REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To Fresno Pacific University

March 15-18, 2002

Team Roster

Team Chair: Michael Beals, President, Vanguard University

Team Assistant Chair: Kerry Fulcher, Provost and Chief Academic Officer, Point Loma Nazarene University

Team Members:

- Anatole Bogatski, Executive Vice President, Life Chiropractic College West
- Chris Procello, Analyst-Academic Policy and Planning - Institutional Research & Academic Planning, University of California System
- Ester Rogers, Former Assistant Dean of Institutional Assessment and Accreditation, Occidental College

Table of Contents

Section I – Overview and Context

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Institutional Context

Fresno Pacific University (FPU) began as an educational extension of The Mennonite Brethren Church in 1941 and was founded in Fresno, California as Pacific Bible Institute in 1944. The Bible Institute was granted accreditation as a two-year institution by WASC in 1948. With the addition of a liberal arts curriculum to the biblical studies core, accreditation as a four-year liberal arts institution was granted by WASC in 1963, concurrent with a change of name to Pacific College. For the next 30 years, enrollment demographics and academic programs expanded until the College changed its name to Fresno Pacific University in 1997. In addition to the 50-plus acre main campus in Fresno, regional campuses were added across the San Joaquin Valley in the 2000s. In 2008, the Department of Education designated FPU as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Dr. Joseph Jones has served as president since July 1, 2017.

The mission statement of FPU reads: "Fresno Pacific University develops students for leadership and service through excellence in Christian higher education." That mission is manifested through a foundational commitment to 'The Fresno Pacific Idea' which "commits it to be: 1) a Christian university dedicated to God's Kingdom and to the perspective of the liberal arts which integrates faith, learning, and action; 2) a community of learners that recognizes learning is the result of interaction between persons, ideas and experiences; and 3) a prophetic witness to serve the church and society."

Previous Accreditation Interactions

Fresno Pacific has been continuously accredited since 1961. Recent interactions since 2013 have included a Capacity and Preparatory Review team visit (2013) followed by an Educational Effectiveness Review team visit (2015) and a Special team visit (2018). Common themes for improvement from these visits included communication, strategic planning and processes for decision making. In the 2015 visit fiscal stability was also identified as an area for improvement and the most recent 2018 Special visit focused on improvements in diversity, systematized decision-making and clearer communication channels.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The AV team for Fresno Pacific conducted three team zoom calls in preparation for the Onsite visit on March 15-18, 2022. The first meeting occurred on September 2, 2021 and was the team organizational meeting where team assignments were given and an orientation to the Accreditation Review process was given. Various parts of the meeting were led by WSCUC VP Tamela Hawley, Team Chair Michael Beals, and Team Vice Chair Kerry Fulcher. Prior to the OSR, the team reviewed the FPU Institutional Report and filled out the OSR Team worksheet for each of their areas. Assistant Chair Kerry Fulcher compiled the team's feedback into a composite worksheet for the team to review at the OSR.   The Zoom OSR team meeting occurred on September 21-22, 2021 where the team developed their lines of inquiry and identified additional materials that were needed by the team in preparation for the Onsite Visit.

Two satellite campus visits were conducted for the Bakersfield site (Zoom with Beals & Fulcher, Feb 2-3) and the North Fresno site (Onsite with Beals & Bogatski, February 28-March 1). For each of the satellite campus visits, the following were interviewed: student representatives, teaching faculty and head of programs, VP of Academic Affairs and Provost, Assistant Director of Operations, Director of Student Support Services, Head of Library, Interim Operations Lead, Head of

Technology, Head of Admissions and Admissions Coordinator. The Off Campus Review Forms for each of these locations is included in the Appendices below.   The OSR meeting resulted in the team developing Lines of Inquiry which identified the following areas for further exploration during the onsite AV:

1. Effectiveness at Academic and Institutional levels of the program review process and the use and understanding of assessment data.
2. Communication as it relates to dissemination of information to support decision making and future planning.
3. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as it relates to accountability processes, systems and structures as well as the oversight of collaborative engagement and feedback for the institution's focus on DEI.
4. Sustainability as it relates to fiscal management of discount rates, net revenues and financial aid as well as the sustainability of the infrastructures and practices around educational effectiveness.
5. Institutional planning as it relates to the implementation and evaluation of the effectiveness of the Grow, Engage, Innovate, Serve, and Transform (GEIST) strategic plan and how the plan feeds into future planning for institutional improvement.

The team members reviewed additional documents provided by FPU based on the Lines of Inquiry and began to draft their sections of the report in advance of the onsite AV. A final team Zoom call occurred on February 22nd, 2002 to review the Lines of Inquiry in preparation for the onsite AV.

The onsite AV was conducted March 15-18, 2022. The team was able to meet with the following individuals/groups for interviews during their visit: President Jones, VP of Academic Affairs and Provost, inquiry circle steering committee, CFO, VP Advancement, VP Enrollment, Student Life leadership, Student Support Services leadership, Executive Director of HR, Assessment committee, University Diversity committee, DEI staff, Chief Diversity Officer, Director of Distance

Education, staff caucus, student ASB representatives, Faculty Senate, Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, and the academic deans. Throughout the visit the team monitored the confidential email account and reviewed documents in the AV team room including: Bylaws for the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Handbook, FPU Organizational chart and other documents previously provided in the FPU AV team Dropbox folder.

C. Institution's Re-accreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The FPU Institutional Report was well written and easy to follow. The report was organized according to the template and a helpful feature was a FPU reflection at the end of each section of the report. The report was thorough in that it addressed each of the components necessary as well as all of the issues raised in the Commission Action Letter from the previous Special Visit. The team felt that the report tried to give an accurate and complete picture of the health of the institution and that the use of inquiry circles ensured broad participation from faculty and staff in the process informing and preparation for the writing of the Institutional Report. That being said, some of the reflections were shallow and self-analysis did not always demonstrate a deep understanding of some of the issues. This was especially evident in Components 3-6 when dealing with assessment and program review. Additionally, sometimes the recommendations given in the reflection sections were often simply an assignment of a task to some group without much reflection on what the data might be telling them. Further, some reflections did not seem to have ready evidence to back them up. One example from page 33 of the Institutional Report stated, "From the PRs, it is clear that on almost every front, FPU ranks higher in student success than comparable institutions." In looking at program reviews provided, the team could find no evidence to back up that claim in the program review documents themselves. Finally, while there

was a lot of data referenced in the report and included in the appendices, it was not always clear from the report and reflections that there was a clear understanding by the institution of what the data meant. This led the team to wonder if some of the data generation was undertaken from more of a compliance mindset than one of learning and improvement. The institution responded promptly to requests for additional information following the OSR and clarifications of progress made since the writing of the Institutional Report.

Section II – Evaluation of Institutional Essays

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

A Special Visit Review Team visited FPU on September 17-20, 2018. A Commission Action Letter was then issued on March 4, 2019 which commended FPU for progress in the areas of diversity, communications and financial stabilization. The Commission also required the institution to respond to the following issues which are a focus of the current accreditation visit:

1. The university (faculty, staff, and students) should continue to articulate its approach to, and definition of, diversity within the FPU context, to develop metrics for achieving their diversity goals, and to determine how the responsibilities for diversity are to be distributed (among the CDO, UDC, and HR). Moreover, the CDO job description should be clear and widely available and the CDO should receive support and training. (CFRs 1.4, 3.7, and WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy)

2. The University should pay significant attention to creating a clear, systemized process for decision-making within the university, defining institutional committee purposes, roles and

responsibilities of committee members and how each committee fits within the larger governance process of the university. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.10)

3. The University should pay significant attention to creating clearer, multidimensional pathways for communication among upper administration and university staff, faculty and students. (CFRs 1.7, 1.8).

Diversity

FPU addressed the issue of diversity in Component 8 of the Institutional Report and was able to show evidence of progress in this area in that they developed a Diversity Rationale that articulates how they define diversity within their institutional mission and provides background and justification for why diversity is an important issue for the institution. Additionally, a Diversity Framework and five-year Diversity Plan was collaboratively created by the University Diversity Committee (UDC) and the DEI staff and formally adopted by the institution. While there has been progress in this area, there are still significant areas for improvement needed as it relates to the CDO role, reporting lines and how they interact with the UDC and HR it terms of authority. These issues will be further addressed in the report below.

Decision Making

FPU addressed this issue in Component 9 of the Institutional Report and while it generally cited improvements in communication flow and transparency around budgetary information, it concluded that there was "no evidence that the current administration has developed, communicated, and followed a plan to prioritize greater transparency in communicating budget decision-making" (page 66). However, the report noted an significant improvement in general communication and information flow through a variety of channels including town halls, Squawk Box, weekly newsletters, access to multiple reports and summaries of information and relevant pandemic related communication channels (page 67). The institution also cited significant efforts to foster collaborative engagement in various areas of decision making such as program reviews, university committees, departmental caucuses, inquiry circles and strategic planning (pages 67-68). Their conclusion regarding a systemized process for decision making was that the academic structure was the best example, with the Faculty Handbook describing the policies and practices for decision

making in that area. However, the self-study found less evidence of any systemized process for decision-making processes across the rest of the university (pages 70-71). The AV team was able to corroborate improvements in communication within the academic area, but also identified tensions and frustration with the lack of clarity for decision-making processes outside of the academic area. Further information on these observations will be addressed later in this report.

Communication

FPU addressed this issue in Component 10 of the Institutional Report and as stated above, cited many examples of improved communication channels, information flow, and transparent access to needed information. Using the example of strategic planning, the report identifies forums, posters, frequent email and verbal references to GEIST themes, and weekly blogs with feedback opportunities as channels for communication and information flow. They also identified efforts to make Board of Trustees minutes, financial reports, committee minutes and caucus minutes publicly available via the campus intranet, citing these as positive changes to facilitate communication, trust and transparency (page 73). Additionally, FPU invested in technology to help facilitate both general and pandemic related communication, including Squawk Box, the FPU website, a cell phone app, and a "FPU Pres" email account. A campus survey regarding communication indicated that 62% of respondents indicated a significant improvement in communication whereas only 19% of respondents felt there was no real change (page 76). Similar results were noted for the accuracy of the multiple communication channels and the transparency of communication efforts. Also noted in the report was the presence of a small but consistent number of respondents who felt strongly contrary to the majority view that issues in this area had significantly improved (page 77). The conclusion in the report was that while significant improvements had been made, there was still room for more improvements especially to and from senior administrative levels (page 77). The AV team was able

to corroborate the Institutional report findings in its interviews with varying constituents across campus. More details on areas for potential improvement will be included in the report below.

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

The FPU Institutional report included a section that examined each of the CFRs for each of the four WSCUC Standards. Based on their self-evaluation and the AV team's offsite and onsite review evaluations, the following represents the AV team findings for each of the Standards.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

FPU has a Mission Statement that is published and freely available (CFR 1.1) as well as freely available policies on Academic Freedom for faculty, staff and students on the website, in faculty/staff/student handbooks and the academic catalog (CFR 1.3). It was clear from their institutional report, program review documents, course syllabi and through meetings with their assessment committee that FPU's educational objectives are articulated in their institutional, program and course learning outcomes and measured and assessed according to the assessment plans for each program (CFR 1.2). Fresno Pacific has demonstrated progress in the area of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion through the formation of a DEI Framework and five-year Diversity Plan as well as a published Diversity Rationale that articulates the university's definition of diversity and its reasons for embracing and promoting it on campus. The Diversity Plan is overseen by the DEI staff and the University Diversity Committee and while there are still areas for improvement as described below, it is clear the university is taking this area seriously (CFR 1.4).

FPU seems to have a clear understanding of its educational mission that is aligned with its faith-based mission. From interviews with the Board of Trustees, the executive leadership team and the Faculty Senate, decision making authority seems to be in balance within the shared governance system of the university. There was no evidence of the trustees getting involved in the day-to-day operations of the university and the administration and faculty seemed to be appropriately involved in decision making according to their roles. There were some faculty that expressed a desire to be more involved in major decisions of the university while others indicated the administration had appropriately engaged the faculty in most cases (CFR 1.5).

The AV team found FPU to be open and forthright about how they represent their programs and costs to potential students with clear information published on their website and recruiting materials. Additionally, their appeared to be appropriate policies in place on the website and various handbooks that addressed complaints and issues of student conduct. Interviews with students from ASB as well as the staff from the student services areas confirmed awareness of these policies and that they were applied in a consistent manner (CFR 1.6).

Finally, the AV team found FPU to be transparent with its constituents as well as the visiting WSCUC AV team regarding policies and procedures for standard operations, grievances and issues that have arisen. The AV team felt the various constituents participated in interviews with honesty and candor, whether discussing FPU's areas of strength or areas of weakness and challenge. There was no sense of concealing information or sugar-coating answers to the team's questions (CFR 1.7, 1.8).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The team confirmed that the institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and they are appropriately staffed by qualified faculty for the type and level of degree (CFR 2.1-2.3). While the educational programs have appropriate content, standards, and rigor, the team notes that at the time of the Institutional Report, program review had not been executed consistently for all programs with some reviews being delayed for multiple years. By the time of the AV team onsite review, all but one of the outstanding program reviews had been completed. The institution indicated that it recently revised the program review template and process in 2020 and added a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to document the outcomes of the program review process. The team encourages the institution to further explore the distribution of program review reports/MOUs to other institutional decision-making bodies to help close the loop of the program review process.

While the faculty are actively engaged in the program quality assurance processes (CFR 2.4), there was some evidence of disconnect between the Assessment office and the academic programs regarding the usefulness of the structure of the program review templates and the quality and integrity of the data provided within the template not matching with the lived reality of the faculty in the program. The team recommends that the program review process be evaluated to address: faculty partnership in the development of program review documentation, guides, and templates; the data included in the program review process to ensure that it is relevant, accurate, and has integrity; and to clarify oversight and accountability structures to ensure the implementation of the program review

cycle such that every program is participating and completing its program review in the prescribed time frame (CFR 2.1, 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.5).

A degree from FPU represents more than an accumulation of units and is described by the institution as "an experience that reflects the three pillars of The Fresno Pacific Idea: Christian University, Community of Learners, and Prophetic". Both undergraduate and graduate degrees are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation. The FPU General Education program has two variations, one for students in traditional program sand another in accelerated programs. Each pattern includes core and distribution requirements. The General Education program student learning outcomes include the five WSCUC Core Competencies GE PSLOs plus institutional distinctives linked to university identity and mission. The institution is currently revising its general education program to address frequent negative perceptions and complaints about the General Education requirements including that they repeat high school level coursework, include too many classes unrelated to the students' primary interests, lacks coherence, and takes up too many units. The institution offers a variety of graduate programs which establish clearly state objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes (CFRs 2,2, 2.2a, 2.2b).

The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and institutional level. These outcomes and standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and aligned with advisement, library, information, and technology resources, as well as the wider learning environment. The institution provided several syllabi to demonstrate that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well-developed, and subject to appropriate

oversight. Academic programs at FPU actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved (CFRs 2,3, 2.5).

While the institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance may have been developed by faculty, it was abundantly clear to the AV team that the faculty did not have collective responsibility for reviewing these outcomes, creating the reporting structures for the assessment of these outcomes, and establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness houses a great deal of institutional data and reports and has representatives that chair or participate in key committees such as the assessment committee. While OIE appears to be more than willing to provide additional data, training, reports, there does not seem to be direct faculty leadership in any of these areas, which leads to the perception that faculty are not fully engaged in assessment. During the visit several faculty members reported that they were not involved in the creation of the assessment report or program review templates and that when they engage with these, they routinely have to reconcile inconsistencies in data or missing data in some of the systems used to manage the assessment data. The team recommends that faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating thorough assessment of the achievement of these standards with special attention to the following areas: clarify its assessment oversight and accountability structures and ensure that faculty demonstrate ownership of assessment; review the data included in the assessment process to ensure that it is relevant, accurate, and has integrity; ensure that faculty are appropriately trained on the use of the assessment management system; and ensure that all programs have an appropriate assessment plan developed and implemented to ensure

sufficient assessment data is available for use in ongoing quality assurance activities and periodic program review (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

Fresno Pacific University has an expansive faculty handbook which denotes the expectations for research, scholarship and creative activity for faculty. The institution views scholarly activity as central to its mission and vocation and, though FPU is primarily a teaching institution, there are processes in place for faculty who wish to be held to a higher standard of scholarship that represents exceptional contributions to their field of expertise, reflects a demonstrable expression of FPU's mission, and/or holds the promise of distinction for the institution and its programs (CFR 2.8).

The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service and centers the role of faculty around the mission of Fresno Pacific University and the Fresno Pacific Idea as professors with lively intellect whose scholarship and professional development leads to increasing knowledge and understanding of his/her discipline, who seeks teaching styles and approaches that best meet the needs of students and reflects the best practices of his/her academic discipline, and who regularly assesses student learning, making adjustments as appropriate (CFR 2.9).

Fresno Pacific University actively tracks retention and graduation data for all students. The institution provided disaggregated retention and graduation data for the last four years for review. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) creates retention and graduation disclosure documents that provide data disaggregated by population, gender, ethnicity and other variables. The institution also utilizes Ruffalo Noel Levitz to provide further analysis of retention data, broken down by a variety of cohorts (athletic status, financial aid award status, residential/commuter status, etc.,) which is distributed to the Retention Task Force, enrollment team, student financial services, and the President's Cabinet. The Retention Task Force has created a retention dashboard for traditional

undergraduate students (TUG) students. The data is disaggregated by first-time/full-time or full-time transfers, gender, athletes, ethnicity, and high-risk indicators such as first-generation status, low socio-economic status, and prior academic achievement. This data has been distributed and discussed amongst the Retention Task Force as well as the President's cabinet and other academic and student support leadership. While the institution provides a great deal of data, from a variety of sources to institutional constituents, it was noted during the visit on several occasions that there is a lack of accuracy and consistency in the data provided. The team encourages the institution to develop mechanisms to ensure the accuracy of student enrollment information and to define variables, reporting terminology, and sources so that inconsistencies in data can be addressed more efficiently. The team also encourages the institution to consolidate data sources and cross-check data variables with external entities to ensure that the reports are utilizing the same definitions and reporting variables as internal offices (CFR 2.10).

The institution provides a variety of co-curricular and support units to support all students' personal and professional growth including the Academic Success Center, Academic Advising, ALAS Intercultural Learning Center, Athletics, Career Development, Disability Access and Education, Health Services, Hiebert Library, Office of Spiritual Formation & Diversity (OSFD), On-Site Counseling, Housing and Commuter Life, student clubs, Student Financial Services, and Veterans Services. Most offices have begun to develop an assessment plan, goals, and metrics to ensure success in their respective areas. While meeting with these offices, the team noted that a similar report of issues with data integrity and consistency was raised in terms of assessment and evaluation. The team encourages the institution to continue to work with the co-curricular and support to offices to refine their existing plans, agree upon the shared source of data and definitions for the variables and reporting periods (CFRs 2.11, 2.13).

Students have multiple opportunities to meet with institutional representatives prior to admission, during the admission process, and once enrolled to review the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. Throughout students' time at FPU, academic advisors maintain regular contact to remind students of deadlines, provide updates, and to follow up on failed courses and early alert notices from faculty. Information about transfer policies, credit, and articulation agreements is available in the UG Academic Catalog and posted online for review (CFRs 2.12, 2.14).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

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

FPU is well led and well organized to address the WSCUC standards for quality and sustainability. Financial, human resource, information technology and physical resources are all in place, appropriate and well managed. FPU invests significantly into continuous improvement, teaching excellence, assessment and data (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.6, 4.7).

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is managed by the Associate Provost who also oversees the Office of Institutional Research, as well as the Center for Online Learning. This ensures the integration of resources and organization that underpin quality and sustainability. There remains room for improvement in the way the institution gathers, aggregates, analyses and distributes data for effectiveness, but FPU is aware of these needed improvements and is actively addressing them. The Accreditation Site Team has made further recommendations on areas to improve this process below (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2).

The budget process is well organized, zero based, transparent and engages all stakeholders. Budget is based on strategic priorities. Financial resources, even though they have improved significantly, are still based on semester tuition revenue and cash flow. Small shortfalls in enrollments in 2020 required budget cuts and other needed and appropriate adjustments. Strengthening the endowment, further diversifying programs, further investing in technology to support growth in online learning and continuing education, will all support revenue diversification and sustainability. Developing out the strategic objectives (GEIST) with separate actions to achieve the objective, data measures and benchmarks for the success indicators for each action, as well as accountabilities, timeframes and budget requirements, will also enable a clearer plan for growth, sustainability and success (CFR 3.4).

FPU has a goal of "Grow Strategically" with an overall enrollment target of 5000. The Enrollment Department has an action plan with specific initiatives that were assessed during the onsite visit. The enrollment team is well led by a senior and experienced executive who is ensuring there is continuity and sustainability in the management of enrollment operations. The Business Office led by the CFO is responsible for working across campus to ensure human resources, investment and capital expense planning, facilities improvement, technology needs, academic and student support, is all in place to support this growth target. The Site Team assessment is that the university is well prepared for growth and planning for growth is in place (CFR 3.4, CFR 3.8).

Degree completion enrollment has seen a steady annual increase until FY20 and the Covid impact. At that time degree completion enrollment went flat but did not decline. Pathways and partnerships with area community colleges have contributed to this and are likely to bring the university back to a growth cycle as soon as the Covid pandemic restrictions are removed. FPU has deep and mature networks through regional community colleges that act as pathways for degree

completion programs at FPU and so the recovery of community college enrollments is critical to future growth in FPU's DC enrollment numbers. Traditional undergraduate degrees rely heavily on financial aid. Federal increases to the Pell Grant would greatly benefit TUG enrollment. Graduate enrollment has been steadily increasing, based around nursing, organizational leadership, teacher credentials, school counseling, psychology and administrative credentials. These programs have a strong reputation for leading to career opportunities and provide a genuine competitive advantage for the institution. They point to a category of programs that FPU could expand and develop further. Covid did not impact increases in graduate program enrollment and this helped maintain overall enrollment which saw only a marginal decrease year on year from FY21 to FY22 (CFR 3.4).

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

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

FPU has established a program review process on a seven-year cycle that is supported by assessment of learning outcomes at the program and course level and data gathered from the institutional research office. With regards to quality assurance and improvement in the areas of program review, assessment, and use of data and evidence, these areas will be addressed further in Component Six below (CFR4.1, 4.4, 4.5).

The GEIST strategic plan was created in consultation with several data sources and wide involvement of various constituents at FPU. Interviews with several groups and individuals, including the Inquiry Circle Steering Committee, senior administrators, enrollment and advancement staff, the Assessment Committee and the Faculty Senate confirmed broad awareness and involvement in the formation and implementation of the GEIST strategic plan (CFR 4.3, 4.6). Greater detail

related to strategic planning and the use of data for institutional improvement and future planning can be found in Component 7.

Conclusion. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

All federal requirements are met including public (online and in print) disclosure of degree length, cost, employment opportunities.

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Policies and procedures are in place for financial, non-financial and administrative issues. FPU student services uses QR codes to quickly and easily direct students to the relevant complaint channel including Title IX, student and employee complaints. (CFR 1.6, 1.7)

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

Degree programs at Fresno Pacific University are representative of the core values of the institution and mission which states that Fresno Pacific University exists to prepare students for faithful and wise service through excellence in Christian higher education, and to strengthen the Church and improve society through scholarship and service. The institution has done considerable work in defining and analyzing the rigor and meaning of their degrees utilizing the Degree Qualifications Profile. While the institution has not fully adopted the DQP, they have begun to utilize

the output of the mapping relationships between the University Student Learning Outcomes (USLOs), General Education Student Learning Outcomes (GESLOs), and the DQP.

The institution is guided by their "Expanding the Possibilities Strategic Map 2019-2022", which states five thematic goals of Grow, Engage, Innovate, Serve, and Transform ("GEIST") that are supported by objectives and success indicators. The visit team noticed at the review that the language of GEIST was present across the campus including on posters, marketing materials, and in the presentation of institutional initiatives, projects, and departmental goals.

The institution measures the quality of its degrees through a robust assessment process, program review, and external accreditation reviews. While the program review process is well established, the institution is struggling with completion in some areas as well as the connection between finalizing the review and implementation of the suggestions for improvement. To help aid in documenting the outcomes of the program review process the institution recently implemented a MOU agreement to aid in the validation of the review recommendations. The institution also plans to review the MOU process to assess the impact of it and whether it helps to motivate faculty to complete program reviews as well as increase timeliness of program reviews.

The institution also defines the quality of its degrees through faculty development, high-impact practices, and academic services. Fresno Pacific University hires dedicated faculty and has processes in place to ensure professional development opportunities dedicated and qualified faculty. The institution assesses the quality-of-service areas, student support areas and administrative offices utilizing the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Student Satisfaction Inventory, and the Adult Student Priorities Survey. While the institution regularly utilizes survey instruments for institutional effectiveness, the review team encourages the institution to further explore and develop specific metrics to measure the effectiveness of academic and student support offices.

FPU's degree programs maintain consistency and integrity through policies set in the academic catalog and degree requirements maintained by the Registrar's Office as well as tracking graduation and persistence rates through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. While the institution maintains adequate data on graduation and student persistence, there were some reported issues with data quality indicated during the visit. The visit team encourages the institution to review their data definitions and reporting practices to ensure consistency and accuracy in data shared across the institution.

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

The institution has a robust structure of assessment that includes course student learning outcomes (CSLOs), program student learning outcomes, (PSLOs), and university student learning outcomes (USLOs). CSLOs and PSLOs are reviewed in the annual assessment reporting process which includes an evaluation of curricular programs and plans, standards of performance, the appropriateness of measures, interpretation of data and closing the loop.

The university student learning outcomes are distributed amongst the institution's general education courses. The ten USLOs are on a ten-year review schedule by the Assessment Committee with two USLOs being reviewed each year and recommendations being evaluated in the second half of the cycle (CFR 2.3, 2.7, 4.1).The institution uses a variety of data points for evidence to demonstrate that core competencies and key learning outcomes are being met including rubric scores, national surveys and/or standardized tests that allow for comparison such as NSSE and the California Critical Thinking Skills Test. The institution is reviewing methods to better assess the USLOs including the assessment measures, types of data collected, and issues around collecting data related to diversity. In order to address questions regarding perceived equity gaps, the institution conducted

an analysis of data from spring 2018 through spring 2020 which reviewed a combination of USLO data, NSSE, and other metrics (CFR 4.1-4.3). While an institutional goal was set expecting that 90% of summative courses would meet or exceed on the devised four level rubric, analysis indicated that students' performance for the majority of courses was below the intended benchmark. The team encourages the institution to continue with the recommendations indicated in the institutional report to increase the performance in each USLO.

While the institution has a great deal of data and reporting in place, there are still several barriers preventing the institution from achieving a culture of assessment. During the meeting with the assessment committee, it was noted that the committee regularly reviews data and provides reports to senior leadership, but they don't receive any follow-up on how the data was utilized to "close the loop". The committee also still struggles with incomplete data, either due to programs not completing required reports or rubrics not being entered into the eLumen software system. Because the institution relies heavily on rubrics, this lack of completion impacts the ability of data from key courses to be tabulated into reports for distribution to programs. The team encourages the institution to continue refining the CSLO, PSLO, and USLO reporting processes to ensure that adequate data is collected to demonstrate that outcomes are being met (CFR 2.3,2.4, 2.7).

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

Fresno Pacific University should be commended for establishing an initial infrastructure for tracking and supporting student success (CFR 2.10). A multi-office effort has been assembled for student success, grounded in the recognition that many students leave for reasons the institution has the ability to influence and guided by a retention plan with four student success goals:

1. Increase retention of students in at-risk populations by 1%-3%

2. Develop and measure efforts to successfully identify and support students who exhibit or experience retention risk factors

3. Continue to acquire and assess data on student departure after the first year and develop goals and strategies to increase student persistence to graduation

4. Establish a forum to foster collaboration, centralize information, and report updates on current and future student success initiatives.

These goals are to be fully assessed and revised on a three-year cycle with updates to action plans occurring annually, and all of these steps are to be taken in connection to FPU's values and broader strategic plans. A Retention Task Force has been established that serves as a planning and coordination body for this work (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

While FPU's overall retention and graduation rates for traditional undergraduate students tend to be greater than those of comparable institutions, academically at-risk, low socioeconomic status, first-generation, Black/African-American, commuter, and male students have lower retention and graduation rates. Thus, the institution is faced with retention and graduation equity gaps—a topic the 2021 Institutional Report admirably addresses—that relate to the campus' efforts around diversity, equity, and inclusion. Interventions and initiatives to address these gaps have been developed, including a new Office of Student Life position dedicated to addressing these gaps. Nonetheless, these interventions and initiatives are neither longstanding nor fully institutionalized.

Complicating this is the issue of data integrity (CFR 1.6, 4.2). The Office of Institutional Research is now able to provide the appropriate data but the timeliness and accuracy of the data provided in the recent past was not ideal and contributed towards a mistrust of institutional student data across multiple stakeholder groups. There remain concerns about data integrity and when data is provided the Office of Student Life must invest in cleaning the data. For example, annual retention

reports have now restarted (without a multi-year schedule for these retention reports) but the Office of Student Life has to check and clean the data for a longer period of time than if the data they received was worthy of greater confidence.

That said, while the current set of interventions, initiatives, data collected, and services provided is commendable, this mix of activity lacks a sufficient amount of integration and synthesis (CFR 4.6, 4.7). How do all these pieces for student success in retention and graduation move in concert with one other? How, exactly, do the pieces inform and advance the others? Are there ways in which these pieces can be constructed (e.g., online retention and graduation rate dashboards) that would better enable connection among them? How might FPU view these pieces as a collective whole and then move towards meta-evaluation as a means of judging the overall effort? How might efforts such as these lead to reconsiderations of the student success reporting process governed by the Retention Task Force and inform how the Task Force will hold itself accountable for achieving its goals?

Of particular importance is the issue of use of results (CFR 4.1, 4.3). FPU has developed an initial infrastructure for data generation and the organizational structure for programmatic intervention but this infrastructure has not yet developed into one that also "closes the loop" in terms of analyzing results across the array of activity and demonstrably uses these results for improvement (and then asks new questions that further advance the overall effort). FPU has put the pieces in place but now needs to connect them towards a more coherent whole that is itself self-reflective and conclusive about its effectiveness and impact.

This line of thinking could be applied to the student learning aspects of student success at FPU. The campus has employed national surveys such as NSSE and IDEA; developed learning outcomes at multiple levels; strengthened its assessments and collected related data (e.g., SAP data);

worked towards integrating assessment and program review; and developed programs such as the

SOAR Program and the Academic Success Center, among other tools, processes, systems, and

programs aimed at student learning. Again, having taken these steps is commendable but their value is

limited without greater integration and synthesis. These various sets of data collection and

organizational activity should be brought together in a more cohesive, complementary way. And

consideration of how the entirety of the effort "closes the loop" to actually use the results for

improvement should occur. For these major aspects of student success, retention, graduation and

student learning, it might be that stepping back from the details to collectively construct a logic model

of how it all fits together—and towards what end—would be a useful starting place.

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

Fresno Pacific University should be commended for the steps it has taken towards quality

assurance and educational improvement (CFR 4.1). It has established a formal program review

process, grounded in the motive to improve the institution from within (as opposed to being grounded

in satisfying WSCUC), established a 7-year cycle for program reviews, and created a series of

roughly a dozen steps that take about 15 months for a program to complete the review process (CFR

2.1, 2.7). To their credit, FPU is working towards integrating program review and assessment. The

"Program Review (PR) and Annual Assessment Report (AAR) Status" document captures where each

degree-granting program is in the flow of these two processes while connecting the two. As a result,

the program review process is—on paper—robust as it includes "collecting, analyzing, and

interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources;

and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results." The 2021

Institutional Report argues that the organizational capacity for quality assurance processes such as

program review exists—and is up and running.

Related to this, FPU has created a viable assessment infrastructure (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6). All academic programs can submit Annual Assessment Reports, in which a program uses its assessment plan to analyze the targeted outcomes for that academic year and develops a plan of action to either affirm or address the teaching and learning that produced the student achievement results. Academic programs also analyze the previous year's student ratings of instruction and decide if and what kind of action needs to be initiated to improve results. Co-curricular outcomes (e.g., from the Chapel Program, Intramurals, Student Programs, Residence Life, Commuter and Parent Services, Student Activities, International Student Services, and Athletics) are also addressed in the assessment process. To this, the FPU 2021 Institutional Report adds that the Faculty Senate "regularly discusses learning outcomes and performance standards" (page 37) and at the 2022 WSCUC on-campus Site Visit it was discussed that FPU has invested in eLumen, an online platform for coordinating assessment activity.

There are indications, however, that these systems are not operating as optimally as possible. To begin with, Annual Assessment Reports and program reviews are not mandatory at FPU. Not surprisingly, many programs have not completed a recent Assessment Report and at the time of the 2021 Institutional Report multiple programs were overdue for a program review. Further complicating the program review process, and according to the "2021 Analysis of Program Review Process" document, it is not explicitly clear if reviewer feedback ought to be used by a program to improve student learning; the exemplar in the Program Review Resource Guide does not require use of reviewer feedback. The 2021 Analysis document also pointed out that it is unknown if the university integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes and that program reviews are completed without explicit expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates.

Added to this are concerns the AV team had about the structure of learning outcomes across the institution (CFR 1.2, 2.3). FPU has developed ten university student learning outcomes, which are grouped under five categories (Communication, Content, Critical Thinking, Mission, and Quantitative Reasoning) and each program has learning outcomes. However, according to the 2021 Analysis of Program Review Process document, when new program learning outcomes are proposed there is no explicit direction to seek counsel from the campus Assessment Director regarding quality of the learning outcomes or proposed assessment strategies, even though programs use the campus assessment management system that allows the Assessment Director to provide feedback. This state of affairs is reflected in some of the learning outcome statements. Many of the learning outcomes include multiple criteria that would make operationalization difficult due to the many outcome statements embedded within. For example, the Oral Communication outcome states that "Students will exhibit clear, engaging and confident oral communication in both individual and group settings and will critically evaluate content and delivery components" and Early Childhood Development program's student learning outcomes #4: "Using Developmentally Effective Approaches. Students understand that teaching and learning with young children is a complex enterprise, and its details vary depending on children's ages, characteristics, and the settings within which teaching and learning occur. They understand and use positive relationships and supportive interactions as the foundation for their work with young children and families. Students know, understand, and use a wide array of developmentally appropriate approaches, instructional strategies, and tools to connect with children and families and positively influence each child's development and learning." To address cases such as these, it should be expected that the Assessment Director provide feedback on the quality of student learning outcomes and assessment plans, on assessment findings, on benchmarking results, and on assessment impact—and that this feedback is seriously considered by all those responsible for administering the program. Connected to this is feedback from the University Assessment Committee,

which provides annual feedback on the quality of targeted university student learning outcomes and assessment efforts. The campus should move to see that this group's recommendations are taken seriously and acted upon in the interest of improvement.

From the perspective of the AV team regarding quality assurance and improvement, there are three areas in need of attention that are addressed in recommendations two and three in Section III. The first and most important is the degree of collective faculty ownership, responsibility and participation in quality assurance processes at FPU (CFR 2.4, 2.6). Moving forward on these matters, faculty should consider codifying their increased ownership of and involvement in quality assurance processes such as program review and assessment through modifications to the Faculty Handbook. As suggested on page 39 of the 2021 Institutional Report, the Faculty Handbook should indeed address required completion of all elements of program review and program assessment, and compliance with these elements should be enforced by the administration. As faculty move to increase involvement in quality assurance processes, the administration should support them. At present there seems to be neither strong incentives nor disincentives for faculty participation in these quality assurance processes; there are neither carrots nor sticks. Especially worth consideration are what incentives might the campus create to increase participation. FPU might borrow from the many incentivizing strategies other institutions have created to reward faculty and recognize them for this work as the institution moves away from a compliance to an owned learning mindset on assessment and program review.

Second, and embedded in the list of recommendations in Section III, there is the use of feedback and results (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). There are no mechanisms for ensuring that reviewer feedback in the program review process is used for improvement; for seeing that feedback from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness on the quality of learning outcomes and assessment plans is used;

and for acting upon feedback from the University Assessment Committee. During the visit, it was discussed that there is now a memorandum of understanding that ensures a meeting with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the respective program administrators. This is certainly a positive step but the use of feedback and results should be based in on-going relationships that promote a healthy, continuous conversation on improvement. In addition to creating such mechanisms and relationships, use of results should be better documented. The "rigor chart" cited in the Institutional Report, for example, could include a column on the assessment findings and plans for using these results for improvement. Doing so would move beyond a detailed description of the ingredients for assessment to a fuller picture of how FPU is completing the assessment cycle.

Third, integration of quality assurance processes such as program review and assessment with other, equally important processes (CFR 4.6, 4.7). These processes should be interwoven into the planning and budgeting processes and the discussion on student success (retention and graduation), among other areas. Results from the program review process, for example, should inform the resource/budget allocation process for departments and programs. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness should be in discussion with the Office of Institutional Research, the Center for Online Learning, and the Teaching and Learning Center about trends in assessment across campus and how assessment results can inform the work of these offices. How might program review and assessment results be used in the retention and graduation equity gaps conversation? How might strengthening program review and assessment data contribute towards the overall effort to make FPU institutional data more reliable and centralized? Collectively, the institution can better employ the capacities it already has to develop evaluation processes that are more impactful and useful and should be in discussion about bringing to bear these capacities in a more integrated, organized, and systematic way.

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

SUSTAINABILITY

Since the last WSCUC Special Visit in Fall 2018, FPU has further strengthened the sustainability of its operations. The move to online instruction, prior to Covid, but accelerated by Covid, has placed FPU at #11 in the top 25 online colleges in California (Nonprofit Colleges Online link). The university is committed to continuous improvement as shown by the many enhancements to communications, decision-making, planning, budgeting, technology updates and not least the development and use of data in assessment and improvement across the institution. The inquiry circle format used by FPU to prepare for the WSCUC Institutional Report has developed communication, transparency, accountability, skills and experience across a wide range of internal stakeholders that will significantly benefit the sustainability of the organization into the future. The inquiry circles are an area of good practice that the AV team suggests FPU consider continuing between WSCUC reports to embed the culture of stakeholder engagement in budgeting, data development, analysis and decision-making. The Site Team agrees with the assessment of the inquiry circle for quality and integrity of degree programs that the university provides a coherent and rigorous educational experience and a learning environment that is rich in diversity, community engagement. This quality and integrity are the foundation for the sustainability of the institution into the future (CFR 3.4, 3.5).

The GEIST Strategic Map 2019-2022 has established a clear strategic direction of moving from the cost cutting of previous years, necessary to address the immediate deficit situation, to revenue generation through enrollment, retention, academic program development and advancement. The GEIST plan has been extended by the Board of Trustees until 2025 showing the relevance and success of the framework for the institution. In planning for the future as part of the next phase of the

GEIST, a useful exercise to consider may be for the institution to gather all the recommendations from the inquiry circles and establish a work program for them within the structure of the strategic plan, using a framework that includes strategic objectives (GEIST), actions to achieve the objective, data measures and benchmarks for the success indicators for each action, accountabilities, timeframes and budget requirement. This would enable FPU to build on all the strengths and growth over the last three years and to continue the momentum into the future. As the institution aims for the 5,000-student target and beyond, a longer-term planning horizon is also needed for budgeting including debt management, investment in infrastructure, new program development, demographic changes, changes in the educational landscape and technology development (CFR 3.6, 3.7).

Student advising to improve retention and graduation rates may benefit from standardization and exchange of best practice across undergraduate and graduate teams. Data dashboards for diversity, retention and graduation outcomes could be developed to better visualize and present data to stakeholders to provide focus on areas of weakness, equity gaps and student failure (CFR 2.10).

HR has successfully developed salary banding for staff positions. This will support staff retention and ensure employee skill sets and experience contribute to institution growth (CFR 3.2).

FINANCIAL VIABILITY

In 2018 the Special Visit report noted operating deficits in FY13 and FY14 followed by further deficits in FY16 and FY17. FPU responded actively and in a structured way to address these deficits. It hired an experienced CFO supported by external consultants, changed its auditors to a firm experienced with higher education clients, and made structural changes. A Budget Director was appointed to work across all university departments in a clear and transparent process, budgets were developed with cost and revenue contingencies built in, a formal cash reserve policy was established with contributions based on agreed percentages of net operating income, and debt began to be paid

down in a managed process. Advancement was given leadership from the new president and the charge across the university management team was to create and sustain operating surpluses (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7).

In 2022 the AV team found a far improved financial viability landscape for the university. Operating surpluses have been achieved in each of the last four years with accompanying improvements in the Net Income Ratio for FY18, FY19, FY20 and FY21. The Primary Reserve Ratio has improved in the last four years through the establishment of policies to develop the cash reserve, and should continue to improve as annual contributions from net operating income continue toward the goal of $10M. Available cash on hand has been further increased through a line of credit during the Covid period although this did not need to be used. The Return on Net Assets Ratio is also significantly higher than in the previous four years reflecting the annual surpluses and a rising stock market. Reduction in debt has seen the Viability Ratio increase to well above the target for debt management. The Equity Ratio is increasing due to reducing debt and the achievement of a significant grant to build the Culture and Arts Center. These ratios combine in the Composite Financial Index and DOE Financial Responsibility Score being comfortably above their required targets of 3 and 1.5 respectively for FY19, FY20 and FY21 and show the university in a solid position to invest in further improvement and growth so long as enrollment trends remain positive (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7).

The university responded well to the Covid pandemic. With enrollment marginally down for FY20, needed HR cost cuts were made and the credit line was put in place. Federal HEERF funds were accessed which offset most additional Covid related expenses. FPU has received clean financial audits for the last four years with only one qualified opinion related to the overvaluation of the university's artwork portfolio. FPU intends to write down the value of the artwork as annual surpluses

make possible. The annual audit management letters have seen the number of concerns around internal controls reduced from thirteen in FY16 to two in FY20, both of which have been addressed (CFR 3.4).

The Covid impact on enrollment in FY21 will likely roll through into FY22 and FY23 revenue, and costs will need to be managed to compensate and to maintain the strong financial ratio performance. The regular decline in undergraduate enrollment has been largely offset by the increase in degree completion and graduate enrollment, but still remains a concern. The affordability marketing campaign around need-based financial aid and time to degree will need investment and focus. Diversification of revenue away from tuition is an ongoing challenge. FPU does not have a large endowment or partnerships with large private institutions or donors. Receipts from gifts and grants have increased to their highest level in FY20 for the last five years, and the endowment has benefited from the increase in the stock market. Advancement has established targets well beyond these benchmarks and these will need ongoing focus and attention from leadership to achieve. Continuing Education to an online market is an opportunity identified by FPU but still needs to be geared up to achieve meaningful revenues. This platform could also be used to develop and expand the micro-credential market and current degree-completion programming (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Retention rates for undergraduate programs meet or exceed the national average for peer institutions. This is now being further enhanced by the Retention Task Force which is developing a coordinated and cross-disciplinary approach to retention across all graduate, undergraduate and degree completion cohorts (CFR 2.10).

The annual budget setting process now has increased ownership and accountability across all departments. The Business Office is further enhancing this transparency and accessibility by

introducing new budget software and 24/7 budget vs actual reporting. Budget updates are communicated to the university quarterly through the college media channel and intranet (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9).

PREPARING FOR THE CHANGING HIGHER EDUCATION LANDSCAPE

The pivot to online program delivery has benefitted FPU. Online education creates an opportunity for all institutions of higher education, and how they respond to the challenges of teaching, learning and testing will define their success. FPU has managed this transition well. It has developed a Teaching Continuity Guide to help faculty prepare their courses and use online tools effectively; it has created a Course Development Academy to further enhance this process, and it is implementing an LMS accessibility tool to make the online programming more accessible for students. Over the next few years the university will be investing in analytics for the all-important measuring of student engagement with the LMS and to implement standards for online course quality. All these measures could reinforce FPU's position as one of the top online not for profit colleges in California (CFR 4.7).

The transition to a campus IT partner in 2020 has made a significant difference to the viability and sustainability of the university and will help to set up the institution for success in the changing higher education marketplace. Previous to this FPU had identified many structural IT weaknesses that it was unable to address on its own. With outside professional support, the university is now on a path to fully engage in the technology driven higher education market place. Items in the IT plan include transitioning Advancement to Raiser's Edge donor management software, implementing the departmental budget sharing software, working with the Institutional Research Office across all data development and dashboards, strengthening cybersecurity, developing the enrollment CRM to support growth, as well as supporting all other online program delivery infrastructure (CFR 3.5).

New academic leadership beginning in 2018 has resulted in a refocusing of academic program priorities and efficiencies. Several programs have been taught out, declining programs have been re-imagined and updated, new programs have been developed better suited to meet student demand (CFR 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 3.4, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

Lack of endowment and financial reserves makes the institution dependent on semester-based tuition cashflow. This lack of leverage can create a mentality of maintaining the status quo and incremental improvement, rather than looking for ambitious and market leading innovation and change. FPU leadership has done an excellent job digging the institution out of a sequence of loss-making years, and of now setting up the institution for success. The challenge will be how leadership responds to the pressure of limited resources while anticipating the rapid evolution of demographics, technology and other environmental factors (CFR 4.7).

Component 8: Action Items—Diversity, Decision Making and Communication

The Institutional Report contained three action item sections that addressed issues brought up in the 2019 Commission Letter, namely Diversity (Component 8), Decision Making (Component 9) and Communication (Component 10). The AV team report will address these topics together in this section of the report. Here, the focus will be on themes that the AV team identified that seem to connect the three above issues in overlapping ways, namely transparency, trust and aligned expectations.

Reliably-consistent and transparent communication that engenders organizational trust is at the core of administrative leadership and there seems to be a recurring theme that FPU does not have a strong history of perceptions of transparency and trust as evidenced by the 2013, 2015, and 2019 WSCUC Commission letters. In line with this, the 2021 Institutional Report describes a result from a

recent survey that focused on budgeting: "There was no evidence that the current administration has developed, communicated, and followed a plan to prioritize greater transparency in communicating budget decision-making. Survey results provide partial support for the sense of a climate of trust. On the other hand, more town halls and campus forums have been examples of greater transparency. With the recent addition of public access to financial reports and minutes, the perception of increased transparency may change…The new public access to financial reports and minutes suggests initial strides have been taken to advance this objective" (page 66). This characterization, one in which the overall picture reflects the need for improvement but recent trends are positive and encouraging, seems to apply to many of the organizational aspects examined in this WSCUC review.

Indeed, the president has established a weekly newsletter ("Connections") for sharing his and other campus faculty and staff perspectives and important announcements are regularly sent out via the "FPU Pres" email account. The campus' "Squawk Box" website communicates daily events and activities and the university's intranet includes committee minutes, handbooks, reports, and policies. Communication mechanisms such as these played an important role during the COVID-19 pandemic (page 75 of 2021 Institutional Report) and FPU should be commended for having putting these communication systems to good use for a variety of reasons (e.g., the shift to remote work, the move to virtual classrooms, etc.) during the pandemic. We might also note that FPU's 2021 Institutional Report itself, based in the inquiry circles, and the campus' WSCUC Reaccreditation website reflect a commitment to communication and transparency. Looking at all of these developments, the 2021 Institutional Report concludes, "It is evident that over the past five years, the university has taken a serious look at communication and made a concerted effort to increase the amount of communication, the types of communication, and the level of transparency in an effort to establish a greater level of trust and openness" (page 67) but then adds, "Continued effort is needed to maintain and expand these initiatives in order to foster a climate of increased trust and feeling of openness from the

administration" (page 67). Matters of organizational trust and negative perceptions of openness do not seem to be fully resolved based on the AV team's evaluation and FPU's own evaluation within the Institutional Report.

Evidence for this lack of resolution is found in HERI campus climate survey results showing mixed findings for a climate of trust and openness (page 69), questions about the openness of the President's Cabinet (page 71), the Fall 2020 FPU Communication Inquiry Circle survey finding that communication has improved but is still not operating at high levels, and the proposal for a staff position for cross-campus communication (page 78). Additionally, interviews with both ASB and the Faculty Senate surfaced continued concerns around communication and transparency from the senior administration team as well as concerns about processes for making decisions that impact the work of faculty. While these sentiments were expressed by several during the interview with the Faculty Senate, there were also dissenting voices that felt that that the expectation for faculty to be included in all decisions (in alignment with the often raised ideal of consensus decision making as part of the Mennonite Brethren heritage) was unrealistic and not scalable to an institution of the size and complexity of FPU. While this is an internal issue that the FPU community will need to decide on, it was clear to the AV team those differing expectations among constituents on this issue seem to be driving why communication and decision making have been identified as recurring issues over the past several WSCUC visits to FPU.

This dynamic of progress made yet important stakeholder group expectations not being satisfied is further reflected in the campus' diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) effort (CFR 1.4). Organizational questions surround leadership of the diversity effort making it unclear how the Chief Diversity Officer and the University Diversity Committee are meant to relate (page 62) and why no member of the University Diversity Committee sits on the President's Cabinet. This has led to: "…

competing reporting structures raise questions as to how DEI is represented at and to the President's Cabinet because of the CDO reporting to the VP of Campus Life with a dotted line relationship to the president, combined with the UDC reporting to the president directly. The current organizational structure still provides a lack of clarity as to who in the University specifically represents DEI concerns at the Cabinet level" (page 63). This sentiment was also represented in comments heard in the AV team interviews with the DEI staff and the UDC as well as concerns with their lack of involvement in decision making around the CDO job description and appointment. This state of affairs has ultimately led to questions about how institutional systems and structures for DEI will be maintained beyond the current administration or leadership age. In the context of this report, some questions here are: How does a fractured approach to DEI impact matters of communication, trust, and transparency? To what extent to current DEI arrangements foster "turf wars" over implementing DEI initiatives and addressing related concerns? Is it not inevitable that such turf wars deepen the dynamic that pits faculty against the administration over what the DEI priorities are and the tactics used to advance these priorities? What is the ultimate cumulative impact of conflicts such as these on quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement? It is questions such as these that led to the first recommendation in Section III below that focused on diversity, equity and inclusion.

The AV team believes that the continuation of the GEIST strategic plan, which was originally intended to end in 2022, is important as it offers a frame for accelerated progress on DEI (CFR 1.1, 1.4, 4.6, 4.7) and potentially communication/decision making (CFR 3.6, 3.7). As FPU continues to broaden its impact and bring into its campus community diverse students, staff, and faculty it will have to learn to better scale the institutional practices grounded in its mission and faith tradition. Pushing a distributed model of authority or a consensus model of decision-making, for example, to higher scales in a growing and increasingly complicated and layered organization will need a frame

such as the one GEIST provides. Protecting and advancing FPU's mission while educating and supporting an increasingly diverse cultural array of students will need a broad strategic frame.

GEIST also provides a potential frame for accountability and DEI (CFR 1.4, 4.3, 4.5). While the impetus to provide an accounting of results that can improve matters of quality or effectiveness in relation to DEI exists on campus, there is not a strong and recognizable accountability system for DEI at FPU. At FPU, in order to create an accountability system for DEI that is coherent—i.e., the organizational outcomes are clearly defined and the indicators of success are identified, operationalized, and emphasized in a way consistent with the outcomes—there will have to be a balancing of a clearly defined DEI commitment aligned with its mission and faith tradition with both the expectations of those outside the organization's core centers of decision making and those with beliefs outside of FPU's faith tradition. Accountability in this context ought to be planned, systematic, and structured as a means of providing the wide range of those with a stake in FPU's success with accurate information on progress made and areas of improvement in order to address underlying challenges with trust and transparency. It might be that FPU's DEI efforts could be leveraged to not only advance the campus' strategic DEI goals but also be used to reverse negative trends around organizational trust and openness.

Section III – Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

The FPU Institutional report, supporting materials and subsequent updates demonstrated that the institution has taken the accreditation review process seriously and has focused its efforts on items that were raised in previous WSCUC Commission actions. FPU is clearly in a better financial position and it appears that the review process has helped the institution make progress in several areas. While this is true and progress has been made, some of the same issues that have been raised in

previous WSCUC visit reports still exist and need additional attention. Based on the FPU Institutional

report, the AV Team identified five thematic areas as Lines of Inquiry for the FPU onsite visit:

1. Institutional and Academic Effectiveness

2. Communication

3. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

4. Sustainability

5. Institutional Planning

The combined offsite and onsite review process by the AV team yielded the following

commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

1. GEIST has structured the goals and objectives of the institution in a well-articulated and organized manner. The Board has extended GEIST as the FPU strategic plan framework until 2025 which shows the significance and shared understanding of the validity and importance of these goals.

2. The financial position of the university has improved significantly since the last WSCUC visit and the institution is to be congratulated on this achievement. The new arts center is fully paid for and will be a significant addition to the campus community as an event space and gathering place, and an organic link to the wider Fresno community.

3. The university is to be commended for developing the Diversity Rationale and Diversity Plan. As the institution grows and encompasses greater diversity within its student body, staff,

faculty and administration, these will be the foundational documents for further development and progress.

Recommendations

1. Accelerate progress on key issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion; with the participation of the full range of campus stakeholders, including the Board of Trustees, Executive Leadership, Administration, Faculty, Staff and Students. Accelerated progress should include the following:

   a. Finalize the institution-wide definition of diversity, equity, and inclusion and ensure that it is consistent with FPU's mission and purpose;

   b. Align the university diversity plan with the institution-wide definition and ensure appropriate leadership, accountability and infrastructure to create a more inclusive environment that addresses diversity, equity and inclusion issues identified by campus constituents;

   c. Clearly define the responsibilities, authority and reporting relationship of the CDO and operationalize the job description according to the university diversity plan. (CFR 1.4, WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy)

2. The program review process should be evaluated addressing the following:

   a. Faculty partnership in the development of program review documentation, guides, and templates;

   b. Review the data included in the program review process to ensure that it is relevant, accurate, and has integrity;

    c. Clarify oversight and accountability structures to ensure the implementation of the program review cycle such that every program is participating and completing its program review in the prescribed time frame. (CFR 2.1, 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.5)

3. Faculty should take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating thorough assessment of the achievement of these standards with special attention to the following areas:

    a. Clarify its assessment oversight and accountability structures and ensure that faculty demonstrate ownership of assessment;

    b. Review the data included in the assessment process to ensure that it is relevant, accurate, and has integrity;

    c. Ensure that faculty are appropriately trained on the use of the assessment management system;

    d. Ensure that all programs have an appropriate assessment plan developed and implemented to ensure sufficient assessment data is available for use in ongoing quality assurance activities and periodic program review. (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

Appendices

The report includes the following appendices:

A. Federal Compliance Forms

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? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? https://www.fresno.edu/students/registrars-office/registration-and-academic-policies - Credit hour and program length policy https://catalog.fresno.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=745 - Credit hour policy
	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)? ☒ YES ☐ NO CFR 2.7 & 2.11 - Description of Program Review Process.docx The processes that FPU employs to review periodically the application of this policy across the institution to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, and consistently applied are as follows: • All reviews and updates of catalog. • Ongoing syllabus audits by deans or their designates every semester. • All academic committees when new programs or courses are being approved, which includes hours for assignment.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet **https://www.fresno.edu/students/registrars-office/course-schedules-and-academic-calendars** Schedule can be found through Sunbird Central, course schedule	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.* CFR 2.3 - Undergraduate Syllabi CFR 2.3 - Graduate Syllabi	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? both
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Grad Counseling, Grad Kinesiology, TUG Com, TUG Language
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ 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? 3
	What kinds of courses? Internship, Practicum, Independent Study
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? TUG Lit, Grad Nursing, Grad Interior Design
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? BA, BS, MA
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? TUG BIO TUG PSYCH, Grad Nursing

	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☑ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Kerr Fulcher

Date: 3-17-22

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.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ☑ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ☑ YES ☐ NO https://www.fresno.edu/programs-majors/degree-completion https://www.fresno.edu/students/registrars-office/registration-and-academic-policies/graduation-guarantees
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ☑ YES ☐ NO https://www.fresno.edu/admission/degree-completion/degree-completion-tuition-financial-aid https://www.fresno.edu/students/student-financial-services/cost-attendance
	Comments: Time to degree is presented prior to admissions through the recruitment process. It is located on program sheets, web pages and in the academic catalog. It is also discussed upon transcript evaluation through the advising process and is dependent upon the number of courses transferred into

	the university. In addition, if a student transfers in an ADT (Associate Degree for Transfer), Fresno Pacific provides both a 4-year guarantee for traditional undergrad and a 2-year guarantee for Degree Completion. Cost per unit for all courses is listed on program sheets, admission web pages, and discussed through the recruitment process.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO See
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO https://www.fresno.edu/students/career-development-and-experiential-learning-center https://www.fresno.edu/alumni **Program sheet example:** https://www.fresno.edu/programs-majors/degree-completion/business-administration-business-management https://news.fresno.edu/pacific-magazine
	Comments: Career opportunities are listed on program sheets, admission program pages and discussed through the recruitment process. Marketing regularly features success stories of FPU's graduates through a variety of publications, media outlets and program web pages. In addition, information can be obtained through the Alumni Office, as well as the Career Development and Experiential Learning Center.

*§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: Anatole Bogatski

Date:3-17-22

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.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? <mark>https://www.fresno.edu/about/disclosure-documents/complaints</mark>
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☐ YES ☒ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☐ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? <mark>All academic documents are housed in e-trieve, under the students' electronic file. They are kept for the life of the file – permanent record.</mark>
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☒ YES ☐ NO

	If so, please describe briefly: <mark>All academic complaints (grade appeals, petitions) are housed in e-trieve. Student files are permanent records, never destroyed.</mark>
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Kerry Fulcher

Date: 3-17-22

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY 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.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ☑ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ☑ YES ☐ NO If so, where? <mark>https://catalog.fresno.edu/content.php?catoid=18&navoid=651#transfer-credits-credits-for-previous-course-work</mark>
	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 ☐ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Kerry Fulcher

Date: 3-17-22

B. Off-Campus Locations Review; Bakersfield and North Fresno

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX B1

Institution: Fresno Pacific University- Bakersfield
Type of Visit: Remote
Name of reviewer/s: Michael Beals, Kerry Fulcher
Date/s of review: 2/2-3/22

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed. 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
   Bakersfield
   1518 Mill Rock Way Suite 101
   Bakersfield, CA 93311

1. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)
   0. Est 2003-04 AY
   1. This is the smallest of the FPU Satellite campuses with a limited number of degree completion programs. The largest graduate program is the Education PPS degree.
   2. The team will need to follow up at the main campus site to get the disaggregated data for Bakersfield as that is centrally kept within the academic units at the main campus.

1. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
   The review was conducted via Zoom by Chair, Michael Beals and Vice-Chair, Kerry Fulcher on Feb 2-3. The remote meeting was precipitated by extended remote learning at FPU due to the Omicron C19 Variant outbreak in California. The review team interviewed the following persons/groups:
   - Current Students (3 students from different programs)
   - Faculty (2 faculty from Education in the Pupil Personnel Services program
   - Chief Academic Officer- Gayle Copeland
   - Bakersfield Campus Manager- Misty Garcia
   - Head of Student Services- Corrie Hawes
   - Head of the Library- Kevin Enns- Rempel
   - Head of Operations and Interim Head of Operations - Denise Baronian and David Black
   - Head of Technology- James Long
   - Admissions Coordinator Tara Pierce

Materials examined included the FPU Institutional report and appendices along, past WSCUC encounter documents, and the materials requested in the Offsite Review. Additionally, the Websites for the FPU satellite campus were examined.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A	
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	The missional "FPU Idea" seemed to be thoroughly embedded at this location and was articulated well by multiple employees in different ways. Most functions had a strong centralized connection to the Main FPU campus with satellite personnel reporting up through main campus structures. The commitment to serve students to the highest standards was clearly articulated.	
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Yes, students articulated a strong sense of belonging that was reinforced by welcoming faculty, devotional faith engagements in the classrooms, strong communication from the main FPU campus (especially during the pandemic) and special Bakersfield campus visits by the president and his wife.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Both students and faculty had ready access to the Bakersfield Campus Manager who was specifically mentioned by both groups regarding her availability and quick response times, even during the pandemic. FPU leases space from Bakersfield Christian High School, which was reported by students and faculty as being a quality space that is well maintained and supported. The Bakersfield site coordinator reports to the FPU Director of Operations.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	The students reported positive experiences with admissions staff, financial aid, counseling services, technology services and records indicating that staff in these areas were accessible, prompt in their responses and genuinely cared for the students and their experience. While there is no "onsite" access to library services, the FPU library services available online were adequate for their needs and the faculty demonstrate how to access library resources at the beginning of each course that students take. Students appreciated the staff's	Since many of these services are centrally provided and run, this should be evaluated at the main campus visit.

	creativity in problem-solving and positive experiences with the financial office.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Academic program directors at the Bakersfield campus are a part of the academic unit for their discipline on the main FPU campus and are invited to participate in meetings of the faculty, curriculum and program reviews as well as assessment discussions and practices. The program directors at Bakersfield in turn support the adjunct faculty who are teaching at their site, gathering their feedback and reporting that back up through the academic unit and specific program area meetings. Aside from the program directors at Bakersfield, all other faculty are adjuncts who are active professionally in their field.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	All curriculum is centrally approved and evaluated by the appropriate FPU academic units for use at all satellite campuses. All satellite campus programs are evaluated the same way as main campus programs and use the same learning outcomes and assessment tools/plans. There is no independent oversight of the academic programs at satellite locations as all are firmly embedded in the academic units centrally administered through the main campus.	Since this is a centralized function, this should be evaluated during the main campus visit.
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	N/A	Since this is a centralized function, this should be evaluated during the main campus visit.
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Student learning is centrally overseen at FPU within the appropriate academic units and there is no difference in assessment practices from those on the main campus. There was no evidence given of differential retention or success rates between the main campus and satellite programs	Since this is a centralized function, this should be evaluated during the main campus visit.
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Faculty and administration report that the quality assurance process at satellites is the same as what is used for the main campus since this is centrally administered.	Since this is a centralized function, this should be evaluated during the main campus visit.

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX B2

Institution: Fresno Pacific University
Type of Visit: Reaccreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Dr Michael Beals, Dr Anatole Bogatski
Date/s of review: February 28th and March 1st 2022

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

   North Fresno Satellite Campus, 5 River Park Place West, Fresno CA 93720

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

   At Fall 2021 twelve subject areas were offered in this location: Business Administration with a Business Management emphasis (68 students), Business Administration: Organizational Leadership (38), Christian Ministry and Leadership (10), Computer Information Systems (28), Criminology (27), Early Childhood Development (87), Healthcare Administration (21), Liberal Arts (140), Bachelor of Science in Nursing (15), Psychology (27), Social Work (167), Social Welfare (23), total 651 students. Degree levels range from graduate programs through to degree completion. All degrees are taught by full time and adjunct faculty.

   In 2005 FPU established regional campuses in Bakersfield, North Fresno and Visalia. The Merced Campus was added in 2012. These campuses offer courses mostly for adult students pursuing graduate degrees or enrolled in the university's degree completion program. The North Fresno campus is designated a satellite location by WSCUC.

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

   The Review was conducted on site over one evening and the following morning. The following were interviewed: student representatives, teaching faculty and head of programs, VP of Academic Affairs and

Provost, Assistant Director of Operations, Director of Student Support Services, Head of Library, Interim Operations Lead, Head of Technology, Head of Admissions and Admissions Coordinator. The team received a full scope description for the satellite campus which is appended.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (Identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A	N/A
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	This site is the largest of the FPU satellite campuses. It fits strongly with the mission to extend the university mission beyond its original denominational boundaries. This plan, called "Broadening the Base," included expanding campus facilities and enlarging the curriculum. Site is fully staffed with faculty, student support, recruitment, and building management. Teaching technology is new and well used. Future plans include marketing staff, career support staff on campus.	N/A
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The satellite campus is well connected to the university. FPU signage is highly visible, all programs at the satellite include spiritual formation elements, a Regional Care Committee has been established for satellite campuses that connects with the Office of Spiritual Formation at FPU. Regular career development workshops take place at the regional campuses in conjunction with the main campus Career Development Center.	N/A
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	North Fresno satellite campus is located in a relatively recently developed area of the city. It is located in a new office building, with new classroom technology that is well appreciated by students and faculty. Due to covid tutors are fully online at this time but will be more consistently on-campus starting in 2022. Faculty-student contact has been online through the covid period but more on-campus classes are planned in 2022. The satellite campus has a fulltime on-campus director of operations and security, with regular visits from main campus managers as needed.	N/A
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Most student support through the covid period was provided online. Library remains fully online, while academic and technology support, advising, counseling and career support, admissions, recruitment and marketing are starting to return to campus through 2022. Data on effectiveness are held	Data on effectiveness are held at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.

	at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Courses are taught on-campus and on-line by both full-time faculty and predominantly adjuncts. Regional operations and recruitment support faculty with technology, events and teaching materials. Online teaching support and training for faculty is available through the Center for Online Learning. Due to covid tutors tied to the North Fresno campus are tutoring fully online, and will be phasing back onto campus through 2022. Faculty teaching at North Fresno is engaged in regular program faculty meetings for program development, faculty senate, and faculty professional development online sessions with colleagues from the main campus. Faculty use the same tools for assessment of student learning as faculty on the main campus	N/A
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	Faculty evaluation for the North Fresno campus will increase in 2022 with in-class observations. Programs and courses for the North Fresno satellite campus are developed at the main campus with the involvement of teaching faculty. Curriculum development is working well and departmental leadership is currently engaged in diversifying the curriculum in Biblical Studies. Programs and courses at North Fresno are the same in quality as those on the main campus.	N/A
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Data on retention and graduation are held at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.	Data on retention and graduation are held at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Data on student learning are held at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.	Data on student learning are held at the main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Effectiveness data from the satellite campuses are gathered through the same system of course reviews, course grades, LMS, retention, graduation and GPA data as the main campus. Data on the educational effectiveness of the programs taught at the North Fresno satellite campus are held at the	Data on the educational effectiveness of the programs taught at the North Fresno satellite campus are held at the main campus and will be

	main campus and will be assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.	assessed as part of the main FPU on-site visit.

C. Distance Education Review

Institution: Fresno Pacific University

Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit

Name of reviewer/s: Ester Rogers

Date/s of review: 03/17/2022

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs[1] 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)

School of Education	21/ GFA-EDUC-638-ONA1 Health Education for Teachers	Online	12 weeks- 2 units

---

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

School of Education	21/GFA-EDUC-695-FRA1 Curriculum Design and Implementation: Single Subject	Blended	16 weeks
School of Education	21/DSS-ECD-400-EV135 Children's Play and Learning Theory	Blended/Synchronous	6 weeks
School of Education	22/DSP-LA-381-LO198 Introduction to Teaching	Online	6 weeks
School of Natural Sciences	21/USP-KIN-320-FRO1 Theory of Physical Education	Online	16 Weeks Traditional Undergrad
School of Natural Sciences	21/GFA-KIN-771-ONC1 Research Methods in Kinesiology	Online	8 weeks Graduate
School of Natural Sciences	21/GFA-SPA-715-ONB1 Sport Leadership and Administration	Online	8 weeks
School of Natural Sciences	21/DFA-MATH-137-XON20 Mathematics Concepts II	Online	6 Weeks Degree Completion
School of Natural Sciences	22/USP-NURS-315-NFC1/DSP-NURS-315-NNF54-META (past)	Blended	6 weeks
School of HRSS	21/DFA-BIB-314-XON12 Jesus and the Christian Community	Blended	6 weeks
School of HRSS	22/DSP-HIST-441-LO197 California History and Politics	Online	6 weeks
School of HRSS	22/DSP-CRIM-350-CON68 Theories of Criminology	Online	6 weeks
School of HRSS	22/DSP-COM-125-XON10 Interpersonal Communication	Online	6 week
School of HRSS	21/DFA-HIST-421-LO199 American Ethnicity and Pluralism	Online	6 weeks
School of Business	22/DSP-BUS-438-AOB45 Human Resources	Online	6 weeks

School of Business	22/GSP-LEAD-730-ONB1 Finance for Leaders	Online	8 weeks
School of Business	21/GFA-MBA-760-NFB1 Advanced Finance	Online	8 weeks
School of Business	21/DSP-HC-310-HON33 Health Care in the United States	Online	6 weeks
Seminary	22/GSP-MIN-755-OND1 Transformative Outreach fo Disciple-Making	Blended/Synchronous	4 weeks
Seminary	22/GSP-MIN-759-OND1 Conflict and Peacemaking within Organizations and Communities	Blended/Synchronous	4 weeks
Seminary	21/GFA-MIN-718-OND1 Effective Contemporary Public Communication	Blended/Synchronous	8 weeks

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)

- Number of programs offered by distance education: 20 programs online
- Degree levels: UG/GR
- FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs: not available at time of visit
- History of offering distance education: FPU's distance education program begin with curriculum and instruction in early 2000s along with kinesiology graduate program, these were the pioneers in offering programs
- Percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment: 3-4 years ago they were at 14 programs, now at 20 programs growth;
- Platform, formats, and/or delivery method: Moodle

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed):
   - Interviewed Dr. Henrietta Siemens Director, Center for Online Learning; reviewed Moodle courses and course shells from (4) courses in School of Education; and (5) courses in School of Natural Sciences; (5) courses in HRSS; (4) courses in the School of Business; and (3) courses in the Seminary School
   - The following information was requested during visit to aid in the completion of the report. The team did not receive this information but would recommend that it is provided for future accreditation visits:
     - FTE enrollment in DE courses and programs
     - % of growth (increase) in DE programs and enrollment
     - Increase in DE courses
     - % of enrollment in DE courses (includes DC hybrid programs)
     - What type of advising services are available for online for online students?
     - What is the breakdown (in%) of FT vs Adjunct faculty teaching in DE programs?
     - What is the % of faculty teaching ONLY online
     - Retention data on online courses and programs – breakout by online vs. on-ground (modality comparison)
     - Do annual assessment reports disaggregate by on-ground vs. online on student learning outcomes?
     - Copy of vendor contracts for LMS/ (Moodle US)

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Programs being offered at a distance come out of the schools and are based on demand, research; part of the process of a new program proposal; for example, liberal arts programs were offered on multiple campuses, there was a desired interest and student feedback; school of business online presence was born out of faculty program directors seeking to grow their programs, what does the market say, part of new proposal. New program proposal process--- this is required for any program that is offered online. Brand new program goes through academic approval process, schools, academic committees,; if it is a change of modality it goes to cabinet, if program moves from on ground to fully online this requires cabinet level approval.	

Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	All Fresno Pacific University Online courses are delivered through a highly collaborative and easy-to-use online course delivery system. Courses are taught in six (6) and eight (8) week intervals, allowing students to consider their busy lifestyle and then select the most convenient times to enroll in courses. FPU ensures that students receive the same services. They work closely with academic success center (online on the web page). They are working on creating orientation for students that is a welcome to FPU, what students will need to learn at FPU, online learning environment, currently being piloted through student success center; revamped over the past years	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. 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?	Training occurs for faculty and students Courses are backed up regularly; technical infrastructure provided by IT with adequate servers; FPU had issues before with internal systems being down prompted move to LMS hosting provider to ensure continuous delivery of all online platforms.	

Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Library, Disability Services, and student resources are available within the Moodle course shell; Advising team goes through degree completion with all students not based on online/on-ground. Center for Online Learning/Academic Services offices regularly evaluate their effectiveness through their annual assessment reports; other academic and administrative offices regularly collaborate with this office.	Note: There does not appear to be a presence of counseling services through Moodle Course Shell or on Center for Online Learning Webpage; Do students have access to mental health counseling online?
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Center for Online Learning conducts a faculty orientation for teaching with Moodle, focuses on the technical side for learning to teach the course. There is also a self-paced course for faculty who are developing courses; designing courses; and curriculum development. The Center for Online Learning also created a course design academy- one that runs 3 weeks and one that runs 6 weeks. The course design academy is a facilitated course on how to design a course based on best practices specific for distance education, high impact practices and learning, and flexible course design. Faculty are involved with assessment through program directors; faculty who develop courses also tend to teach within programs so they are very involved in curriculum development.	Faculty data was not available regarding percentage of those teaching online courses vs ground

Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Courses are developed under the supervision of program director and dean, and are approved by curriculum committees, once they are approved, faculty work one on one with center for online learning to develop course; two types of approval: approval of content and curriculum by program director; review and approval of design process (best practices) – is the course designed in a way that allows faculty to establish presence, interact with students, adhere to standards by Center for online learning. Credit hours are developed in syllabi, center for online learning offers insight on credit hours/seat time/work expectations per week; for example- this does not appear to be 3credit hour course worth of work	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	Data on retention and graduation disaggregated by online vs ground courses was not provided during the visit.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	FPU utilizes the same assessment processes as ground courses for programmatic assessment; annual assessment reports; data is collected in Elumen system.	Do the assessment reports disaggregate data based on online vs ground?

Rev 7/2017

Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	LMS- Moodle hosting Development: instructional design vendors; faculty also develop and design courses. FPU provided a copy of the institutional contracts.	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	In many cases these would be the same as on-ground and occurs doing program review. There is a process to ensure that programs that move online they meet quality standards for distance education.	

Rev 3/2015

Rev 7/2017