



## **FPU Team OSR Lines of Inquiry Report**

**1. Overview of the lines of inquiry.**

This document identifies 5 lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution's report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR) that may be pursued during the visit. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section IV: "The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit."

**2. Commendations.** The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

- a. The report demonstrates intentionality in responses to Commission Action Letters and shows good self-awareness regarding mission, identity and demography.
- b. FPU has put substantial resources into Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research as a foundation to support further development in assessment and strategic planning.
- c. Inquiry Circles are an effective tool for engaging broad representation of the community.
- d. FPU has made good use of external consultants with IT to help the university make significant improvements in its technology infrastructure.
- e. The improvements made in university finances show progress toward sustainability with stronger budgeting practices, the strategic plan focus on new revenue streams, key hires, good use of external consultants and the overall adoption of improved fiscal practices.
- f. The institution has made a good start on developing an assessment culture using a variety of data sources. Infrastructure is in place to track and address student success through multiple committees and offices.
- g. An initial administrative infrastructure is in place to track and address quality assurance and improvement.

**3. Lines of inquiry.** The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit with embedded questions for specific areas of focus:

**a. Effectiveness (Academic and Institutional)**

- i. What are the plans to develop a cohesive and integrative approach to the use of assessment data, institutional data, and program review data to ensure educational effectiveness?
- ii. What are the impediments to programs completing the program review process?

- iii. How are the recommendations from the Annual Assessment Report tracked? Is there a follow-up on the completion of the assessment report recommendations?
  - iv. Can the institution provide specific instances of how data are actively used by committees and leadership, outside of posting to institutional websites?
  - v. Outside of the inquiry circle exercise, does the institution regularly review this information at the holistic level, pulling together data from across the institution?
- b. Communication**
- i. How is the institution integrating/synthesizing the inputs and results provided in the Institutional Report for effective communication and coherent use for decision making and future planning?
  - ii. How is FPU communicating student success information and data to the appropriate stakeholders for use in decision-making?
- c. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**
- i. How are the identified equity gaps in the areas of student learning, retention and graduation connected to goal-setting plans to address them? What tools and practices are being put in place to close the loop and address the equity gaps that have been identified?
  - ii. How are you developing a system of oversight for coherent and collaborative engagement, accountability and feedback for the institution's focus on DEI?
  - iii. What accountability processes, systems, and structures can be put in place that would advance FPU's DEI efforts in a developmental way?
- d. Sustainability**
- i. How is the institution managing the trio of discount rates, estimated family contribution and net tuition revenues as they impact their enrollment goals in the context of the changing demographics?
  - ii. How sustainable are the infrastructures and practices around educational effectiveness; including those for assessment and program review?
- e. Institutional Planning**
- i. What is the status of the institution's intention to carry the strategic plan forward beyond the current plan period?
  - ii. Does the GEIST plan have identified actions to achieve the objectives? Additionally, does it have data measures and benchmarks for the success indicators as well as identified accountabilities, timeframes and budget requirements for each action?
  - iii. How are the reflections through the Institutional Report, which tended to descriptively identify issues, being included in future annual planning for institutional improvement? How are action plans for each issue identified created through the institutional planning process?

4. **Request for additional documents and information.** The only written documents and information the team expects before the visit are listed in this section. *The team does not expect or invite a written response to any of the questions posed or issues raised in other sections of this form.* The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information by **January 24, 2022**:
  - a. Student Complaint policies and procedures. Access to the records of student complaints is requested.
  - b. Statement of Financial Activities to June 30th, 2021
  - c. Updated financial ratio report
  - d. Admissions plan for achieving 1200 TUG enrollment
  - e. Full scope description for each satellite campus - location, programs, teaching support, student support, other admin, technology, student numbers/program, location-specific marketing
  - f. Advancement plan for achieving outcomes set out on page 49 of the 2021 WSCUC Institutional Report
  - g. Any market research data or reports used to inform the establishment of strategic enrollment goals
  - h. A brief explanation on how to interpret the Rigor Chart and how it functions for the institution
  - i. The schedule or frequency of NSSE survey implementation
  - j. Profile of faculty scholarship and creative activity if available (don't need to create this if you don't have it)
  - k. Any Board of Trustee minutes that would show their involvement or engagement with the GEIST planning process
  
5. **Individuals and groups to meet during the visit.** The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit. In developing the schedule for the visit, the team may identify additional individuals or groups with whom they wish to speak.
  - a. CFO
  - b. VP Advancement
  - c. VP Enrollment
  - d. CIO
  - e. Exec Dir HR
  - f. CDO
  - g. Assessment Committee
  - h. Program Review Committee
  - i. DEI related committees or working groups
  - j. Strategic planning committee or working group
  - k. Board of Trustees (or representative group)
  - l. Faculty Senate (or Faculty ombudsmen group)
  - m. Student leadership

- n. Focus group of students

## **Guidelines For Institutions**

- a) The Lines of Inquiry form can serve as a planning tool for the institution as they prepare for the Accreditation Visit.
- b) The only written documents and information that the team expects in response to the Lines of Inquiry are listed in section IV. The team does not expect or invite a written response to any of the questions posed or issues raised in other sections of the form, even though institutions may be tempted to do so.
- c) The institutional response is due no later than *January 24, 2022*
- d) Institutional responses are submitted through box.com. The institution's response to the Summary of Lines of Inquiry can be uploaded to the box.com folder that contains their Institutional Report. Once the response has been uploaded, WSCUC staff will share the materials with team members.