California State College at Palos Verdes, it opened its doors in 1965 to its first students at a temporary site in the Palos Verdes' Rolling Hills Estates, an affluent section of the South Bay of Los Angeles. However, in August of the same year, the civil unrest in the Watts area of Los Angeles erupted and changed not only the city and nation, but also the new state college.

In the aftermath of the "Watts Rebellion" (as referenced in the institutional report), Governor Edmund G. Brown and the California State University Board of Trustees acted to relocate and establish a new campus that would be responsive to the area's racially and ethnically diverse population and their desire for access to higher education. As a result, CSU Dominguez Hills was officially begun in 1965 on its current 346-acre site in the city of Carson, located 18 miles south of downtown Los Angeles. Today, CSUDH is an urban, comprehensive university that serves the South Bay and the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area. The region is home to one of the country's most dense and diverse human populations in terms of race, language, ethnicity, and national origin. The surrounding communities served by CSUDH reflect this diversity and, as stated in the institutional report, "The University's mission, vision, and values have therefore been articulated and clarified over time with an intentional focus on serving a profoundly heterogeneous population with ever-increasing success."

California State University Dominguez Hills had a total enrollment for fall 2016 of 14,731 students. At the undergraduate level, there were 10,246.3 onsite FTES and 171.7 offsite FTES. Graduate students on the campus accounted for 1,380.3 FTES with an additional FTES of 109.3 enrolled in off-site programs. Fall 2016 enrollment indicated an increase from the previous year of 14,635 students. This serves to highlight a modest growth in enrollment and the university overall. However, as pointed out in the Institutional Report, CSUDH is one of five CSU

campuses that have not declared impaction. This is significant in that students are still being offered admission without having to take into consideration restrictions to admission based on program availability. Moreover, the plans for the campus include growth in student enrollment as well as facilities.

According to its Institutional Report, CSUDH qualifies to be both a Minority Serving and Hispanic Serving Institution as designated by the U.S. Department of Education. The student body is comprised of 61.9% Hispanic/Latino; 14.1% Black/African American; 11.1% Asian; 9.5% White; 0.3% Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander; 0.1% American Indian/Alaskan Native; and 3% two or more races. Moreover, 50.8% of the student body is comprised of first generation college-going students. In addition, 67.6% of CSUDH students are Pell eligible. While CSUDH is clearly a campus that serves predominantly underrepresented minority students (URM), over 60% of its entering students require remediation in English and/or math.

Graduation rates for all students at CSUDH reflect a substantial increase during the past five years. However, the four and six-year graduation rates are still relatively low but the campus expects the improvement to continue and to be on track to meet the CSU System's expected Graduation Initiative 2015 benchmarks for the campus. For example, the Fall 2010 cohort had a four-year graduation rate of 5%. In contrast, two years later, the Fall 2012 cohort of first-time freshman had a four-year graduation rate of 10%. Moreover, the Fall 2010 cohort had a six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time freshmen of 42%. In contrast, the previous cohort (Fall 2009) had a six-year graduation rate of 35%. Based on the Institution Summary, however, White non-Hispanic students had a six-year graduation rate of 44.12% while Black students registered a 28.68% six-year graduation rate. Hispanic students' six-year graduation rate was 37.12%, while Asian students had the highest rate at 48.48%. However, except for Asian students, women students had higher six-year graduation rates than their male counterparts. Thus, while the graduation rates for the campus are still relatively low, there is positive movement toward improving graduation rates for all students.

Programs and departments are organized into six colleges: The College of Arts and Humanities; College of Business Administration and Public Policy; College of Education; College of Natural

and Behavioral Sciences; College of Health, Human Services, and Nursing; and the College of Extended and International Education.

California State University Dominguez Hills offers 47 Bachelors degrees and 26 Masters degrees. Of the degrees and programs offered by the university, 119 are offered on-site while 12 are offered off-campus. These off-site programs include locations at CSU Long Beach, Ventura County Medical Center, Huntington Hospital, Northridge Medical Center, Washington High Prep High School, Kaiser Permanente, and Quest Labs. The degrees and programs represent not only those normally associated with an urban comprehensive university but also programs that are responsive to community needs. For example, the program with Quest Laboratories Inc. is focused on providing a site for student internships. Off-site laboratory facilities like these are critical for satisfying the licensure requirements graduates need to be employed. None of the off-site program offerings were reviewed as part of the accreditation visit.

For the 2016-17 academic year, California State University Dominguez Hills conferred 3,807 degrees. These included 1,545 Bachelor of Arts Degrees and 1,498 Bachelor of Science Degrees for a total of 3,045. It also conferred 331 Master of Arts Degrees; 234 Master of Science Degrees; 55 Master of Business Administration Degrees; 70 Master of Public Administration Degrees; and 74 Master of Social Work Degrees. In total, the university awarded 764 Masters degrees.

For the fall of the 2016-17 academic year, the university had a total of 830 instructional faculty members. Of these 313 or 37.7% were full-time while 517 or 62.3% were part-time. This configuration constitutes almost a 2:1 ratio of part to full-time faculty members. By gender, full and part time members of the faculty who were women comprised 453 or 54.6% while male members of the faculty numbered 377 or 45.4% of the total.

However, when the faculty demographics are viewed by race/ethnicity, it is clear that while the faculty is diverse, the distribution is uneven. Specifically, Asians comprised 14.4% of the full-time and 11.3% of the part-time faculty.   Black/African American faculty members who were full-time numbered 22 or 7% of the full-time faculty, while part-time instructors who were

Black/African American numbered almost three times as many (n=65) but were only 12.6% of the total part-time faculty component. Hispanic/Latino faculty members who were full-time accounted for 12.5% (n=39) of all full-time members of the faculty. Moreover, the 75 Hispanic/Latino part-time faculty members accounted for 14.5% of the total. Of the 313 full-time faculty members on staff, 164 or 52.4% fell into the White category. Similarly, 48.7% (n=252) of the part-time faculty was White. Taken together 416 of the 830 members of the faculty were White, accounting for a total of 50.1% of all faculty members for Dominguez Hills.

The staff of CSU Dominguez Hills is comprised primarily of full-time employees (n=575). Part-time staff account for only 7.1% (n=44). The members of the staff who are female number 359 and account for 58% of all staff employees on campus. Male staff employees number 260 and comprise 42%. Unlike the faculty, the staff employees are more evenly distributed in terms of race/ethnicity. Asians staff employees account for 15% of the total staff employees; Black/African American 26%; Hispanic/Latino 28%; and White 23%. The other categories account for the remaining 8% of the staff members on campus.

CSU Dominguez Hills is a campus that is in the process of implementing a relatively new Strategic Plan focused on goals for educational quality, student success, and financial stability. It is based on the institution's core values of accountability, collaboration, continuous learning, rigorous standards, proactive partnerships, respect and responsiveness. The campus community is also proud of the structural changes that the campus has implemented under President Hagan. These include a commitment to increase the number of full time faculty as well as to utilize rigorous financial and enrollment planning as part of the change process. In addition, plans have been developed to change the physical nature of the campus by adding much-needed facilities. Taken as a whole, these activities reflect a clear statement of the university's mission and its values and vision for the future.

At the beginning of the fall semester, President Hagan announced that he would be retiring at the end of the academic year 2017-18. While his decision will have a direct impact on the campus, he has pledged to continue to lead the institution with all the energy and expertise he has shown during his tenure as President. Moreover, he is focused on implementing the Strategic Plan as

well as a new Campus Master Plan that will include making investments in its infrastructure and the construction of a new Science Building and a new Academic Building. Finally, a Land Development Plan is being implemented that will utilize open space on the campus to build revenue generating enterprises to augment the campus' general fund budget.

Recent Accreditation History

California State University Dominguez Hills was first accredited in 1964. The last commission action to reaffirm accreditation was in June of 2008. At that time, the proposal for the two-stage comprehensive review was scheduled as part of the action taken by the commission. The Capacity and Preparedness review was to occur in spring 2018 and the Educational Effectiveness review was scheduled for fall 2019. In addition, an Interim Report was due in spring 2012 that would focus on the progress in the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units within the institution, and the linkage of the results with its strategic planning processes.

In 2012, CSU Dominguez Hills submitted its Interim Report. The commission's letter of August 2012 accepted the report and commended the university for providing a report that was exceptionally thorough in documenting how it had responded to the assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units and how the university had provided the linkage of assessment results with strategic planning. However, with the adoption of the 2013 WASC accreditation handbook and revised process, implementation of the new approach necessitated the change in the previously agreed upon visit schedule. Thus, the Off-Site Review was changed to the fall of 2017 with the campus visit following in late February 2018.

Between the last accreditation reaffirmation in 2008 and 2016, there were several Substantive Change Committee actions that resulted in the expansion of the university's off-site programs. These included Antelope Valley Union High School District (2014); Quest Laboratories (2016); and Kaiser Permanente Medical Group (2016). In 2008, CSU Dominguez Hills submitted a request to develop an Ed.D. program in educational leadership. However, even though it was considered, due to the lack of funding, the program was never established.

<u>Description of the Team's Review Process</u>

Off-Site Review (OSR)

On October 2-3, 2017, an Off-Site Review of California State University Dominguez Hills' Institutional Report was conducted at the Hilton Hotel Oakland Airport. Alexander Gonzalez, President Emeritus of California State University Sacramento served as chair while Larisa Genin, Associate Dean, Faculty, Accreditation and Undergraduate Programs, Saint Mary's College of California served as assistant chair. Team members included Michael Groener, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Holy Names University; Maria Pallavicini, Provost, University of the Pacific; and Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Vice President for Educational Effectiveness, San Diego State University. Tamela Hawley, WSCUC Liaison, WASC Senior College and University Commission provided support for the Off-Site Review.

The Off-Site Review process included the development of a team worksheet that identified the institution's strengths, weaknesses, and outstanding work or other aspects of the university that deserved commendation. After a thorough review of the Institutional Report and all supporting materials, the team developed the following Lines Inquiry for the Accreditation Visit to the campus on February 26-March 1, 2018. These "Lines of Inquiry" were:

- Please explain how you are operationalizing your strategic plan and how you integrate it with campus activities and priorities. Also, please describe the ongoing evaluation of the strategic plan and the progress that is being made. Has the strategic plan been redrafted into a strategic business plan that prioritizes aspirations within appropriate/attainable assumptions about state funding and potential campus revenue generation? Do you have adequate financial resources to execute the strategic plan? Please provide sources of funding for key strategic priorities. Does the institution have a contingency plan in place?

- The campus has done a great job in addressing student success and implementing various programs. Now that the executive orders have been issued by the Chancellor's Office relative to the remedial education courses and requirements, how will the campus deal with the elimination of remedial education?

- Understanding that resources are insufficient, how do you expect to implement the campus' plans for faculty hiring and development? And, how does the campus plan to double the

number of permanent faculty? Moreover, how will the campus deal with concomitant staff issues?

- The campus has instituted many programs aimed at student success. How does the campus intend to sustain them as well as scale up as it grows? Or in the alternative, how will the campus evaluate and sunset them if necessary? Also, what is faculty involvement in student success initiatives?

- Does the campus have a formal retention and graduation plan? Is there a formal committee that oversees this area? How is the campus measuring the impact of its initiatives on retention/graduation area? What specific initiatives led to the substantial increase in the graduation rate from 24.4% to 42%?

- How will the Land Development plan work and how realistic is it given the system and financial constraints of the current funding model?

- Please provide evidence of assessment activities and how data is gathered.

- Please provide more information on career services. Is it adequately staffed? How is the campus measuring/tracking post-graduation outcome? What are the targets? How is the campus measuring its success in achieving these targets?

These Lines of Inquiry were sent to the campus a week after the Off-Site Review along with a request for additional information. The campus was advised that it had until October 24th to respond. CSU Dominguez Hills' response provided additional information that assisted the team in understanding the institution further and helped shape the ensuing Accreditation Visit.

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

The institutional report was organized around the nine components of the review and provided data within the report and supporting documents in a set of appendices; the optional essay on institutional-specific themes was not exercised. Thus, the institutional report contained eight rather than nine components.

The Institutional Report was well organized, clearly written and reflected a thoughtful and inclusive approach to its development. It provided an excellent overview of the history of the

institution and how its founding shaped the mission and goals of the present day university. In addition, the development of teams that included members from the various constituencies with specific assignments for review and writing, demonstrated how faculty, staff and administration worked collaboratively to produce a very important document. The net result was a high quality report that presented an accurate assessment of the campus and where it would like to focus for its future development.

Above being well-produced and easy to read, the narrative focused on the campus' responses to the Commission's actions from the last accreditation review in 2008. Each section noted the appropriate Criteria for Review (CFRs) or referenced the standards and/or relevant materials and data.

Thematically, the Institutional Report developed several themes that reflected both the condition of the campus and areas where it wants to develop and implement change. For example, while it responded to the Commission's recommendations regarding the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units as well as the linkage of that assessment with strategic planning processes, it also identified the need to increase the graduation rates of students, increase the number of full-time faculty, integrate data and institutional research into enrollment and strategic planning, and develop its physical resources. Each of these themes was clearly presented and developed as part of the institutional self-assessment and the reaccreditation process.

Overall, the team found the Institutional Report to be indicative of the care, effort, and intention on how the process of self-review for accreditation was accomplished. While each component was approached separately, there was a common thread throughout the report that focused on the WASC Standards and Core Competencies. Ultimately, the report provided the necessary level of review and self-reflection but raised other issues for the team to consider. This was an iterative process that was quite fruitful.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews

In the Action Letter dated June 24, 2008, the Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation for CSU Dominguez Hills and commended the institution for the progress it had made in meeting the needs of its students. In particular, it commended the faculty for its dedication "…to the success of each member of the very diverse student population…" and for the "…skill and insight in the assessment of learning and in the use of assessment results to improve learning." However, it did note the uneven implementation of student learning outcomes across programs. As a result, the Commission requested an Interim Report in the spring of 2012 that would address the "…progress in the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units within the institution, and the linkage of the results of such assessment with its strategic planning processes."

As requested, the Interim Report was submitted in March of 2012 and accepted by the Interim Report Committee Panel who praised the university's efforts. In fact, the letter from the Panel noted that the report and its attachments were "…exceptionally thorough in documenting how CSUDH has addressed the Commission's recommendations." Moreover, the Panel found the response to the assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units to be "well beyond minimal." In addition, the Panel was impressed with the scope and detail of the information provided relative to the linkage of the assessment results with the strategic planning processes. In particular, the panel noted the benefits to the institution of creating both an academic and an enrollment management component to the strategic planning process.

The Institutional Report noted the success of the Interim Report and acknowledged the need to sustain the efforts in these areas. In fact, it is one of the themes that is prevalent throughout the Institutional Report.

Component 2: Compliance with Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The team found evidence that CSUDH broadly complied with the Standards. The institution has a well-defined mission of access and student support, educational objectives, and a strong sense of community and commitment to the mission (CFR1.2). Similarly, the campus exhibits integrity and transparency in its interactions, communications, and operations (CFR 1.7), and is monitored regularly to ensure compliance with all facets of its operations, including complaints and grievances, financial resourcing and expenditures. The campus operates with a clear commitment to honest and open communication with the WSCUC (CFR 1.8). The administrative leadership organization appears to be highly integrated with clear lines of responsibility. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8). As part of the reaccreditation process, CSUDH engaged in the examination of its compliance under Standard 1. CSUDH identified two areas that needed attention. The first was under CFR 1.4 and highlighted a need to focus more on diversity and its development on the campus. The other area identified a need to be more responsive to student grievances (CFR 1.6). However, the report indicated that it wasn't that the campus wasn't engaged in these areas, but rather, that it needed to be more vigilant and focused on its activities in these areas. Overall, the self-review demonstrated an honest and thoughtful review of the campus compliance with Standard 1 as well as a clear focus on strategic planning and data gathering that would include the CFRs under this Standard.

The institution's assessment infrastructure has developed and ramped up since the prior review (CFR 2.6). There is a clear commitment to program assessment (CFR 4.3), and while the collection and use of data for continuous improvement is uneven among programs, substantive progress is being made. As with many institutions, this is a work in progress. Experiential learning and co-curricular learning opportunities (CFR 2.3, 2.10, 2.11) abound and will benefit from a clearer articulation of both outcomes and performance measures (CFR, 2.3b, 4.1, 4.5). Student success data are disaggregated for distinct student populations and several of the student success initiatives are directed towards success of these groups (CFR 2.10, 2.13). The institution is implementing a robust and exciting advising strategy (CFR2.13) to provide students integrated advising support from a team of professional, faculty, and peer advisors. The program review process is developed, implemented, and based on principles of shared-governance. The

institution recognizes that academic program review with attention to clarity of learning outcomes, collection of evidence, and evidence-based decisions needs to be further strengthened to ensure that student learning outcomes are measured and improved (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.1, 4.5). It is commendable that the institution has made considerable progress in these areas and is working actively to address gaps. Finally, faculty appear broadly engaged in the process of teaching and learning based on evidence from program assessment.

The institution faces many challenges with respect to the high need for student support services. The institution's planned enrollment growth will require sufficient faculty and staff to support the academic, co-curricular, and administrative support of the student population. The institution has developed a faculty staffing plan with stated ratios of tenure track/tenured faculty that will take some time to realize, particularly given uncertain and evolving fiscal constraints (CFR3.1). The institution does provide access to information resources and technology to support the academic offerings as well as the research and scholarship of faculty, staff, and students (CFR 3.5). Current investments in classroom upgrades are underway, and this process is slated to continue as part of an upgrade plan over the next four years. Through a University Planning Council comprised of students, staff, faculty, and administrators, the campus developed a strategic plan, *Defining the Future 2014-2020*, with six goals that are broadly aligned with their institutional mission, and this strategic plan appears to be informing many of its current and future initiatives (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

The updated 2016 Campus Master Plan now includes the proposed Land Development Plan for retail, housing and business tenants. This project should significantly improve the environmental quality and campus experience of students (as well as faculty, staff, and the local community), and should provide additional revenue to underwrite myriad student success initiatives (many of which originated and persist through one-time funds) and to accommodate a projected 20,000 FTES enrollment (up from the current 15,000 FTES). The university states that this will support all aspects of a top-performing model urban university.

During the site visit, faculty indicated they feel supported for advancement and recognized for accomplishments and service. They noted that more clarity in the advancement processes

(CFR3.2 and 3.3) would be helpful. The institution provides access to information resources and technology to support the academic offerings as well as the research and scholarship of faculty, staff, and students (CFR 3.5). Faculty appear broadly engaged in the process of teaching and learning based on program assessment efforts and the Faculty Development Center; notably, the latter includes Instructional Technology and appears sparsely staffed and under-resourced given its catalytic potential for increasing student engagement and success (CFR 4.4). Current investments in classroom upgrades are underway, and this process is slated to continue as part of an upgrade plan over the next four years. Multiyear capital budget planning will be needed to ensure pre-funding is in place and not subject to budget re-allocation to other priorities.

The program review process is fully developed and broadly implemented, with many reviews incorporating survey data from students and alumni. In contrast, the assessment and evaluation of co-curricular programs is less well-developed and, in some cases, would likely benefit from a clearer articulation of both outcomes and performance measures (CFR 4.1, 4.5). The campus' University Effectiveness, Planning, and Analytics unit, under development to support institutional research, program assessment, program review, and accreditation, maintains a public online Institutional Research Fact Book with myriad metrics (e.g., disaggregated enrollment, retention, and graduation data) as well as a ticket-system to request specific data (CFR 4.2). Program assessment and review documents demonstrate a widespread commitment to identifying opportunities for improvement, though resource limitations appear to constrain many efforts. The process of prioritization and resourcing of such opportunities within the organizational structure was unclear from the Self-Study, but emerged as driven by the strategic plan during the Accreditation Visit (CFR 4.3).

All of the above initiatives show a commendably ambitious and aggressive plan to improve the campus facilities and technology. With the strategic plan priorities, deferred maintenance issues, the speed and cost of technology changes, and the budget base shortfall, the university will need to maintain strategic budget planning, ensure open communication, and focus on priorities to ensure levels of fiscal, physical and information resources are in place for the current students, faculty and staff.

There is strong accountability at the institution with clear decision making authority and accountability. The institution has created a highly integrated team approach to manage key responsibilities of enrollment management, with a new Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management who reports to the VP of Student Affairs and works closely with both Academic and Student Affairs. A new Associate Vice President of Retention and Academic Advising in Academic Affairs reflects the strong commitment of the institution to both retention and student support services. This organizational structure has the potential to be a highly integrative model of enrollment management (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8). This integrative model appears to be working well as evidenced by robust recruitments into academic programs with student interest and in collaborations on student support initiatives.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators:
The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness (IEE) was provided as an Appendix in the Institutional Report. The worksheet "Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements" was prepared in 2016, at the beginning of the self-evaluation by CSUDH on each of the CFRs. Nineteen CFRs were rated as 1 indicating areas of strength. Five were rated between 1 and 2, 13 were rated at 2. Two CFRs were rated between 2-3 and one was rated at 3 indicating need for improvements.

The area receiving a rating of 3 for improvement needed was 'clearly stated institution student learning outcomes and standards of performance at the course, program and institutional level' (CFR2.3). Areas that received ratings of between >2 and <3 included: 1) Institution provides academic and other student support services to meet the needs of specific students (CFR2.1), and 2) the institution provides faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution (CFR3.1).

In the report the institution acknowledged these areas and discussed actions underway to address them. The review team recognizes that it is critical that the institution continue to develop and support a culture of not just rigorous data collection, but to use data to drive action and decision making and to integrate learning across programs, curricula, advising, and the wider learning environment.

It is clear that the authors of the Institutional Report feel that one of the most important issues is the need to hire more tenured/tenure track faculty. The hiring plan presented by administration is loosely aligned with the projected short-term enrollment growth.

Additional areas that need improvement include developing and implementing more robust advising strategies, establishing General Education pathways, assessing graduate student learning outcomes, setting standards of performance and validating methods to assess core competencies, and developing and implementing robust criteria for on-line instructional delivery. Finally, it was noted that while the institution is committed to providing educational opportunities and support for diverse students, it does not have a diversity plan. The institution is working to strengthen these areas.

Compliance with Federal Requirements:
The appendices to the accreditations team's report include the Federal Compliance Forms. Overall, the team found that the institution is in compliance with federal requirements.

Component 3: Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring Their Quality and Rigor
The institution has a well-developed mission, vision, and core values that embrace a commitment to access and to the success of its students. The institution recognizes that improvements in graduation rates and retention rates are a high priority and has made impressive progress in improving graduation rates through programs that provide both academic and developmental support. A commitment to integration of High Impact Practices (HIP) via curricular and co-curricular partnerships (CFR2.2, 2.11), with the goal of each student engaging in at least two HIPs, is commendable and doable. Given that all "best practices" should be locally adapted, assessed, and refined, scaling these to maximize impact on student success in a time of limited resources will be important and challenging. Assessing the effectiveness of HIP using outcome data on disaggregated student populations will also be important for scaling and to establish the ROI and improve upon on various practices and support models.

CSUDH's Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) align with the five core competencies of WASC and include an ILO of engaged citizenry that incorporates respect and community

engagement (CFR2.2.a). Proficiency levels have been established by engaged faculty groups who have done a good job in using data to evaluate student learning and in so doing are seeking to implement other learning assessment instruments (CFR2.4, 2.6). Moving with some speed to identify and assess new instruments will be important to allow meaningful data collection and identify opportunities for improvement and optimization. The ILO of engaged citizenship is supported by Service Learning through CSUDH Center for Service-Learning, Internships, and Civic Engagement (SLICE). CSUDH is the only university nationwide to have received the 2014 President's Higher Education Award for their general community service focus. Assessment of student learning for the Engaged Citizenry ILO is at early stages as the Divisions of Academic and Student Affairs contemplate assessment instruments. It is formally linked to General Education (GE) via Cultural Pluralism and other requirements and the service learning ILO credits are reflected on the student transcript.

The General Education program for undergraduates is being re-imagined so that students can better understand the importance of the GE curriculum. This redesign will be a major undertaking and help students understand the value of general education. A road map for conclusion needs to be developed and implemented to ensure clarity among faculty and students as to where ILOs will be measured and how the GE curriculum is integrated with development and assessment of ILOs as well as Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (CFR2.4, 2.6)

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are available for undergraduate and graduate programs, and for undergraduate programs are supported by road maps for each student to meet both general education and disciplinary learning outcomes in a four-year timeline. The institution is collecting data on learning outcomes (CFR2.3). Multiple examples of granular program review indicate that assessment findings from direct measures appear to have been used to make evidence-informed changes/improvements to the curriculum. Nevertheless, the team recognizes that there is work to be done to use data to improve student learning, and that this is an area where the institution continues to make progress.

The institution has an integrated system for annual program assessment which informs components of the periodic program review process (CFR 2.7, 4.1). The process is robust and

substantive and several examples of review-driven actions were presented. The majority of actions focused on curricular changes, such as curricula revision and identification/justification for additional faculty resources. It appears that the department chair, program lead, faculty committee, and the Provost engage in shared conversations about program findings and actions (CFR 2.7). The team encourages the institution to ensure follow-up on re-assessment of program review actions as well as maintain a regular schedule for program review and assessment. Overall, the team recognized the considerable on-going work occurring between faculty and staff, and amongst multiple shared governance and other forums, to actively promote and incorporate practices and support systems aligned with their commitment to access and student success (academic and developmental), including ILO and PLO assessments and realignment intentions for general education.

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

The campus has well-established expectations and processes for the assessment of student learning at course, program, and institutional levels, and is demonstrating good-faith efforts to develop meaningful and sustainable approaches for assessing the five WASC Core Competencies. Academic programs and their faculty have direct authority and responsibility for developing, assessing, and improving curricula at the course and program levels, and appear to work beyond disciplinary boundaries to align course and program content with institutional learning outcomes (CFR 2.4). Course, program, and campus-level assessment appears supported through policies established by Academic Affairs and is facilitated through administrative processes and shared governance structures, particularly the University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC). The USLOAC has played a central role in providing stability, feedback, and guidance to academic units regarding their program improvement efforts and in promoting a culture of using assessment to identify opportunities for programs to better serve their students (CFR 4.4, 4.5).

At the course level, learning outcomes, planned assessments, and grading policies are developed and implemented by program faculty, and are required components for course syllabi (CFR 2.3). As typical, these assessments, along with other course components, contribute to course letter

grades and, where aligned with program outcomes, are routinely leveraged for broader assessment purposes as evidenced in USLOAC meeting minutes, Campus Labs records, and program review documents. Course letter grade distributions were historically compiled and analyzed by Institutional Research, and are now available through a BI-warehouse-fed dashboard where letter grade distributions can be viewed, filtered, and disaggregated by various campus- and student-based components (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). This infrastructure and transparency affords the potential to identify grading disparities among courses, faculty, and student populations, and, if artfully conducted, could inform productive local discussions focused on increasing inclusive excellence and student learning, while maintaining and ideally strengthening course integrity and curricular cohesiveness. Course-level assessment and improvement can also be informed by student evaluations, and the campus administers a "Perceived Teaching Effectiveness Survey" (PTES) for each course at the end of each term. However, this instrument was described as "weak, and also suffering from low response rate," while the Institutional Report lacked any substantive discussion of findings, actions, or plans to improve this indirect measure in service to program improvement, professional development, etc. Increasing the value and utility of this type of indirect measure is warranted, particularly given its potential to provide formative feedback to faculty and its central evidence role in the retention, tenure, and promotion process as stipulated in the CSU-CFA collective bargaining agreement.

At the program level, faculty are responsible for establishing and conducting program assessment (e.g., developing program outcomes, identifying appropriate measures based on student work, developing expectations and targets, and reflecting and acting on findings (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 4.1, 4.3). To facilitate and guide these efforts, the USLOAC has developed rubrics that establish general assessment expectations for programs, and also informs USLOAC feedback to programs, including recommendations for the next cycle. Each year, programs are expected to assess two to three program learning outcomes for each of their degrees, with the goal that all outcomes for each degree are reviewed twice between each program review (i.e., every six years). Based on USLOAC's evaluation of Campus Labs-submitted program assessment reports for undergraduate and graduate degrees, these expectations are being met to varying degrees. These observations, along with unevenness in program assessment across departments and colleges, merits substantive discussions among the university administration and shared

governance, specifically regarding barriers to engagement in assessment and opportunities to support and reward exemplary efforts. The University is aware that work needs to be done in these areas. Finally, given that most degrees appear to have well-developed program learning outcomes and at least rudimentary curricular maps, the campus is well-positioned to make these efforts and intentions more visible for their current and future students.

At the campus level, CSUDH has established five Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs): The first three are aligned with the five WASC Core Competencies (see below), the fourth focuses on demonstration of expertise within a specialized discipline and is evidenced through local program assessment efforts and actions (see previous paragraph), and the fifth formalizes CSUDH's commitment to engaged citizenry through myriad curricular and co-curricular components discussed in other sections of this report. This approach to ILOs is strategic in its integration of WASC expectations, workforce development, and the campus mission. With respect to the Core Competencies, competency-specific task forces spent considerable time and effort in recent years to identify and pilot potential approaches to assessing each competency. Some approaches have been more informative than others, and the campus is encouraged to continue these efforts with some urgency, refining approaches that show potential and exploring strategic alternatives to move from piloting to sustained efforts and informed actions. The campus's commitment to progress in meaningful assessment of each competency is summarized below.

Written Communication: Data from a Graduation Writing Exam (GWE), already established for placement purposes, was explored as an assessment tool. Longitudinal data showed improved scores over time for exam-passing students, but scores overall were deemed marginal. The campus appreciates the limitations and caveats of this approach, and is committed to developing more robust measures as part of its broader GE reform and Writing Across the Curriculum Program.

Oral Communication: Responses to selected NSSE items were compared to peer campuses and findings were variable. While such self-reported data can be a useful formative approach, they can also be problematic and misleading without careful consideration of response rate, response

demographics, etc., which were not reported. The campus might consider more direct-measure approaches embedded within oral-communication-focused GE courses and senior capstone presentations.

Critical Thinking: A LEAP VALUE rubric was adopted to assess an unspecified sampling of "critical thinking" assignments drawn from lower- and upper-division courses. Results showed a general developmental improvement from lower- to upper-division; this finding is encouraging, but could be biased by differential retention of academically better performing students. Expansion and refinement of this approach could provide useful insights into opportunities for developing critical thinking skills.

Information Literacy: This competency was explored in various ways. A review of assessment findings for information-literacy-aligned program-specific learning outcomes across campus (~75% of all programs) revealed generally positive outcomes; in many cases measures were indirect, but a number revealed local curricular improvement opportunities. Pilot results from the Individual Assessment of Information Literacy version of the SAILS test revealed student performance generally between basic and proficient with an overall score of 49%, a value on par with other comparable institutions. However, the rate of improvement from baseline scores to graduate scores was markedly greater than peer institutions, which indicates strengths in meeting students where they are upon matriculation and on rapidly improving their Information Literacy skills, presuming that this result is not an artifact of differential retention.

Quantitative Reasoning: The campus attempted to explore this competency through a pilot of the CLA+, but upon reflection identified numerous problems in this approach. A clear plan for the assessment of this Core Competency was not evident in the Institutional Report or Site Visit, and should arguably be developed independent of the critical thinking ILO, perhaps through course-embedded measures.

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

The campus is clearly committed to student access and success based on a myriad array of support programs for first-time freshman and transfer students as well as equity-focused programs for historically underserved populations. In recent years, the Toro Testing and Learning Center has evolved as a hub for student success and assistance, with the hiring of a director and increased coordination and connectivity among many programs. Institution-level success efforts for graduate students have also been developed in recent years to complement academic-program-specific efforts, and these include improvements in onboarding, financial support, and professional development. Multiple support structures exist across campus to promote and facilitate student engagement in various HIPs, particularly civic engagement via the SLICE program and undergraduate research via the Office of URSCA. These largely curricular-based endeavors are complemented by a similarly diverse array of co-curricular efforts (CFR 2.11), and together they model a holistic approach to student success and achievement. The institution has also made efforts to assess student satisfaction and perceived gains through various surveys (i.e., communication-major-specific, Writing across the Curriculum survey, and NSSE), while appreciating that these are indirect measures.

Improvements in retention and graduation rates are laudable, especially for the six-year first-time full-time (FTFT) freshmen graduation rate (i.e., 24% in 2012 to 42% in 2016) and first-year FTFT freshman retention rate (i.e., all time high of 81% for 2014 FTF cohort and 87% for 2014 transfer cohort). In contrast, four-year and two-year graduation rates for FTFT freshman and transfers have remained relatively flat at 6% (2011 cohort) and 27.8% (2013 cohort), respectively. The CSUDH 2025 Graduation Initiative Campus Plan commits to "redoubling" institutional efforts for programs "proven to be effective," which assuming fixed resources would arguably require cutting or reduction of other programs. While analytics may represent a low-cost means to focus on and sustain successful programs and interventions, the campus plan also references "new and ambitious" initiatives (e.g., data fellows) to improve these metrics. The campus is encouraged to continue to disaggregate retention and graduation data as one means to assess impacts of their various efforts, and to connect demographic-based enrollment, retention, and graduation rate data.

With respect to the WSCUC Graduate Rate Dashboard data for the last five available years (2012-2016), the CSUDH shows an average Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR) of 62% and an average Unit Redemption Rate (URR) of 76.6%. While CSUDH's average six-year graduation rate of 30.8% is markedly lower than the median rate of 57% for all participating institutions, its AGR and URR are less than five percent lower than the median AGR and URR values for all participating institutions. These patterns reveal, as intended, how institutional and student success may be obscured and distorted through traditional IPEDS metrics. Thus, while the lived experience of students at this access-focused campus may often involve transfers, leave-of-absences, and part-time enrollment that limit six-year graduation rates, the investments of campus and students are eventually leading to high-quality degrees that, in turn, contribute to the regional workforce and broader society.

While the campus demonstrates a clear commitment to student success and achievement through many curricular and co-curricular programs, ranging from first-year summer remediation to graduate-level professionalization, the prioritization, assessment, refinement, and sustainability of these efforts remains a focused work in progress. The institution is mindful of these challenges, and is structuring and coordinating efforts to facilitate attribution, ensure efficacy, and maximize positive impacts. However, much of these efforts are currently supported by one-time funding, and sustaining these collective student-centered efforts was identified by multiple constituents as perhaps the grand institutional challenge moving forward.

Component 6:   **Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence**

<u>Program Review</u>

All programs at CSUDH are subject to a regularly scheduled program review process (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.6). Since the previous WASC visit, program review has been the focus of various changes to improve not only the process but also the outcomes. In 2014, the Provost approved the Program Review Panel model, and in 2016 a revised version of the Program Review Guide was approved by the Academic Senate. The aim of these changes was to streamline the program review process and to affirm the central role of program review in academic planning at CSUDH.

The goals of the Program Review Process (PRP) are clearly articulated with a positive emphasis on assessing areas of strength and areas needing improvement. In addition, the PRP has the overall goals of improving the teaching and learning environment, ensuring academic quality and the student learning experience. The Program Review outcomes balance the goal of continuous improvement by considering teaching performance, resource needs, and priorities in the context of the University Strategic Plan and Student Success Initiatives. Recommendations may include phasing out poorly enrolled concentrations, improving course scheduling, hiring additional faculty, etc. Thus, balancing the goals of improvement with resource needs is appropriate.

The university has adopted a policy of regular self-assessment, implementation, and evaluation that is at the core of the review process. Program review includes analyses of the achievement of each program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, as well as placement when appropriate.

Evidence from employers and licensing examinations may also be included (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4). The Program Review Panel controls the process and utilizes the Program Review guide. Full program reviews are to be completed in a six-stage process within the academic year. Of significance is that at the conclusion of each program review the relevant report(s) are transmitted to the Provost and relevant dean for review and to establish priorities for program development (CFR 2.10, 2.7). The faculty has opportunities to comment and provide feedback at various stages of the review. Overall, this is an inclusive and transparent process.

Program Level Assessment

The Institutional Report states that program review and the annual assessment of student learning outcomes are the two best indicators of quality for CSUDH (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). The campus has developed a system whereby each program identifies Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for every degree program at CSUDH. In addition, the University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC) requires all programs to develop, review, and revise PLOs during each assessment cycle. Since 2016, data generated from this process are archived using the Campus Labs program. Notably, the University is attempting to have PLOs and results available for all programs, and the Director of Assessment is planning to make the

CSUDH assessment archive publicly accessible, which speaks to transparency with respect to institutional improvement.

Use of Data and Evidence

CSUDH utilizes data for planning and to ensure quality at every level of the institution. The President and his Cabinet as well as the University Planning Council (UPC) address and discuss topics relevant to the overall mission and goals of the university. In addition, a very well-defined process of review and collaboration with the various academic committees on campus exists to ensure continuous improvement and quality.

Institutional Research (IR) plays a key role at CSUDH. Its "…mission is to enhance University effectiveness with information to support planning, assessment, policy formation, and decision-making." IR gathers and analyzes data, designs and produces reports in support of the university and its programs, undertakes special studies on enrollment trends, is involved in the assessment of programs and the investigation and analyses of student surveys. The IR office has developed considerably since the last WASC review and has become an integral part of the university's high-level decision making and planning (CFRs 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

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

Under the visionary leadership of President Hagan, CSUDH has not only developed a clear and exciting plan for the future, but also attained a high degree of financial stability as well as a realistic approach to increase revenue, and enhance the campus' physical plant. Increased revenue will support achievement of the institution's strategic goals, including faculty and staff hiring and student success.

CSUDH has achieved a significant level of financial sustainability with regular positive net asset balances, and focusing resources on strategic priorities while operating within budget constraints and experiencing operating losses for the years ending June 30 2013 through 2017. CSU system-level financial audits have been unqualified. Resource planning and budgeting is focused on strategic priorities including improving SLOs and graduation rates. The university

acknowledges issues arising from the operating losses, is managing a budget within financial constraints, and has longer term planning to diversify income and sustain its access to resources from the CSU system (CFR 3.4).

The university has responded to reductions in State appropriations from 62.8% of total operating fund revenue in 2009, down to 49% in 2018 budget year. This is a significant reduction compelling a focus on revenue generation from tuition in the main which has increased from $38.8M in 2009 to $86M in 2018 (budgeted). As for all CSU campuses, sustainability for CSUDH is tied heavily to state funding of direct operating appropriations and legislatively governed indirect Cal grant funding, allocated to eligible students attending a qualified institution.. Individual campuses in the system need to diversify revenues for long-term sustainability. CSUDH has recognized this need and has been aggressively pursuing additional sources of revenue. The university has been successful in receiving additional base funding support from the system (for additional student enrollment and to fund student retention and the Graduation Initiative), and system level support is likely to remain firm in coming years with the issuing of system bonds to support campus development. Beyond the receipt of system bond funding, the university will continue to need to engage closely with the system administration in future years to communicate its priorities for funding. The challenge will be to ensure that new funding from the state is permanent to base and not one-time, including for enrollment growth, faculty and staff compensation increases, capital improvements in campus facilities and new buildings, deferred maintenance and other strategic priorities.

Income diversification is tied mainly to plans for the development of the business park and residential apartments on University land. This is anticipated to generate $6.8M in net income annually. However, completion will be in five years' time and constrained budgets will need to be managed in the interim. Other diversification should come through University Advancement as alumni graduating since establishment in 1960 continue to mature in their earnings and retirement cycles, and the Advancement capital campaigns gain momentum.

Operating losses have come notwithstanding strong enrollment growth and total budgeted revenue growth of 8.3% ($18.5M) in 2018. The university has not declared impaction and

continues to encourage further enrollment growth. This is coming at the price of mean unit load increases, with a greater number of students for a limited number of staff and resources. The 2017/18 budget is projecting a $4.7M base shortfall that will need to be funded either through operating budget cuts, through re-allocating non-operating funding to operations, or through increasing student load still further. Over-enrollment is a real issue and strong enrollment modelling will be needed to ensure optimal resources for students, faculty and staff are maintained until further funding is available from the state, land development, and other diversification efforts.

At the same time, CSUDH's location is an advantage and affords the institution an opportunity to draw students from a diverse socioeconomic student population, particularly a large population of underserved, first-generation college students compared to many other CSU campuses. Recent changes in recruitment have resulted in more effective student recruitment and, coupled with appropriate support for less well-prepared students, prospects are good for continued improvement in retention and graduation rates.

Ensuring resources are focused on key strategic objectives is another priority that the university appears to be achieving in at least two areas. Funding is being allocated to new tenure track faculty hiring, but ensuring these costs are base line and not one-off will be a budget challenge in future years. Extra funding for improving retention and graduation rates is being generated by the Student Success Fee introduced in 2015. Revenues from this fee have increased from $660,000 in 2015 to $4.4M in 2017. All of this fee revenue is committed to supporting projects and initiatives for improving student success.

It is less clear how the other strategic goals, such as Outstanding Academic Programs, Innovative Learning Environment, Administrative Excellence and Notable Points of Distinction are being funded in a budget-constrained environment. Also less clear is how Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research are being supported to ensure data supported targeted and effective resource allocation. Along with net operating results, long-term sustainability needs success in attracting, retaining, and graduating students in a timely manner. With CSUDH aggressively targeting graduation rates despite greater numbers of students in the overall population of less

well-prepared, the institution appears to be addressing odds stacked against it. What priority Institutional Effectiveness has in the university's resource planning remains a question. A five-year strategic business plan to complement the university's strategic plan would enable the institution to model a number of these assumptions, including tuition and enrollment growth, state appropriations, land development and revenue diversification, University Advancement, all flowing through to retention and graduation rates and other effectiveness and success indicators.

With the pressure on budget, the need for transparency and communication of budget planning and resource allocation is being well managed through the University Budget Committee. This committee includes student, staff, and faculty representatives, and its proceedings inform reports from the University CFO to the entire campus community through budget town halls. Notes from these meetings show a good level of understanding and communication of the pressures resulting from enrollment growth, limited base funding, and need for investment in strategic priorities. Continuing this level of transparency and communication will serve the university well as it continues to address the changing higher education environment.

Faculty and staff hiring and appropriate deployment of these critical human resources are essential for the institution to achieve its enrollment goals. The institution developed a faculty hiring plan for tenure track and tenured (TT/T) faculty that projects the numbers of faculty that the institution feels is reasonable to hire. At the Accreditation Visit, the institution also provided evidence that they are instituting best practices to develop a diverse faculty and discussed approaches to address the lower yield rate of TT hires than other CSU campuses. These are well developed plans that emphasize the institution's commitment to addressing instructional needs associated with growing enrollment. During discussions, it was evident that a similar plan to grow the ranks of non-tenured contingent faculty was not as well developed. It will be important to consider all types of faculty in the hiring plan to ensure that the very best are recruited, and that all are supported in professional development for effective teaching and scholarship where appropriate.

The institution self-identified that an area that needed improvement was the availability of funding and development opportunities that provide faculty and staff with substantial and

continuing commitment to the institution (CFR 2.1). The institution has ambitious plans to grow enrollments in support of its overall goal to provide higher education access. This will require considerable investment in faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) to ensure adequate support in and out of the classroom. It will be challenging to double enrollments in the next several years. Increasing the numbers of tenured/tenure track faculty continues to be problematic because of state budget challenges and the need to provide flexibility and market competitiveness in programs offered. Meeting these challenges will be important to allow the institution to achieve its vision.

The institution has clearly defined criteria for promotion and tenure that reflects a commitment to excellence in teaching and scholarship (CFR 2.8 and 2.9). The faculty review process is well described. As the institution strives to build its faculty to meet enrollment goals, it will be important to consider the balance between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to ensure that teaching needs are met effectively while also retaining a reasonable balance of scholarship.

Development of a staff hiring plan to support student success and faculty is also important. As with any institution with rapid growth, continual assessment and prioritization of leadership and staff positions for effectiveness, efficiency, and meeting functional needs will be critical for campus climate and morale and the wise stewardship of resources.

Given the diversity of students at CSUDH and the comments heard during the Accreditation Visit regarding lack of clarity about the meaning of diversity on this campus, it will be important to consider how diversity plans impact priorities. In addition, it would be important to continue discussion of diversity, its definition/meaning, and significance for the campus.

With the transition of President Hagan, it is also imperative that the number of positions that are currently being filled on an interim basis be made permanent. In order to achieve the plans identified by the campus, a permanent and committed core of leaders of the various campus units must be in place as soon as possible. The stability gained by acting quickly will benefit the many goals set out by the campus.

Component 8:   Reflections and Plans for Improvement

The concluding chapter of the Institutional Report provided a detailed summary of the process and results of the campus' efforts at self-evaluation and assessment that it undertook as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process. Its approach included the involvement of all constituencies on campus and this section identified successes as well as challenges. Highlighted was the work on assessment and student success as well as the addition of new programs and initiatives the campus had undertaken since its last review. For example, the focus on assessment of all programs through the Program Review process and student learning with the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment System were salient throughout the report. In addition, the emphasis placed on high impact practices for students and the use of data at all levels for planning and decision-making was reiterated in the recap. Finally, the attention to structural changes that had taken place on campus as well as the outlook for new facilities and new sources of revenue rounded out a nicely done concluding chapter of a thorough and expertly presented Institutional Report.

This chapter was also reflective and provided a sober view of the current condition of the campus. While the campus had achieved a high-level approach to program review and had implemented an exemplary process, it was also aware that it still needed work in order to achieve a greater level of implementation. Moreover, while the trend toward higher retention and graduation rates was presented as evidence of positive change, the report was also clear that there was still some stagnation in the four-year first-time freshman and two-year transfer graduation rates that had to be addressed. Thus, while the campus understands that some areas are works in progress, the report concludes that the self-review process has had a positive impact on the campus.

This chapter also presented not only a reflection of the past and present, but also a clear plan for the campus's future. Clearly, they have identified their goal to be a model campus and reach an enrollment of 20,000 FTES as the driver for many of the campus' aspirations. Concomitantly, they want to develop a Campus Master Plan that will change the structural landscape of the campus. The accreditation review has also sharpened the focus on how to achieve campus goals that include building a new science center and hiring new faculty.   In addition, the Land

Development Plan is a new and exciting approach to bridging the funding gap between base funding and the new initiatives that have been put in place during the past few years.

The conclusion drawn from the final chapter and the report is that the WASC review has served as a catalyst to achieve campus goals under their Strategic Plan. In addition to maintaining a focus on the campus values, CSU Dominguez Hills has been successful at "…providing students the opportunity to complete a university degree, pursue career aspirations and contribute to their communities." The team agrees with the report's concluding paragraph:

"The entirety of this report documents CSU Dominguez Hills' ongoing engagement in thoughtful, evidence-based reflection upon the university's vital economic and educational impact in the region as well as on the functioning of campus systems and structures. Such intentional, sustained examination of institutional strengths and challenges will ensure the University continues to fulfill its mission for many years to come—to provide education, scholarship, and service that are by design, accessible and transformative for all students—because America truly does happen here."

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

The Visiting Team found that CSU Dominguez Hills is meeting the requirements of accreditation. The campus produced a well-written and documented Institutional Report that focused on the institution's strengths as well as weaknesses. The Accreditation Visit served to present further evidence and to reinforce for the Team the efforts that are being undertaken by the campus as it prepares for a transition in leadership. The vision, direction, and day-to-day operations are focused on the continued development of the campus and meeting system and WASC requirements. The Visiting Team felt the campus was not only fulfilling its mission, but also the requirements of an accredited institution.

Commendations

The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and achievements:

1. President Hagan's visionary leadership and strong administrative ability along with his development of a clear vision and path forward for the University.
2. The strong sense of community, commitment to students, and optimism about the future.
3. The Institutional Report was well organized, written, and structured, and contained relevant information/documentation that was needed for the review.
4. A pervasive "entrepreneurial spirit" that includes a robust plan to increase net revenue with its land development and other plans.
5. The development and implementation of processes to optimize evaluation and inform decision making.
6. Remarkable improvements in student retention and graduation rates and a focus on student success and achievement.
7. Development of a cross-functional team-based approach to student advising.
8. Considerable progress in the realm of assessments since their last review.

Recommendations

1. Update WASC on the strategic planning process and its implementation including progress on the physical development of the campus. (CFR 3.4, CFR 3.5)

2. Continue to build institutional capacity for collecting, integrating, analyzing, and disseminating data among key stakeholders for decision-making purposes. (CFR 4.1, CFR 4.2)

3. Continue to develop and implement financially sustainable faculty hiring and allocation plans. (CFR 3.1, CFR 3.4)

4. Strengthen evidence-based approaches to curricular and co-curricular program assessments and reviews. (CFR 4.3, CFR 4.4)

5. Explore models to optimize staffing across key units in order to achieve strategic goals. (CFR 3.1, CFR 3.2, CFR 3.3)

6. Identify sustainable approaches to support the pedagogical and scholarly development for faculty (i.e., tenure track, tenured, and lecturers). (CFR3.2, CFR3.3)

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review

3. Student Complaints Review

4. Transfer Credit Review

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

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 YES ❑ NO
	Where is the policy located? Within catalog; see http://csudh.smartcatalogiq.com/en/2017-2018/Catalog/General-Information/University-Regulations/Grading/Credit-Hour
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? x YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Program Review see http://www5.csudh.edu/AAPM/pdf/aa-2017-02.pdf
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 YES ❑ NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? Four
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both (3 online, 1 hybrid)
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS and MA
	What discipline(s)? Economics, public policy, nursing
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❑ NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? Three
	What kinds of courses? Internship, independent study, practicum
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS, MA
	What discipline(s)? Health Sciences, Orthotics, and Prosthetics
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❑ NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Eight
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Major, minor, concentration, certificate, credential
	What degree level(s)? BA/MS, MA
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology, Counseling, Digital Media Arts, French, Occupational Therapy, Special Education
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES ❑ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Maria Pallavicini, Stephen Schellenberg   Date: March 1, 2018

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
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: - The institution provides information about degree programs (https://www.csudh.edu/academics/degree-programs/) - The institution provides information about the cost (https://www.csudh.edu/financial-aid/cost/)	
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: - Strengthen the information presented on the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified - Publish post-graduation outcomes on annual basis	

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Larisa Genin, Alexander Gonzalez   Date: March 1, 2018

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

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? Within Catalog; see http://csudh.smartcatalogiq.com/en/2017-2018/Catalog/General-Information/University-Regulations/Student-Conduct/Student-Complaint-Procedure	Yes
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: Students are encouraged to provide feedback to front-line educators and their immediate supervisors whenever possible, to provide for timely resolution. Complaints that are not resolved locally are referred to the Division of Student Affairs for further action. The institution recognizes that this procedure can be improved.	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Records of student complaints are maintained by the Division of Student Affairs, in Suite 410 of Welch Hall.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	Yes
	Comments: Student Affairs typically relies on other offices or committees to address student complaints, and actions become part of the official record of each group's activity. The Vice President of Student Affairs and the rest of the President's Cabinet, monitor activity to identify patterns or chronic cases of failing to meet student expectations.	

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Stephen Schellenberg, Maria Pallavicini   Date: March 1, 2018

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?	Yes
	Is the policy publically available? If so, where? In catalog; for evaluation see http://csudh.smartcatalogiq.com/en/2017-2018/Catalog/General-Information/Baccalaureate-Degrees-And-Undergraduate-Studies/Evaluation-of-Academic-Records/Evaluation-of-Transfer-Credits; for allowance see http://csudh.smartcatalogiq.com/en/2017-2018/Catalog/General-Information/Baccalaureate-Degrees-And-Undergraduate-Studies/Evaluation-of-Academic-Records/Allowance-for-Transfer-Credit	Yes
	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? A general statement is provided, but this statement defers to policies within individual departments	
	Comments: Students and institution would benefit from more specific information and criteria regarding transfer credit	

*§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 WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Stephen Schellenberg, Maria Pallavicini   Date: March 1, 2018