

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM  
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW  
for REAFFIRMATION**

To Fresno Pacific University

Dates of visit  
25-27 February 2015

Team Roster

Team Chair - Douglas McConnell, Provost and Senior Vice President, Fuller Theological Seminary

Team Assistant Chair - DawnEllen Jacobs, Vice Provost/ALO, California Baptist University

Team Member - Carole Huston, Associate Provost, Provost's Office, University of San Diego

Team Member - Lisa Bissell Paulson, Vice President for Student Services, Pacific Union College

WASC Staff Liaison – Richard Osborn

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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page numbers |
|---|--------------|
| <b>SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT</b>   | <b>3</b>     |
| A. Description of the Institution and Visit   | 3            |
| B. The Institution’s Self-Study Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report  | 6            |
| C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review   | 8            |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS</b>   | <b>11</b>    |
| Other Matters Raised on the Visit   | 12           |
| Leadership  | 12           |
| Strategic Planning  | 13           |
| Theme #1 Student Achievement and Strategic Assessment of Learning   | 14           |
| Theme #2 Aspects of Diversity and Faculty Engagement in Diversity Efforts   | 18           |
| Theme #3 Resources and Financial Stability  | 23           |
| Theme #4 Writing  | 24           |
| Theme #5 Critical Thinking  | 27           |
| Theme #6 Rigor and Meaning of Degrees   | 29           |
| Program Review  | 31           |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW</b> | <b>32</b>    |
| <br>  |              |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   | <b>36</b>    |
| Off-Campus Locations Review   | 37           |
| WASC EER Site Visit - Bakersfield   | 42           |
| Federal Compliance Checklist  | 43           |
| FPU Credit Hour Policy  | 46           |

## **SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **A. Description of Institution and Visit**

Fresno Pacific University serves California’s central San Joaquin Valley as a four year, faith-based liberal arts university offering undergraduate and graduate programs in more than 60 subject areas to a diverse population of approximately 3,700 students, with an emphasis on teacher preparation and professional/applied programs. The institution was restructured in 2005 to include four schools: the School of Business; the School of Education; the School of Humanities, Religion, and Social Sciences; and the School of Natural Sciences. Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary became the fifth school under the University umbrella in 2010 changing its name to the Fresno Pacific Biblical Seminary to better identify with an institution grounded in Anabaptist evangelical theology and Mennonite tradition. Regional centers in Bakersfield (2004), Visalia (2004), North Fresno (2005), and Merced (2011) offer graduate programs and degree completion programs. Instruction is delivered using face-to-face, blended, and fully online modalities.

The Bakersfield Center was visited as a part of this Educational Effectiveness Review visit, and a report is included as Appendix 1. No special follow-up visits were conducted in as a part of this EER visit. Neither a checklist for candidacy nor a checklist pursuant to a Commission action letter was a factor in this visit.

The university mission is “to develop students for leadership and service through excellence in Christian higher education” (FPU EER Report, p.10). This mission, articulated in the FPU Idea, is central to FPU’s institutional identity, which defines the institution as a Christian University, a Community of Learners, and Prophetic. FPU has been designated as a Hispanic-serving institution (HSI) since 2009, and just prior to the 2013 CPR visit had hired its first Hispanic president. The subsequent resignation of this president along with the discovery of an institutional financial crisis generated a “ climate of serious, difficult, and necessary

administrative changes” that set the context for the final preparations of the EER document, which the institution describes as “one of purposeful actions in a crisis situation” (FPU EER Report, p. 9).

In response to this climate of crisis, the Board of Trustees (BOT) took what the FPU EER report and subsequent interviews confirmed was decisive action on September 16 to ask a past FPU president to return as FPU’s twelfth university president. Additionally, the BOT endorsed a dual leadership model that gave the president charge to focus on community relations, fundraising, and external duties, while elevating the profile of the provost include the designation of senior vice president to oversee the day to day operations of the main campus and regional centers. Interviews confirmed the efficacy of this new model of leadership. Faculty and staff generally feel more confidence in the decision-making process under this new model and reported increased satisfaction with the level of communication used by the president and the provost to handle the crisis and move forward. The financial health of the institution, reshaping of the institution under the new leadership model, and sensitive questions about diversity and governance were issues that were still very much at the forefront of discussion that colored and shaped the visit.

Although these issues remain to be fully resolved, the visiting team felt the institution embodied the FPU Idea in its call for “the building of community that is central to learning, inclusion of voice, embracing diversity, peacemaking and reconciliation, and prophetic action in serving the community and the world” as it sought to deal with the very serious issues it faces. The institution has taken this challenge as an opportunity for deep self-reflection that incorporated their definition of prophetic action as “...engaging in dialogue with and critique of contemporary culture and practice” (FPU Idea, section 4) to their own institution. (CFR 1.2, 1.5)

Fresno Pacific is the only regionally accredited private, not-for-profit HSI in the Central Valley (WASC 2014). Among the institution’s 40 baccalaureate majors and 24 master’s degree programs are programs in School of Education, the seminary, marriage and family therapy, and nursing that carry specialized accreditation. The institution’s last accreditation visit was in 2003. Regional centers in Visalia and Bakersfield were approved by WASC in 2003. An Interim Progress Report was completed in 2007 and WASC identified 6 areas for continued attention.

FPU is the last institution to follow WASC's three-stage accreditation process. These areas formed a major focus of the institution's CPR Report. The Institutional Proposal in May 2012 was commended for "seriousness, feasibility, relevance, thoughtfulness, and transparency" (Osborn Letter June 2012, qtd in FPU EER report, p13). In addition to addressing the six areas identified in 2007 for continued focus (1) a more structured cycle for program reviews with external reference points; 2) need to develop expectations of scholarship, community service, and the culture of research and explicitly state these; 3) clearly demarcated faculty governance of structures; 4) data and analysis of the decentralization of services and the performance and quality of the Regional Centers; 5) the development of a more comprehensive Diversity Plan to help focus campus priorities; and 6) closing the assessment loop-demonstrate that assessment data and program review outcomes are being used to inform change at the institutional and departmental levels), the institution was tasked with defining educational effectiveness, degree quality and integrity, and providing preliminary data for two of the four core competencies within the upcoming cycle of reaffirmation.

In response, FPU added three new themes for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report submitted in December 2012. During their site visit in March 2013, the visiting team found the work of the institution to again be thoughtful, strategic, and well-organized around these themes and noted particularly "the transparency of the Report and the honest self-examination that seems to have marked" the work done by the institution. The team was further "impressed by the degree to which the FPU community reflected active involvement in the review process" (FPU CPR Team Report, p. 5) as it grappled with seven major contextual issues: leadership changes; the recession, financial stability, enrollment; regional centers; university designation as a Hispanic serving institution; faculty rank and scholarship; the biblical seminary; and the move from NAIA to NCAA athletics (FPU CPR report p. 6).

The thematically organized CPR report dealt effectively with processes related to student achievement and strategic assessment; aspects of diversity; resources and financial stability; organization, governance structures and institutional planning; critical thinking and writing; and rigor and meaning of degrees (FPU CPR Report, p. 9-36). The visiting team commended the institution for voluntarily addressing two core competencies, for the steps it has taken in creating

a culture of assessment, for efforts to include co-curricular programs in assessment, for the work at the regional centers, and for the widespread involvement of the campus community in preparing for this CPR visit.

The team made five recommendations, which were subsequently endorsed by the Commission:

1. Continued work to finalize and implement the Strategic Plan. [CFR 4.1, 4.2]
2. Greater attention to clarity and definition of the annual budgeting process. [CFR 1.2, 3.5]
3. Greater transparency and better communication across units at all levels within the University and among all constituents and stakeholders. [CFR 1.7, 4.1, 4.2]
4. Attention to clarifying the lines of responsibility and reporting in order to stabilize the infrastructure. [CFR 3.8, 3.10]
5. Strategic prioritization of the numerous self-identified recommendations within the thematic areas of the CPR Report. [CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5]

In looking ahead to the Spring 2015 EER visit, the team felt FPU was positioned well to continue to work with the data they had built systems and mechanisms to collect. There was a sense of synergy that boded well for the institution's ability to infuse a robust and consistent culture of assessment throughout the institution in a way that would foster and support data-driven decision-making, budgeting and strategic planning.

## **B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report**

The level of quality and detail in the report was exemplary. The document was an open invitation to review all aspects of the University. It indicated that the institution took seriously the recommendations of the previous visit and was willing to engage in close examination of all elements of educational effectiveness. The report provided far more evidence of institutional effectiveness than had been apparent at the capacity visit, testifying to the hard work this institution has done in the two years since the CPR visit. Links to documents and supporting evidence within the report were helpful, and the institution quickly provided any additional information that was needed.

The report was also appropriately forthcoming about the resignation and replacement of the university's president and the change in leadership structure to re-allocate some of his day-to-day responsibilities to the provost, who was additionally designated as the senior vice president (PSVP), in an effort to help stabilize the leadership function of the institution. Although the report examined the logistical impact and some of the efficiencies gained in this transition, it did not examine in any great detail the impact to institutional morale or the general climate of the community. The team recognized the need to focus on the tasks that would bring about recovery for the institution and acknowledged that the recent nature of the events may have left little time during the creation of the FPU EER report for the sort of institutional self-reflection necessary for an analysis of an institutional climate still in flux, but the team did hope to find evidence during the visit that the institution was able to have dialogues that would bring not only recovery, but restoration and reconciliation to the FPU community.

There was clearly much work happening on a very broad scale as the institution prepared for the visit, but the sheer volume of reports and data available at times threatened to be overwhelming and made it a challenge to see the connections between these various efforts. The level of detail and the broad scope of the work as well as the number of individuals involved in the preparation efforts did, however, raise questions about the sustainability of these efforts moving forward. That such work was able to continue and the report still be completed during a time of institutional crisis is impressive and speaks well to the institution's ability to consider issues of next steps and to develop processes that will allow them to sustain a level of excellence without overtaxing systems and personnel.

The report clearly stated that the task of establishing educational effectiveness was being addressed and that the significant leadership changes in financial issues the institution continues to face were being addressed. The most significant gap, and perhaps the greatest question left unanswered by the report, was the extent to which these events had affected the climate of the institution. The tone of the report was quite positive, and there have been many positive steps taken from a leadership perspective; however, there was little evidence in the report of voices other than those of leadership. Given the potentially divisive and demoralizing nature of the

issues this institution continues to face, this was something of which the team made note and which they felt was important to pursue as an avenue of inquiry during the visit.

### **C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review**

The EER report responded specifically to the following recommendations stemming from the 2013 CPR visit.

#### **1. Continued work to finalize and implement the Strategic Plan. [CFRs 1.2, 1.2, 3.6, 3.7, 4.6, 4.7]**

Implementation of the strategic plan in process at the time of the CPR visit was delayed to allow the recently appointed president time to establish his leadership of the institution. It was evident to the CPR Team in March 2013 that until the strategic plan was finalized, the progress toward the aggressive goals held by the FPU leadership would not be realized in full. The CPR Team recommended that “FPU [continue] work to finalize and implement the Strategic Plan.” [CFR 4.1, 4.2] The Commission further expected “to see greater internal transparency about decision-making and the creation of budgets that flow from the strategic plan (Commission Action Letter 2013). It is evident that further work was done on the plan between March 2013 and February 2015, but since much of the work was still in progress at the time of the report there was little concrete evidence of connections between the planned budget and strategic planning.

Establishing the degree to which these connections were being made and ascertaining the extent of the progress made on strategic planning, especially in light of significant leadership changes at the institution, was a priority for the visiting team.

#### **2. Greater attention to clarity and definition of the annual budgeting process. [CFR 1.2, 3.5]**

As a result of the financial issues discovered in the period leading up to and including the season during which the EER report was prepared, much attention was given to explaining the steps taken to deal with budget deficits and fiscal management. Perhaps the most significant step taken by the institution was the addition of a qualified chief financial officer who oversees the



controller and manages the budget process. Under his leadership and in collaboration with the new president and the provost and senior vice president (PSVP), the institution hopes to see the budget brought back into balance with a projected \$1.5 million surplus this year. Thematic Essay III: Resources and Financial Stability outlines and explains the actions taken to achieve this goal, and data was given to demonstrate the effectiveness of these actions, but the report shows more evidence of effective management of the crisis situation than it clearly defines an annual budgeting process moving forward. The institution was not, at the time of the report, at a place where it was able to step back and effectively evaluate what worked and what did not in a way that would allow FPU to develop clear processes, although the adoption of various CFO Colleague tools and processes bode well for the institution's ability to do so once the financial situation is completely stabilized.

**3. Greater transparency and better communication across units at all levels within the University and among all constituents and stakeholders. [CFR 1.7, 4.1, 4.2]**

FPU was transparent in their report about the issues the institution faced in dealing with the departure of a president and the discovery of serious financial concerns. Financial exhibits prepared for the 2012 CPR report were updated with more recent data and were provided in the report. The team appreciated such candor, but there was little discussion about steps taken to communicate with equal but appropriate transparency to internal and external stakeholders and constituencies or across the various campus units. Given the current and ongoing nature of events, this did not surprise the team; but it did make establishing evidence of such communication a priority during the visit. The perspective within the document seemed to be largely that of leadership and administration; there was little evidence or sense of the voice of "rank and file" staff and faculty or of outside constituencies within the community. The impact of such dramatic turns of events on the campus and community climate was an important avenue of inquiry for the team during the visit.

The team noted the degree to which students, faculty, staff, and board were educated on the importance of the assessment cycle and the important differences between the CPR and the EER. The Board of Trustees presentation (doc/evidence) detailed information regarding student learning, the framework, annual review template, program review and action plans, a listing of

artifacts for both the curricular and co-curricular, Core Competency highlights with benchmarking noted, and the expected EER report content. This high level of communication and excellent preparation of those participating in interviews facilitated the work of the team during the visit. Constituents understood the importance of the assessment and the accreditation processes and generally embraced that process as a means by which to improve the institution.

**4. Attention to clarifying the lines of responsibility and reporting in order to stabilize the infrastructure. [CFR 3.8, 3.10]**

The EER report made it clear that institutional leadership acted decisively and quickly to establish and stabilize lines of responsibility and reporting at the highest levels following the change in presidents. Lines of reporting and communication across the committee structure, and the significant overlap of representation on these committees, raised some questions for the team that were pursued during the visit. Although responsibilities and reporting to the president and the senior vice president and provost were quite clear, how information was reported and disseminated from and to levels below that were not as obvious. As will be discussed further, although changes particularly in these two lines of responsibility and reporting between the senior vice president and provost have resulted in greater efficiencies and clarity, and although they have equipped and empowered some, the changes have left others feeling marginalized and unheard. Although already planning to query the impact of these and other changes on the institutional climate, the team did not anticipate the degree to which these differences in perception would color the tone of the visit.

**5. Strategic prioritization of the numerous self-identified recommendations within the thematic areas of the CPR Report. [CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5]**

The FPU EER Report began the report with a brief institutional background that appropriately dealt with the leadership issues and changes the institution had recently undergone and which laid out the approach the institution planned to take to the EER. Inquiry Circles were again chosen as the means by which the process of compiling the data necessary to complete the report would take place. This had been an effective tool during the CPR portion of the cycle, and the team affirmed it as a good plan for maintaining continuity during the EER. An overview of

Educational Effectiveness Assessment described the mapping process to align course, program, and institutional outcomes through syllabus templates, signature assignments, and criterion-referenced scoring rubrics and outlines some of the impact of these efforts on the quality of teaching and learning and on student success. Further, the FPU Idea is now linked to outcomes at all levels in most curricular and co-curricular areas and is subject to various qualitative and quantitative assessments. The remainder of the report organized itself around six themes that were developed as a result of the institutional response to the recommendation to “use the site visitor’s report to prioritize the areas for greatest attention.” These themes were well chosen to address issues raised by the CPR team in their 2013 report, and the team found the “EER Responses to WASC Commission Action Letter Recommendations” and the “Responses to CPR Recommendations and Questions” to be useful documents in terms of providing an overview of these themes and a rationale for their development. This approach demonstrated the institution’s ability to identify and prioritize those recommendations most important to the process at this point. The report concluded with institutional recommendations.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **Evaluation of the Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry**

#### **Organization of the EER Team Report**

Fresno Pacific elected to move forward with a thematic approach as they had done in the CPR report, thus this section will be organized around the six identified themes. However, since recent transitions in leadership have been such a factor in the climate of the EER visit, and since they have so impacted the institution’s ability to move forward with strategic planning, those two elements will be dealt with first as “other matters raised on the visit.” Diversity and financial stability emerged as key areas of inquiry for the team; but, as those areas have already been identified in the organizational themes selected by the institution, they will be discussed within the context of those respective sections. Program Review is similarly threaded through the report as it touches several themes.

## **Other Matters Raised on the Visit**

### **Transitions in Leadership [CFR 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9]**

Between the CPR visit (3/19-21/2013) and the EER visit (2/25-27/2015) the university underwent a major transition in leadership including the resignation of the 11<sup>th</sup> president on 11 September 2014 and the appointment of the 12th president on 16 September 2014. In addition to the presidential transition, FPU appointed a second new Vice President of Finance and Business Affairs (VPFBA) in August 2014 and adopted a dual leadership model (September 2014) which tasks the president with external responsibilities and the provost (newly titled the Provost and Senior Vice President - PSVP) with broader internal responsibilities. During the CPR review in March 2013, the WASC CPR Team interacted with the 11th president, who was in his first year. The institutional commitment to diversity was prominent in the conversation due in large part to the fact that as a Hispanic Serving Institution, the Board chose a Hispanic candidate to lead Fresno Pacific University. As part of his presidential role, this 11th president also accepted the leadership role of the institution's diversity efforts. Both public and private documents point to the importance of the president's appointment to a wide cross-section of underrepresented racial/ethnic minorities. [CFR 1.4]

The CPR team made reference to the new appointment leading to a settling period in which the previous strategic plan and a number of other institutional matters were postponed until leadership roles and styles could be established. In the evaluation of institutional capacity, the team concluded the following.

The need to finalize and adopt this plan as the institution continues to prioritize human, physical, technological and financial, and academic needs is fairly urgent if FPU is to restore the equilibrium necessary to move forward in establishing priorities for aligning institutional resources with the institution's mission and goals [CFR 4.1 – 4.3] (Report of the WASC Visiting Team CPR, Section II, page 9).

The EER Team noted that aspects of the institutional priorities were not addressed in the ensuing period, and this led to the need for immediate action by the dual leadership model in the fall of

2014. Equally significant was the impact of what was referred to in a letter from the Committee for Advancing Intercultural Competencies of the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCCU) as the departure of the 11th president very early in his tenure. Throughout the EER visit reference was made to the unsettling impact of the resignation of the president, which appeared both precipitous and unexplained by the official documentation, particularly among several key constituencies. Concerns over the propriety of the resignation and the nature of the Board's influence on the decision surfaced during the visit as a source of deep concern. As is the case in such personnel matters, the 11th president signed binding "non-disclosure" and "non-disparagement" agreements that limit the current leadership's ability to address the concerns with the level of transparency requested by many groups both internal and external. The team strongly encourages FPU to implement a holistic approach to diversity including attention to structure, climate, staffing, and curricular areas demonstrated by a plan that will address the residual challenges in the current transitional period and fully respond to diversity issues that have been an ongoing concern for the institution. [CFR 1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 3.1, 3.3]

The positive net result of the prolonged transitional phase (2012-2014) is a new level of fiscal and institutional stability with attention to the sustainability and health of the institution in keeping with the university's mission and objectives. [CFR 3.6, 3.8] It is important to note the significance of such an assertion, given that the transitions experienced in the leadership of the university are critical to the EER team's assessment. The team also concluded that the dual leadership model is an effective approach for the leadership of the 12th and current president based on his strengths and experience as well as his compatibility with Provost & Senior Vice President (see Commendations 3 & 5).

### **Strategic Planning**

Although work had begun on the strategic plan, the institution did not plan to finalize the plan until the Board meeting on 28 February 2015, the day after the visit concluded. Under the direction of the PSVP, it appeared to the team that various groups within the university participated to identify the three major goals and 43 strategic priorities listed in the 13 December 2013 document. The rapid shift to a dual leadership model, necessitated by the sudden resignation of the president and the need to stabilize institutional leadership under the current

president, further delayed implementation of the plan. The process moved ahead quickly under the new leadership model, adding the Strategic Planning: Vision Statements (draft 5 on 9 February 2015, revised 20 February 2015).

As the team will discuss throughout the EEC report, the challenge ahead for FPU is to reclaim the momentum in addressing strategic priorities 1.3.3 Diverse Faculty and Staff Hiring and 1.3.4 Hispanic Serving Institution as stated in Goal 1: Strengthening Our Christ-Centered Community. [CFR 1.4] The institution attempted to address this challenge in Vision Statement 4, which is still under review by the University Diversity Committee, and stated there that the “diversity of FPU faculty, staff, and students will exemplify the core commitment.” Expressed commitment to this goal is an evident thread throughout several of the institution’s other vision statements; however, the EER Team received evidence during the visit that there is a lot of work to be completed before this goal and these priorities are realized. The Team recommends that FPU continue to work on institution-wide development and ownership of the strategic plan. [CFR 4.1, 4.6, 4.7]

### **Theme #1 Student Achievement and Strategic Assessment of Learning**

The team reviewed the effectiveness of FPU’s systems for enhancing educational effectiveness and student learning and evaluated the institution’s strategic assessment practices and standards of performance in supporting student progress towards graduation and degree attainment. An impressive 97% of academic programs and much co-curricular information is now set up on the intranet exhibit room (Co-Curricular Assessment Links) where it can be accessed and used for ongoing educational effectiveness activities. Summative signature assignments with rubrics, criterion lines linking Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) and University Student Learning Outcomes (USLOs) are available for 78% of the academic programs. This has resulted in a strong culture of evidence generated from direct and indirect assessment tools.

[CRF 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.9, 3.5, 3.10, 4.4]

The institution has created a culture of assessment grounded in discussions that ask questions about the relevance, the usefulness, and the significance of data. Faculty and staff interpret the data and develop action steps to evaluate, improve and revise elements of the student experience.

Various reports such as the annual assessment report and numerous program reviews provided the team with access to data already disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, location, modality, and academic level. FPU's emphasis on evidence is documented in the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Manual and Program Review Manual.

The team applauds FPU on the progress it has made in maximizing the capabilities of TaskStream across campus, in providing careful training with resource documents, in showcasing assessment data, and in creating the Institutional Academic Assessment Initiative. The team encourages FPU to continue to utilize such tools as they engage in the continuous work on updating departmental data and various assessment reports. [CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.10, 3.5, 3.7, 4.1, 4.2]

The team saw evidence of the effectiveness of a well developed program review process which the institution is able to use to develop areas of academic focus. An early alert system enabled FPU's faculty to see immediately the significance of evidence collected on the effectiveness of the first year experience and from an evaluation of student writing. Faculty used the data to make adjustments to the first year experience course and to revise elements of various writing courses to positively impact student success. Data was clear and transparent. The creation of templates helped bring clarity to the process and was generally seen as a positive experience across different departments. Faculty and staff were pleased to see that consistent of the these tools in both the academic and co-curricular programs and the incorporation of data from sources such as NSSE allowed the institution to create a cohesive assessment narrative in forums such as program reviews.

Evidence of student success was clearly demonstrated as a result of the linkage among FPU's ten USLOs, the FPU Idea, academic PSLOs and co-curricular Area Student Learning Outcomes (ASLOs) and Group Student Learning Outcomes (GSLOs). The ten-year assessment plan evaluates USLOs and the five WASC Core Competencies twice during the cycle. This plan has good potential to create a meaningful, manageable, and sustainable process of assessing university learning outcomes. This demonstrated sequence of assessment combined with intentional conversations in venues such as Data Dialogues showed the institution's ability to use the evidence in program decision-making. Training sessions for faculty who then examined

direct and indirect evidence, the assessment plan, curriculum maps, alignment of PSLOs, and any other data that would be included in the Annual Assessment Report further supports the sustainability and continuity of these efforts. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 3.5, 3.7, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6]

Graduation and retention rates were of primary focus during the CPR visit with noted concern regarding declining graduation rates and the need to stabilize retention rates. Of particular concern in the season of transition that marked the departure of the previous president, was the impact on minority students; however, the team was told that overall graduation rates between 48 and 60% were higher than comparator schools, who averaged 45% and that Latino students graduated at a rate of 63%. FPU concluded in the Stem (Retention Success) 2011-2014 document that the fall-to-fall retention rates were highest for STEM students. Retention rates for white males appear to be lower. Overall the team had some difficulty corroborating this data and would encourage FPU to carefully monitor and report this data so that it can be used to create a sustainable retention plan.

The team also noted that FPU has responded proactively to current conversations about the need for transparency in making retention and success data readily available to a broad cross-section of internal and external stakeholders. Annual USLO and PSLO data and biennial data such as the Noel Levitz/HERI survey data is available for entire FPU campus community including students on the Intranet. A number of programs are using the TaskStream exhibit room function for their current program review process. FPU's career services office is exploring ways to better enable the institution to follow up with alumni to gather assessment data and to gain better longitudinal data on the success of graduates as they transition to the workplace.

Although not as developed or consistent as in the academic programs, FPU conducts co-curricular assessment in three areas: Student life (Residence Life, First Year Programs, Student Activities, International Programs and Service, New Student Orientation, Health Services, Career Services Center, Commuter Services), Athletics, and Office of Spiritual Formation (College Hour, Multicultural Scholars, Student Ministries, Missions Awareness, Diversity Education). For this seven-year co-curricular assessment cycle, each of the three areas has developed Area Student learning Outcomes (ASLOs), and departments within each area have developed Group



Student Learning Outcomes (GSLOs). Each area/group aims to align its SLOs with USLOs. These three areas have either written or are currently drafting student development outcomes, which, when aligned with USLOs, are intended to address the whole student experience and embed the assessment process into the co-curricular. The Dean for Spiritual Formation (also the University Pastor) is a member of the Academic Cabinet, attesting to the institution's increased understanding of the important role outcomes in the area of student life play in shaping the FPU experience. [CFR 2.7, 2.10, 2.13, 2.14]

The Team observed and affirms this new level of discourse, excitement, and understanding of assessment among the co-curricular team who sees this process as a way to determine “how well we are doing with a given outcome instead of always doing it the same way.” Evidence of FPU as a learning institution was seen in this statement that is reflective of many of the interviews conducted during the visit: “We learned that if we come together we can accomplish more; we discovered silos and began to collaborate. It is now more clear why we are doing what we are doing and how.” The team was also encouraged to hear that those most involved with the work of assessment as a “continuous process where we never ‘arrive’ [but] as we are constantly examining and refining what we do and the system we use.” This realistic view of assessment bodes well for the sustainability of the FPU model as they continue to evaluate the efficacy and usability of TaskStream and the intranet against the ever-increasing number of data warehouse tools that may offer features to better meet their needs, and seek to continually clarify data and improve efficiency. [CFR 2.13, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6]

The team concurs with FPU's institutional recommendations. As the institution continues to strengthen its culture of assessment, the linkages among ASLOs, GSLOs, the FPU Idea and USLOs will be more evident across the academic and co-curricular units and will likely include elements such as service, service learning, reflection, moral reasoning, cultural and global perspectives, and the five WASC core competencies. Further work in evaluating the success of diversity initiatives will be helpful in addressing concerns in that area (see Theme #2). Although ASLOs and GSLOs are developed to track co-curricular progress along with USLOs, few systematic attempts to assess these outcomes were reported for diversity initiatives. Disaggregating this data could be helpful to the institution in documenting its efforts to serve

under-represented and at-risk populations and to addressing some of the concerns related to diversity raised during the visit (see Theme #3). The team highly encourages FPU to pursue such avenues of inquiry so as to continue work already begun to serve these populations.

Enhanced targeted support services were reported for academically at-risk groups for both TUG (Traditional Undergraduates) and DC (Degree-Completion) students, and more advanced services are now available through athletics and disabilities services, for example. Developing faculty expertise, highlighting and giving prominence to the work of the University Assessment Committee; reshaping the University Assessment Committee structure or assignments to embed university wide effort and to consider the needs of different degree levels; monitoring and continuing to address the needs of at-risk students; and further connecting assessment results into the planning and budgeting processes (FPU EER Report p. 46) will solidify and enhance the institution's successful efforts. [CFR 1.4, 1.8, 2.5, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 4.6]

## **Theme #2 Aspects of Diversity and Faculty Engagement in Diversity Efforts**

As a clear institutional emphasis, Goal 1 "Strengthening Our Christ-Centered Community" of the 2013-2016 strategic planning document identifies attention to "Aspects of Diversity" as its third objective. The primary administrative responsibility for this goal was the former president, as the self-appointed Chief Diversity Officer, and the University Diversity Committee (UDC). It was the intention of strategic planning to develop a comprehensive plan for cross-cultural living and learning that builds upon the strength of our "diversity in race and ethnicity, gender, ability, history and heritage and expressions of faith that will foster a climate that affirms the dignity and worth of all people, and that practices mutual responsibility and accountability." Strategic priorities for this objective included developing a common understanding and language on the campus for diversity, establishing core curricular and co-curricular learning about diversity, hiring a diverse faculty and staff, owning the Hispanic Serving Institutional identity, and developing an organizational structure that would support this strategic objective (p. 5).

The CPR Report previewed this set of strategic priorities (p. 17):

Recommendations Related To Diversity:

- 1) The university should appoint a Diversity Officer to champion issues of diversity across the institution and clarify the role of the Diversity Advisory Committee.
- 2) The university community should develop a shared definition of diversity, consistent with The FPU Idea and informed by the university's Christian commitments.
- 3) The university should develop, adopt, and implement a comprehensive diversity plan. The OIE should assist in the development of a means to assess the diversity plan.
- 4) There should be a dedicated line item affirming the work of diversity as a budgetary priority within the university.
- 5) The university should develop consistent recruitment and retention practices, undergirded by necessary budgetary resources, to strengthen and stabilize the diversity of faculty, staff, and administration.
- 6) The Undergraduate Academic Committee (UAC), the Degree Completion Academic Committee (DCAC), and the Graduate Academic Committee (GAC) should ensure greater integration of diversity related content across the university's curricula.
- 7) The university should commit to increased resourcing of the university's disability services.
- 8) HR guidelines related to diversity should be formalized and operationalized.

The institution has made some progress toward the achievement of these recommendations since the CPR visit. Conducting a campus-wide diversity survey; convening "diversity dialogues"; sharing information about student support programs at national conferences; establishing funding for training, webinars, and global education initiatives; and integrating student life and spiritual formation events are among the actions summarized in the EER Report (pp. 44-45). The EER Report addressed three institutional questions as guides for understanding their progress.

Discussion of how effectively the university has cultivated respectful dialogue revealed that the university implemented a set of targeted initiatives (EER p. 22) to fund and support diversity-related engagement and dialogue. The targeted initiatives included faculty, staff, and student seminars focusing on the intersection of faith and diversity (e.g., Diversity Dialogues, Ethnic Bible Studies, etc.), discussions within the President’s Cabinet and Board of Trustees, the Athletic Department’s diversity plan, Campus Safety training on sexual harassment, and tutorial and related services offered through the Academic Support Center for all students, including those with disabilities. Additionally, the PSVP and Assistant Dean of Multicultural Ministries have shared broad participation in several internal, regional, and national initiatives undertaken by their campus as a Hispanic Serving Institution.

The EER visiting team discussed these campus efforts with a variety of groups across the FPU community and received a mix of positive and tempered responses relative to the perceived success of these activities. The team was concerned that knowledge about and understanding of these efforts seemed uneven, particularly across some of the very constituents who would seem to be most invested in them. During the luncheon discussion with the Board of Trustees, for example, the climate and dialogue were generally quite positive; however, two Hispanic BOT members were absent during this discussion. The visiting team saw consistent evidence from a number of sources of the need for more campus-wide, systematic training on multiculturalism, diversity issues, and intercultural competence; however it is also evident that many across the campus community are ready to become involved in the work of diversity. (CFRs 1.1, 1.4, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.7).

Both the EER report and evidence collected in interviews during the team’s visit acknowledged that generalized learning outcomes in the area of cultural competence are under development. USLO 8 (“Cultural and Global Perspective: Students will identify personal, cultural, and global perspectives and will employ these perspectives to evaluate complex systems”), captures elements of intercultural competence, but the campus is still working to develop a unified vision of how this outcome would be demonstrated and assessed in curricular and co-curricular contexts. Several group discussions during the visit identified the need to

encompass local and regional diversity within the current, more globally focused definition of intercultural competence. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11]

The institution is to be congratulated for the development of Degree Completion programs at satellite campus locations that serve large proportions of non-traditional, underrepresented student cohorts. Students, faculty, and staff at these sites expressed strong affiliation for and support from the university across multiple domains (e.g., academic, financial, and social). The institution also distributed the ReNew Partnerships Diversity Survey (RPDS) instrument to all students, faculty, and staff as a measure that would evaluate general understanding of campus-wide diversity efforts and the campus climate. Generalizations about climate issues among students should include the caveat that response rate among students was very low. Survey results included perceptions of disparity between the administration, faculty, and staff as a white majority and a student population in which students of color, particularly Hispanic students, are strongly represented. Many respondents were in favor of more successful efforts to recruit, hire, retain, and graduate students at all levels on campus, and to increase the focus on diversifying all university employees (i.e., administration, faculty and staff). The team found evidence that indicated a lack of unified understanding of diversity issues and intercultural competence, and constituents in several areas advocated for clear articulation, communication, and modeling of FPU's diversity goals. A number of respondents disagreed with integrating diversity and faith practices, such as mandating diversity engagement through the College Hour experience. Should the institution wish to re-examine the effectiveness of this model, the team urges the creation of an environment for discussion that welcomes and values the engagement of diverse voices expressing differing opinions in a climate of mutual respect. [CFRs 1.1, 1.4, 1.8, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11, 2.13, 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.7]

Multiple goals were identified across several plans, past and present, but the integration of the 2006-2011 strategic plan and the current 2013-2016 plan was not apparent. Some evidence suggested the need to return to even earlier plans (1999) to revisit definitions and establish procedures for developing policies and documenting progress. In several discussions related to planning, the team noted evidence of substantial difficulties resulting from an absence of a unified approach to diversity. Upon his appointment FPU's former president assumed leadership

as the Chief Diversity officer along with his office. This action had the immediate effect of strengthening diversity as a major strategic initiative by creating a direct link between the University Diversity Committee (UDC) and the President, Executive Cabinet, the Academic Cabinet, and even the Board of Trustees. With the September departure of this president, these connections shifted. The UDC is now co-led by a faculty member and an administrative staff member, but appointments to this committee have been very recent and establishing clear goals as a framework for a plan will likely require assistance and dedicated resources from the administration as well as substantial input from a broader range of community voices. The role and function of the UDC now seems less clearly defined, and the team identified a sense of ambiguity rather than empowerment in discussions about the planning and decision-making purview of this body. For example, the team was unable to determine if the Executive Cabinet or the Board of Trustees had accepted a recommendation from Human Resources and the UDC to consider best practices for hiring more diverse faculty, staff and administration. [CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 2.7, 2.10, 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7].

The team affirms the university in recognizing the following as important next steps for promoting diversity:

- 1) develop clear intercultural competence guidelines and a distinct diversity outcome promoting multiculturalism beyond the globally focused USLO;
- 2) implement infrastructure essential to hiring more diverse faculty, staff, and administration; and
- 3) provide additional university resources for the Strategic plans' diversity goals (p. 27).

The team concurs with the following institutional recommendations (p. 47):

1. Develop full understanding of the placement of the University Diversity Committee within the university structure as a committee of the Executive Cabinet.
2. Develop shared understanding of its purpose and goals.
3. Finalize policies and procedures for searching and hiring for diversity
4. Disseminate diversity study results for understanding and action.

The team strongly urges the institution to look at ways to provide the resources necessary to develop an organizational structure that can ground and frame the work of diversity on campus.

The institution must continue to work to develop a master plan that will address staffing issues (recruitment and retention), curricular and co-curricular development of diversity and intercultural competence, and climate concerns expressed in the diversity survey and in various discussions during the team visit. The team further encourages the institution to revisit its CPR recommendations and to consider which of these steps would be most important to prioritize as it moves forward.

1. Empower diversity leadership (UDC) to work with faculty, students, staff, and administration in the creation of a campus diversity plan.
2. Develop a widely shared definition of diversity consistent with institutional values and commitments as a central guiding rationale for its plan.
3. Assess the effectiveness of achieving the goals identified in the diversity plan.
4. Dedicate adequate resources to diversity efforts as a budgetary priority, including those for disability services.
5. Examine and synthesize curricular and co-curricular efforts to ensure greater integration of diversity processes and content across the university's programs

### **Theme #3 Resources and Financial Stability**

The current president, the PSVP, and the Executive Cabinet put renewed effort into finalizing the plan in a way that captured the essence of the Vision Statements. The prolonged iterative process (2011-2014) appeared to be inclusive of the major groups within the university. The result, according to one Executive Cabinet member, was that “so much ownership of the strategic plan ...[was] almost too much ownership!”, and yet the team discovered an undercurrent of discontent among some constituencies that may indicate that ownership of this process was not as representative or balanced as it might have been.

FPU has managed their financial situation with transparency and fiscal responsibility, once the situation was clear. After three years of surplus (FY10-12) the university experienced significant deficits in FY 13 and FY 14. The university acted decisively to appoint an experienced CFO and to hire a financial consultant for FY15. Together, these two individuals introduced budget and financial management tools that have reversed the downturn. It is estimated that the

university will finish the year with a healthy surplus. The decisive action was implemented with the support of the University Board, faculty, staff, and administration. [CFR 3.4, 4.1, 4.2]

A major contributor to the deficit was the drop in enrollment in the degree completion program from a high of 1393 in 2011 to a low of 1136 in Fall 2013. By Fall 2014 the enrollment rose to 1313, an overall drop of 9.4% that decreased net contribution by 29%. Analysis of enrollment revealed that longer time to degree completion and increases contact hours were significant factors in the enrollment decline. Even after the traditional undergraduate and graduate enrollment offset the decline in total revenue, there was a decline in expendable or net revenue from enrollment of approximately \$3,600,000 over two years while expenses grew.

Other factors contributing to the two-year deficit included a 50% increase in expense in health care costs, rising costs of personnel and operating costs, and faculty salary increases tied to the adoption of faculty rank and step compensation. In response, university leadership under the direction of VPFBA further reduced positions, reconfigured offices for enrollment emphasis, and reduced salaries for personnel above a designated earning threshold (4% base – 8% for Cabinet), and suspended retirement benefits contributions. The net effect was to turn the budget around from a deficit to a projected surplus for FY15. More importantly for the university, the deficit reduction plan is being deployed over three years to ensure sustainability. The reduction plans were reviewed with the university community and included a survey requested by the faculty. In addition to the budget cuts, new initiatives in enrollment in the degree completion programs are being implemented to restore the financial health of the university. [CFR 3.6, 3.8, 3.9]

In reviewing the overall resources and financial stability it was apparent to the team that the absence of a full-time CFO contributed negatively to the health of the university. As stated in the consultant's engagement letter, "the issues confronting the University are serious and ... our work together will likely include difficult decisions, ... [but] I am confident that your goals can be fully met" (CFO Colleague engagement letter page 4). The team recommends continued work on reconciling and sustaining the budget under the leadership of the CFO supported by advancement efforts under the leadership of the President and Board. [CFR 3.4, 3.6, 3.8]



## Theme #4 - Writing

At the time of the 2013 CPR visit, FPU had made significant strides in identifying writing as one of the campus core essentials for which data would be collected and analyzed. The rationale for selecting writing as one of the core competencies upon which to focus was rooted in the institution's recognition of the large number of Spanish-first speaking and international FPU students who face challenges in this area. The work of the CPR Writing Inquiry Circle had established the English Placement Testing and tracking systems for undergraduate students on both the main campus and at regional centers. An effective placement system was in place that afforded students the opportunity to receive writing instruction better tailored to the needs of their cohort. Additional attention was being given to students at the regional centers. Signature assignments were being developed to ensure uniform assessment and consistent experiences across all populations, and there was a plan to incorporate TaskStream for assessment and data analysis. [CFR 1.4, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 2.10, 2.13]

The CPR team encouraged the institution to continue work in the following five areas:

1. assistance to faculty and tutorial support on the assessment process
2. development of observation-based evaluation methods for teaching strategies
3. expansion and integration of "writing-across-the-curriculum" as well as development of discipline-specific strategies for writing,
4. assessment of proficiency-levels and needs of transfer TUGs and DC students and the development of support strategies to meet their needs, and
5. ongoing evaluation of the sufficiency and effectiveness of curriculum support resources (e.g., tutorial staff, workshops for faculty, staff, and students, etc.) for students in writing-intensive courses, particularly at upper division and graduate levels and for those students who score very low on the English Placement Test (CPR Report p. 32-22).

FPU took these suggestions seriously and showed evidence of their ability to use collected data on student writing to inform ongoing educational effectiveness and quality improvement in this area. The First Year Experience Committee, the EER Writing Inquiry Circle, and various cross-disciplinary participants have met frequently since the CPR visit to prioritize and focus on ways

to improve student writing. The group exceeded its modest goals and was able to complete goals in areas of faculty preparation, training, evaluation, assessment of student writing, and student skill building. [CFR 3.3, 3.10, 4.1]

Faculty workshops were developed to help faculty with such areas as evaluation techniques, rubrics and grading, peer review, plagiarism, and APA and other citation styles. Workshops were offered on the main campus as well as at the regional centers, and for graduate as well as undergraduate faculty. Common rubrics, such as the Freshman Writing Model Rubric, improved consistency in assessing student writing and allowed the institution to gather valuable data on student performance. The rubric has been adopted in five GE disciplines. Faculty who have adopted the rubric expressed overwhelming support for the tool as being “very helpful” (Freshman Writing Rubric Survey Results). The Inquiry Circle identified next steps, which included plans to continue to reach out to faculty not yet using the rubric for various reasons identified on the survey. There are plans to reach out to all of the academic caucuses to further tailor writing courses to meet the needs of students in these disciplines. Work done with the help of a Provost Research Grant to identify the types of writing done in different classes in the various academic areas will inform the group as they continue to dialogue about writing needs across the curriculum. [CFR 2.3, 2.9, 3.3, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3]

This Inquiry Circle worked to identify ways the institution could improve student writing for all students, but particularly for degree completion (DC) students. The group worked with the University Success Class to require students to go at least once to a writing tutor. They also evaluated and subsequently changed the textbook required for the class. The course is required for all students who are admitted below a certain academic level, but students may also elect to take the class, and a number do. Although there was initial resistance from the DC instructors, improvement in student writing has won them over. Additionally, LANG 170 has been developed to help DC students focus on writing for academic purposes. [CFR 1.4, 2.3, 2.9, 3.3, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3]

The effectiveness of measures and changes in approaches to writing were evidenced in improved student performance. Comparative data between traditional undergraduate students (TUG) and DC shows no difference in performance between the two populations. Curriculum has been

modified in a number of areas to require writing that demands critical thinking, synthesis, submission to a tutor or writing mentor, editing, and resubmission. As a result, faculty are seeing improved writing fluency. Further study may be necessary to determine if these measures have had or have the potential to impact literacy. A downward trend in reading has been identified by the Inquiry Circle, and the group would like to continue to explore the implications of this. The team supports this as a valuable avenue of inquiry, especially as the institution begins to assess other core competencies such as literacy. [CFR 4.1, 4.3]

The enthusiasm and collegiality exhibited by this learning community is evidence of the effectiveness of the inquiry circles as a tool that will help the institution continue have rich dialogues about the culture of writing at FPU. The team encourages the Inquiry Circle to pursue some of the Ideas about continued work including investigation of ways to have more impact on DC GE courses where writing is a significant element; discussion about what characterizes writing in various disciplines and at different levels, both graduate and undergraduate; and dialogue with critical thinking. To further work in these and other areas, the team encourages the institution to consider broadening the influence of this Inquiry Circle by inviting additional voices to the table, by exploring opportunities for additional support for writing such as a graduate writing center or staffing writing centers with faculty or staff rather than student mentors and tutors, and regularizing the administration and evaluation of placement testing.

### **Theme #5 Critical Thinking**

As the FPU Idea is in part “prophetic,” critical thinking is fostered and encouraged “toward a reflective and critical perspective on the nature of humanity and its relation to the world.” The FPU Idea links with the critical thinking USLO which states, “Students will apply critical thinking competencies by generating probing questions, recognizing underlying assumptions, interpreting and evaluating relevant information, and applying their understanding to new situations.” This core competency of critical thinking embodies four components within the USLO which are assessed through various courses, a Critical Thinking Assessment Test, surveys, and national benchmarking. [CFR 2.3] The majority of the courses at FPU now link a PSLO to the critical thinking USLO. [CFR 2.3, 2.7]

Although critical thinking (CT) does not have an academic home as the writing USLO does in English, it is still very much owned by faculty. The visiting team noted what was described as cohesion among the faculty and a “pulling together in gathering data.” FPU has been intentional about faculty training and development, particularly on critical thinking and writing assessment, and 20% of full time faculty have scored student responses, normed grading, and been involved in cross-departmental CT discussions, half of those from undergraduate and regional center programs. [CPR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4]

Following the CPR visit, the Critical Thinking Inquiry Circle completed a tracking sheet that ranked recommendations using criteria established, along with TaskStream, annual data dialogues, and Annual Assessment plans to help the institution demonstrate the results of the piloted projects with multiple measures, including those with benchmarking capabilities such as CAT. The EER Team was able to observe evidence of implementing critical thinking learning, establishing a cycle of data collection and analysis, and closing the loop/corrective measures all to attain continuous improvement and to document inter-institutional benchmarks for critical thinking in general education and major programs. Achievement of USLOs in this area are shared in the CT section of The University Student Learning Outcomes Achievement Report, which shows 93% of students to have met or exceeded institutional expectations. [CFR 2.7, 2.11, 4.4]

FPU’s plan to establish longitudinal critical thinking assessment demonstrates the institution’s potential to engage in a continuous improvement cycle enhanced by faculty dialogue about meaningful data. Efforts to clarify the USLO CT definition that involved further CAT scoring session discussions, CT discussions, open forums, and numerous committee discussions (Senate, GE, Assessment, Dean’s Council, and Academic Cabinet) evidences the institution’s willingness and ability to engage in serious, multi-dimensional discussions that will continue to enhance the quality of assessment in this and other areas. [CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.6, 2.7]

These continuing efforts will also enable FPU to address some of the disaggregated data that shows that degree completion males outperform females by 5%, whereas TUG females outscored males by 9%. Ethnicity disaggregation shows a gap of 10% in both DC and TUG GE

programs between White and Hispanic/Latino students. This data combined with the noted improvement in curricular data from DC and TUG scores parallel in the CAT results. The team congratulates FPU on closing the CT attainment gaps both in the area of gender and in ethnicity. The institution may wish to consider a plan to provide additional support for TUG male and Hispanic/Latino students, to calibrate TaskStream scoring across all academic levels, to provide directors with access to disaggregated TaskStream results, and to remain watchful for potential areas of deviation between campuses and programs. Thinking intentionally about the implications of CT assessment for the co-curricular PSLOs would provide the institution with concrete assessment results rather than aspirational goals. [CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5]

The team affirms FPU on the progress of the CT assessment cycle and process. FPU has embraced CT as intentionally implemented and effectively assessed student learning in this core competency. The institution has evaluated their effort and encouraged faculty dialogue and development opportunities. The team supports FPU's institutional recommendation to continue to strengthen this aspect of FPU's culture of assessment as previously outlined in Theme #4 Writing.

### **Theme #6 Rigor and Meaning of Degrees**

Fresno Pacific University was one of the first institutions to “pilot” the new review processes even though this accreditation cycle was conducted under the structure of the old review. FPU tackled several of the five competencies and addressed the “meaning and rigor” of the degree. As one of the first institutions, their approach predated the WSCUC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation and the 2014 revision of the Degree Qualifications Profile. As a first step, an Inquiry Circle (IC) was formed on the Meaning and Rigor of Degrees. Through a series of discussions with the FPU community, the circle developed their own understanding of the terms, defining them as follows:

**Meaning** addresses what is unique about FPU's mission, vision, values, and the FPU Idea, how they relate to our degrees, and how we support their meaning in community.

**Quality** describes how we embrace service and how we know that we are serving our community effectively, and evidence of our impact.

**Integrity** addresses what we appreciate seeing as a result of our service and how we know if student learning outcomes meet the needs of a diverse community and university. (p.41, FPU EER Report)

FPU's Inquiry Circle systematically studied the alignment of outcomes at all levels (USLOs, PSLOs, and CSLOs) through assessment reports and program review. They then conducted additional reviews to determine the alignment of the degree outcomes (meaning) with institutional mission and values, to discern student levels of performance by degree levels (quality from Handbook), and to consider the holistic integration of student learning inside and outside of the classroom (integrity from Handbook). [CFR 2.3, 2.4]

The Inquiry Circle then used the Lumina DQP 2.0 to map "Areas of Learning" categories to University GE SLOs. They provided evidence that every GE SLO was aligned with a corresponding DQP area; moreover, further study revealed that bachelor's level DQPs were aligned with the USLOs "with the strongest representation noted in DQP's two "Knowledge" domains and comprehensive USLO representation across each of the other DQP domains. To assess the quality of the degrees, the Inquiry Circle analyzed PSLOs for their level of cognitive skills across degree programs at undergraduate and graduate levels. Use of Bloom's categories to score complexity of degree levels confirmed that scores for undergraduate programs were lower than they were for graduate programs. In at least one case, a DC program scored higher than the average, while a TUG program scored lower, and "one TUG program scored higher than its graduate counterpart" (p. 42). This analysis sparked important discussions with the academic Deans, who then worked with program directors to target specific programs and PSLOs for examination and modification where needed. Deans and program directors were able to experience firsthand the articulated differences between undergraduate and graduate programs. They particularly noted differences in program "intensity, rigorous analysis, higher-level critical thinking, practitioner-based curriculum, "career-readiness," and extensive literature review and synthesis" (p. 42). [CFR 2.4, 2.7, 2.10, 2.13]

Third, an analysis was conducted that included an examination of the relationship between the FPU Idea (FPU is a Christian University, a Community of Learners, and Prophetic) and the USLOs. As a means of adopting a more holistic approach to understanding FPU's Idea as a

learning environment, 45 faculty, staff, and students from many areas across campus met as a focus group to discuss the Idea's "impact, relevance, and existence" (p. 43). The outcome was very positive, generally confirming that the Idea at its core has remained the same though various modalities and technologies have changed. The focus group also examined the relationship between the FPU Idea and the USLOs, concluding that there was broad overlap between the two with a special emphasis on critical thinking and communication. This relationship had not been examined publicly before, and there was general agreement that such a discussion helped to develop communal understanding of how the Idea functions in the life of the university community. [CFR 1.2, 1.8, 4.5]

The Inquiry Circle persisted with the study of the alignment between the USLOs and the FPU Idea. It was concluded that, although PSLOs are aligned with USLOs, not all programs address every USLO. Moreover, they found that the USLOs generally cover the major concepts expressed in the Idea with two exceptions: the individual's "dynamic relationship with the trinity and the church, and the second having to do with Christian community" (Theme VI Report: USLOs and FPU Idea). The IC members suggested that the missing concepts may be covered as "student development outcomes," to be generated by co-curricular areas such as Student Life, Office of Spiritual Formation, and Athletics. Additionally, some concepts in the Idea, such as lifelong learning, may not be present in the USLOs but are present in the PSLOs for various graduate programs. The IC suggested that further analysis is needed to link common university practices and other Idea concepts such as a "servant-oriented, participatory leadership and governance" and "imaginative, experimental ways of engaging students." Finally, the FPU Idea and the USLOs have been used to organize information collected from college surveys (programs' senior surveys) and national surveys conducted with FPU students. All programs are encouraged to use the data available for their programs to further understand and make explicit for the campus community the integration of and the relationships among their own PSLOs and the USLOs with the FPU Idea. [CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 3.10, 4.3]

FPU has made substantial progress in developing an institution-wide understanding of the meaning, quality, and integrity of the degree at undergraduate and graduate level, within programs and across units. The study these concepts was the general charge of the IC as

preparation for the EER visit. The meaning of the degrees are manifest in their outcomes, but quality and integrity should remain focuses of inquiry. The IC members were encouraged to think about intentional ways the institution could persist with its efforts to expand and assess not just the meaning through outcome achievement, but to critically evaluate benchmarked achievement levels at greater and greater degrees of integration.

### **Program Review**

FPU has a well-developed system of program review that has led to the institution's ability to establish a culture of assessment and inquiry about teaching, learning and student achievement that is the cornerstone of their EER report. The process meets the expectations in the WSCUC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews. Review is stronger in academic areas than in the co-curricular programs, but good progress is being made there as well, and the team encourages FPU to continue to follow the next steps necessary to assure consistency across all programs, both academic and co-curricular. The team had some question about whether the institution might be better served to have a five year cycle in which all outcomes were evaluated once rather than a ten year cycle during which outcomes are evaluated twice. The institution must consider issues of workload, timeliness of data in making decisions, and the rapidly changing landscape of higher education, including changes in the needs and abilities of the student population, as it continues to evaluate the effectiveness of their processes.

The team was impressed at the degree to which the institution has been able to use the data collected in their program reviews and assessment processes to "close the loop." Evidence is included throughout this team report that supports the institution's ability to make significant, effective, and appropriate changes to the curriculum and the student experience as a whole as a result of data-driven inquiries and discussions. What was less apparent, and is something the institution should continue to develop as they refine the program review process, is the degree to which data that emerges is used to drive strategic planning and budgeting.



### **SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

The quality and detail evident in the preparation FPU engaged in leading up to the EER was exemplary. The team appreciates the openness with which it was received and the invitation to review all aspects of the university. The team further appreciated the interaction with each of the groups who gave their time and energy to meet and discuss quite candidly issues of interest and concern. These forums were well attended and gave the team insights not readily available in, or appropriate to, the EER Report.

The team identified three significant themes that shaped the visit: Attention to academic processes, the culture of crisis stemming from leadership and financial challenges, and attention to issues of diversity. Two of these themes were appropriately addressed and outcomes support the team's sense that the institution is capable of continuing progress in these areas. The third theme, transparency and communication, particularly as related to diversity, emerged with somewhat unexpected vigor and import.

The institution has taken seriously the recommendations, suggestions, and considerations stemming from the CPR report and has made significant strides forward in developing a culture of assessment and program review that supports an educationally effective learning environment. The institution is making good use of and contributing to best practices in this area. FPU has been pro-active in looking ahead to changes in WSCUC accreditation and discussions in the broader context of high education and took the initiative to begin work on defining the meaning, quality and integrity of degrees and to assessment of WASC Core Competencies. The institution demonstrated numerous ways in which they are using the data collected to improve the student experience. These are all commendable activities that demonstrate the institution's commitment to learn and continually seek quality improvement. Connecting these activities to strategic planning and budget is the next step in sustaining this culture.

The institution similarly identified leadership and financial management as priority concerns, and the institution demonstrated decisive and effective steps to deal with both in the short time

between when the issues emerged and the EER visit. The EER report gave the team a good initial sense of how to address these issues during the visit, and the candor of FPU leadership in providing additional insight and information during the visit was not only helpful, but commendable. Leadership was exceptionally forthcoming in addressing the challenges and the action steps taken. They also exhibited a good level of self-awareness about the continued challenges moving forward. For the most part, these actions were commendable. The severity of the financial crisis and the inconclusive state of strategic planning and implementation remain cause for recommendations in this area.

The most serious gap the team identified was the degree to which the institution is aware of the gap between perceptions of some in leadership and some diverse constituencies of the climate of FPU relative to diversity and representation. It has appeared to the CPR team that appropriate steps were in place to address issues that arose during that visit, and the team left feeling that the institution was poised to make positive strides in this area. The resignation of the president and the ensuing questions and uncertainty about what that means for underrepresented groups are of particular concern given the institution's status as Hispanic Serving. The team found ample evidence that underrepresented students from various demographic groups are considered in disaggregated data. The institution has supported programs and services to assure the success of students with a wide variety of needs. Evidence indicated that many of these initiatives have already had concrete, positive results in fostering student success.

Although it was clear that administration had made numerous good-faith efforts to be as open as possible about events as they unfolded, there was an unmistakable undercurrent of unease and concern that emerged from several corners and in several elements of the visit. The climate identified by the team seems to indicate that giving information is not the same as dialogue and that providing information is welcome but not as valuable as discussions. The unevenness the team saw from the community seemed to fall into a pattern: the closer the individual or group was to the decision-making processes that have driven the institution in recent months, the more confident they are in those decisions and the more comfortable they were about them. In probing outside the "inner circle" the team uncovered definite discontent and a lack of confidence in the level of sensitivity FPU administration had for divergent opinions. There appeared to be a sense

in numerous quarters that there was little acceptance of or tolerance for these views. The team had already noted the absence of this voice in the document and expected to hear some dissention during the visit, but the degree to which it emerged and the broad nature of the input received raised the situation to a level of concern that warranted a recommendation that FPU considers ways to broaden representation in decision-making bodies and processes and that they explore forums which encourage bi-directional communication and make all voices feel safe and welcome. Three of the team's recommendations are related to these issues, and the potential of these issues, if not addressed, to undermine all the excellent work the institution has completed cannot be ignored.

The team supports FPU and encourages them to tap into their denominational heritage for the tools that will help them restore relationships, reconcile the campus and the broader constituency of stakeholders, and continue to serve their community with excellence and integrity. The team takes great hope from the message conveyed overwhelmingly by everyone involved in the visit of their love for and commitment to this institution. Such unity will surely allow FPU to have the difficult conversations that lie ahead, to make hard decisions yet to come, and to move ahead from the EER visit an even stronger and more unified institution than they already are.

## **Commendations**

1. The Team commends FPU in their willingness to tackle several of the new core competencies and address the “meaning and rigor” of the degree while completing their review under the old structure.
2. The Team commends the significant gains FPU has made in establishing a culture of assessment and encourages the institution to ensure the continuation of these best practices in the next period of accreditation.
3. The Team commends FPU for its efforts to stabilize the university during a difficult period and for the implementation of the dual leadership model to use effectively the skills of the current president and the provost and senior vice president.
4. The Team commends the continued progress made in educational technology serving the online and traditional student, staff and faculty on all campuses. Notable examples

include the progress in acquisitions of eResources in the library, the support for Moodle course design, and availability of technology support at all sites.

5. The Team commends the candor and self-awareness with which FPU identified and articulated institutional recommendations made in their Educational Effectiveness Report.

## **Recommendations**

1. Implement a holistic approach to diversity including attention to structure, climate, staffing, and curricular areas demonstrated by a plan that will address the residual challenges in the current transitional period and fully respond to diversity issues that have been an ongoing concern for the institution. [CFR 1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 3.1, 3.3]
2. Continued work on institution-wide development and ownership of the strategic plan
3. Continued work on reconciling and sustaining the budget under the leadership of the CFO supported by advancement efforts under the leadership of the President and the Board. [CFR 3.4, 3.6, 3.8]
4. Greater inclusion of and broader representation from faculty and staff in decision-making bodies and processes. [CFR 3.7, 3.10]
5. Continued development of intentional mechanisms of communication that create feedback loops for bi-directional communication, transparency and understanding. [CFR 3.6, 3.7, 4.3, 4.5, 4.6]

## **APPENDICES**

### **Off Campus Locations Review – Bakersfield Regional Center**

#### **Federal Compliance Forms**

**Compliance Audit Checklist**

**Credit Hour Policy**

**OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)**

Institution: Fresno Pacific University  
 Type of Visit: Off-Campus visit – EER  
 Name of reviewer/s: Doug McConnell, Carole Huston  
 Date/s of review: February 24, 2015

1. Site Name and Address

Bakersfield Center  
 Fresno Pacific University  
 11000 River Run Blvd., Ste. 200, Bakersfield, CA 93311

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

Fall 2014 256

The Bakersfield Center is a direct extension of Fresno Pacific University's main campus serving 256 students in Fall 2014. The comparative grid below indicating numbers of students, full time and part time faculty/instructors:

|          | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Students | 321  | 344  | 445  | 553  | 490  |
| FT       | 2    | 9    | 8    | 8    | 8    |
| PT       | 51   | 35   | 50   | 58   | 57   |

The Bakersfield Region Center offers accelerated bachelor's degree completion programs as well as master's degrees and credentials (see list of Bakersfield Degrees below). All courses are offered in the evening and are taught or team taught by experienced lead faculty and/or instructors. Additional onsite services include: admissions, recruitment, academic advising, career services, writing tutor, spiritual counseling, IT support via help desk, access to library resources including articles and eBooks online and print books from a consortium of approximately 50 libraries via mail, as well as bookstore purchases via courier.

Faculty support services, Center for Online Learning, are available for online and blended learning courses, course syllabi template assistance, and TaskStream usage. The Student Online Services (SOS), assists all adult learners with extended hours and weekend help desk availability.

The Bakersfield Center was founded and WASC approved in 2003. The Bakersfield Campus is 109 miles away, approximately 1 hour 45 minutes driving time, from the main FPU campus. FPU expanded into the current facility in Bakersfield 2009 occupying 20,000 square feet of a well developed business park. The campus offers well equipped classrooms, administrative offices, student services, student lounge area, and ample parking.

The majority of the Degree Completion students at the Bakersfield Center in the liberal arts degree are also pursuing a masters program (75-80%) and/or educational credential programs. In the interview process respondents affirmed that the Bakersfield program is well-developed locally, and is connected to both the satellite and main campuses.

### **Degree Completion Programs**

- [Business Management](#)
- [Organizational Leadership](#)
- [Christian Ministry & Leadership](#)
- [Criminology & Restorative Justice Studies](#)
- [Liberal Arts](#)

### **Online**

- [Early Childhood Development](#)

### **Graduate Programs**

#### **School of Business**

- [Global MBA](#)

#### **School of Education**

- [Administrative Services](#)
- [Curriculum and Teaching](#)
- [School Counseling and School Psychology - Pupil Personnel Services Program](#)
- [Special Education](#)
- [Teacher Education](#)

### **Online**

- [Clear Credential - Multiple & Single Subject](#)
- [Master of Arts in Curriculum & Teaching](#)
- [Master of Arts in Educational Technology](#)
- [Master of Arts in Kinesiology](#)
- [Teacher Librarian Program](#)

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

See attached WASC EER Site Visit, Bakersfield Regional Center

**Observations and Findings**

| Lines of Inquiry  | Observations and Findings   | Follow-up Required (identify the issues)  |
|---|---|---|
| <p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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, 3.4, 4.6)</p>              | <p>As noted in the CPR review through the regional center, FPU met a community need in serving greater numbers of Hispanics, many of which are first generation. Serving the needs in the community is very much a part of the FPU Idea and mission of a Christian community of learners serving the greater community. Based on leadership input, community needs assessment and institutional offerings, specific programs of study became the focus at regional centers.</p> <p>In the two years since the CPR visit, FPU implemented a new structure under the leadership of the Executive Director for Regional Centers including three positions at each center: Assistant Director of Community Development, Assistant Director Advising, and Assistant Director of Operations.</p>  | <p>FPU leadership of the Regional Campuses comes under the Executive Director for RCs whose job it is to ensure the quality and program integrity covers all the campuses. A concern in CPR report required follow-up on the inclusion of the RCs needs for growth and development in the strategic plans. Progress was evident both in interaction with the university leaders and the Bakersfield staff and faculty. Completion and progress in implementation of the strategic plan appears to be on pace with the wider university.</p> |
| <p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> 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)</p> | <p>Bakersfield Center provides the same breadth of service as other campuses. As noted previously FPU imprint and institutional identity is visible through signage, marketing materials, name tags, and messaging.</p> <p>Integration of off-campus students into on-campus meetings occurred throughout the WASC visit via V-com. This live streaming occurs regularly to integrate students and faculty to the campus. Examples include the Campus Hour, presentations and interviews, training sessions, and other programming.</p> <p>The integration of spiritual values and culture at regional centers is evident; the FPU Campus Pastor prepares short devotional messages which may be used by faculty or students; staff are available for spiritual counseling and support, devotionals, conflict resolution, and students are invited to campus spiritual programming via V-com.</p> | <p>Continued nurture of students is a priority that needs to be funded as part of the on-going development. The new CFO and the ED for Regional Centers must ensure that adequate funds are allocated to maintain the FPU Idea across all campuses.</p>   |
| <p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> 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 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)</p>                          | <p>Opened in 2005, Bakersfield Center is a state of the art facility. As noted in Visalia, the facility fosters a learning environment with smart boards, V-Com, collaborative learning classrooms, and support services to assist faculty-student contact in blended classes and online learning. The Executive Director of Regional Centers meets regularly with the three Assistant Directors at Bakersfield as well as other administrators and faculty. The overall administration for the campus demonstrated a clear understanding of their tasks and the mission &amp; vision of FPU.</p>   | <p>As noted in the CPR report the administration must continue to link academic department leadership into the oversight of student learning and the curriculum. Progress was evident both in the interviews with faculty and students, as well as support from the assessment of the broader FPU DC programs.</p>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>Student Support Services.</i><br/> <i>CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)</p>                           | <p>FPU's response to staffing needs is done through student input, teacher observations, and staff identified needs. Onsite services (from a few hours a week to full time) include admissions, recruitment, financial aid, academic advising, career services, writing tutor, spiritual counseling, IT support via help desk, access to library resources via mail and online (Link plus system in place by July/August 2013) and bookstore purchases via courier.</p> <p>FPU provides an online course addressing university success, that provides library and technology training for students at the RCs.</p>   | <p>As noted in the CPR report, continued attention to processes and needs assessment of staffing and/or cross training is necessary to provide clear evidence of effectiveness and adequate staffing. The Bakersfield administrators and staff have allocated responsibilities in a manner to address student needs while maintaining morale. The new structure appears to be more efficient in its support of students based on feedback from the interviews.</p> |
| <p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are 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, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)</p> | <p>As noted in the CPR report, Academic Cabinet oversees FPU's academic programs both on and off campus. Dean of the degree completion program works with deans of various schools/departments who then oversee their regional curriculum and assign lead teachers to work with regional center teachers (part time, adjunct, or onsite professors). Courses are reported as being held to the same expectations as campus for academic rigor and core competencies. Periodic audits of courses to assess SLOs for programs and courses along with the Lumina assessment, indicates compliance with academic standards. There are inevitable challenges in ensuring academic rigor in the DC programs due to the demands outside of the classroom. In the interviews with students, there was ample evidence of the impact of community on academic standards created and maintained by the cohort approach. Adding that to the faculty accessibility to students creates an effective educational model.</p> <p>Best practices for online instruction and the Online Blended Course Quality Initiative started in 2012.</p> <p>SOS (Supporting Online Students) and the Center for Online learning team assists students and teachers with online and blended classes. Instructor training and orientation occurs in the creation, design, and technical details of online/blended course development and in the use of Moodle, course management software. Across campus, the use of a course template ensures essential information be included in every course, which also assists in the upload of SLO's and other pertinent assessment linking information to TaskStream, one of FPU's assessment and reporting tools.</p> | <p>As noted in the CPR report continued inclusion of the schools/departments in the RC strategic planning is necessary for academic oversight of programs, courses, and assessment.</p>  |
| <p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i><br/> 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) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>   | <p>As noted in the CPR Visalia campus visit, the faculty oversight as noted above is primarily responsible for Bakersfield. More specifically, teachers use the course syllabus template and work with lead teacher on course design. Dean of the Degree Completion program, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and Associate Dean, Accreditation/Registrar sit on Academic Cabinet and various academic committees to ensure oversight to the academic program. Regular semester course syllabi audits and the program review process, which includes both internal and external reviews, hold all levels accountable. Discussions onsite with deans of schools noted how adult learners successfully accomplishing course content, SLO's, and expectations in a consolidated period of time.</p> <p>Clarification in credit hour policies occurred in May, 2012 with the</p>   | <p>Continued monitoring and full participation in the assessment of educational effectiveness of each of the Regional Centers is important to the overall strength of the programs offered in Bakersfield as with all the campuses.</p>  |



|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <p>following Definition of Policy Practice:<br/> Each program will meet the DOE/Accreditation Credit Hour Policy in ways distinct to its programmatic structure, yet fully in compliance with all new regulations. The syllabus for each course will include a record of estimated times for the work of the class as a guide to students and to demonstrate compliance. <b>Degree Completion/Undergraduate:</b> Seat time will be met by a combination of face-to-face, traditional classroom instruction regularized in the 2011-12 program modifications of DC programs (two weeks per unit of instruction), along with mediated/online instruction which has the effect of making all DC programs (General Education, elective, and cohort) hybrid/blended programs. Homework hours will continue to be 30 hours per unit of credit as has been the policy and practice. Total instructional and homework time will equal 45 hours per unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <b>Online Courses:</b> Seat-time and homework time in online courses are difficult, if not impossible to isolate. Total instructional and independent work will equal or exceed the total required time of traditional undergraduate and graduate courses respectively according to Carnegie standards. Course design will balance instructional activities and will be guided by best practices as developed in 2011-12 in the "Online/Blended Course Quality Initiative" by the Online Instruction Committee and the Center for Online Learning, and approved in May 2012.</li> <li>· <b>Internships, practica, studio and lab work, independent programs</b> (e.g. IMAP) will include "at least an equivalent amount of work" (see WASC Credit Hour Policy) as required in classrooms, guided by standard higher education conventions.</li> </ul> |   |
| <p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i><br/> 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)</p> | <p>FPU is to be commended for remarkably high retention rates both on campus 80% and at the Regional Centers 90%.</p> <p>Retention rates are collected and reported on the university website on the Disclosures page. Resulting data show that retention rates at regional centers are higher than on the main campus as noted above. One reason they believe this is occurring is due to the strong bonding and support within the cohort group.</p>  | <p>Continue to monitor enrollment trends, retention, and student learning through the cohort model.</p>   |
| <p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)</p>     | <p>Assessment of student learning at FPU has a long history with 12 years of school specific assessment and all assessment under the purview of the University Assessment Committee. Both FPU and regional centers are included in the student learning assessment processes, reporting, and use of Taskstream. Assessments of writing and critical thinking skills are also part of this process. The structure of assessment is inclusive of regular program review, course syllabi audit every semester, and biannual Taskstream data assessment.</p> <p>Regional centers added a writing placement exam and writing tutors based on reported needs.</p> <p>Regional centers have the SOS/Online Center team to assist with online/blended course design and TaskStream use assistance.</p>  | <p>Ongoing attention to assessment of all programs with all faculty (regular and adjunct) involved in the course, programs, degree, and campus reviews.</p> |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i><br/> <i>CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)</p> | <p>The team found the same approach to quality assurance in Bakersfield as was evident in Visalia. The details and processes for online/blended and geophysical courses are noted in the evidence and comply with Standards 4.</p> <p>Assessment and review processes of Inquiry Circles, Lumina DQP, and discussions about academic rigor and the meaning of the degree continued to show student success in achieving SLO's to be similar both on campus and at regional centers.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

### WASC Educational Effectiveness Site Visit - Bakersfield Regional Center

**Tuesday, February 24, 2015**

| TIME            | ACTIVITY  | PARTICIPANTS   | LOCATION |
|-----------------|---|--|----------|
| 12:00 -12:30 PM | Meet Regional Center Welcome Group & Tour Facility  | Stephen Varvis, Provost/Senior VP<br>Cindy Carter, Assoc. Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Degree Completion<br>Jon Endicott, VP for Enrollment and Student Services<br>Brice Yocum, Executive Director, Regional Centers   |          |
| 12:30-1:15 PM   | Lunch with Student Representatives                  | Endee Grijalva: Liberal Arts<br>Cyndie Navarro: BUS MGT<br>Mayra Trevino: BUS MGT<br>Elma Barraza: Liberal Arts  | Room 201 |
| 1:15-2:00 PM    | Academic Programs: Meet Program Directors & Faculty | Randy Wallace, Director of Business Programs, Bakersfield<br>Ann Paslay, Site Director for Teacher Education<br>John Mendiburu, Program Director, Admin. Services<br>Dianne Young, Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Development<br>Dennis Johnston, DC Liberal Arts Regional Coordinator<br>Susan Cox, Program Director, MA in Leadership Studies<br>Christine Goedhart- Humphrey, Business Adjunct Faculty<br>Robert Snoddy, Business Adjunct Faculty<br><br>By v-con from MCD 261: | Room 201 |

|              |                            |  |          |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|----------|
|              |                            | Breck Harris, Program Director, Org. Leadership<br>Carol Gossett, Program Director, Early Childhood<br>Peggy Avakian, Program Director, Liberal Arts   |          |
| 2:00-2:45 PM | Meet Student Service Group | Brice Yocum, Executive Director, Regional Centers<br>Jon Endicott, VP for Enrollment and Student Services<br>Endee Grijalva, Asst. Director Community Development<br>Dani Fox-Lopez, Asst. Director Advising<br>Elma Barraza, Asst. Director Operations<br>Heather Spaulding, South Valley Student Financial Services<br><br><u>By v-con from MCD 261:</u><br>Gary Nicholes, Financial Aid Director, Student Financial Services<br>Stacie Benedict, Director of Student Accounts<br>Bethany Rader, Student Account Manager<br>Denise Baronian, Assoc. Director of Regional Enrollment<br>Joanie Joy, Assoc. Director of Regional Enrollment<br>Angulus Wilson, University Pastor<br>Mike Allen, Registrar<br>Kevin Enns-Rempel, Director, Hiebert Library<br>Shirley Warkentin, DC Operations Manager<br>Dahne Watson, Articulation/Transfer Officer<br>Melinda Gunning, Academic Support Services<br>Fran Martens-Friesen, Tutor Writing Program<br>Matt Gehrett, Center for Online Learning (SOS Coordination) | Room 201 |
| 2:45-3:00 PM | Exit Interview/Q&A         | Stephen Varvis, Provost/Senior VP<br>Jon Endicott, VP for Enrollment and Student Services  | Room 201 |

## Compliance Checklist

Expectations for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation of WASC Accreditation  
or as Specified (2013 Handbook)

Name of Institution: Fresno Pacific University

Dates of Visit: February 25-27, 2015

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation

| CFR | Documents Required                | Links to website or document portfolio  | WASC check |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|------------|
| 1.3 | Academic freedom policy           | <a href="#">Academic Freedom: Faculty Handbook p76</a>  | <b>XX</b>  |
| 1.4 | Diversity policies and procedures | <a href="#">Diversity rationale</a><br><a href="#">Non-discrimination statement: Undergraduate Catalog p10</a><br><a href="#">Non-discrimination statement: Graduate Catalog p9</a><br><a href="#">Athletics: Gender Equity and Diversity Statement</a> | <b>XX</b>  |
| 1.5 | Documents regarding the           | <a href="#">Articles of Incorporation</a>   |            |

|      |  |  |           |
|------|--|--|-----------|
|      | authority of a controlling or sponsoring entity that is affiliated with the institution, if any  |  | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.6a | Catalog (online) with degree program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (including grade appeals and changes; policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades) | <a href="http://registrar.fpu.edu/catalog">http://registrar.fpu.edu/catalog</a><br><a href="#">Undergraduate Academic Catalog</a><br><a href="#">Graduate Academic Catalog</a>   | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.6b | Human subjects in research policies (if applicable)  | <a href="#">Guidelines for Human Subjects Research</a><br><a href="#">CITI Training</a><br><a href="http://www.fresno.edu/irb">www.fresno.edu/irb</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.6c | Tuition refund policy  | <a href="#">Tuition refund policy: undergraduate</a><br><a href="#">Tuition refund policy: graduate</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.6d | Disability accommodations policies and procedures  | <a href="#">Procedures for Special Accommodations</a><br><a href="#">Disability accommodations: undergraduate</a><br><a href="#">Disability accommodations: graduate</a><br><a href="#">Disability accommodation presentations</a>   | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.6e | Redacted examples of student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, degree levels, and related interpretive information (one transcript for each degree level)               | <a href="#">AA Transcript</a><br><a href="#">BS Transcript</a><br><a href="#">MA Transcript</a><br><a href="#">Transcript Key</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.7a | Faculty complaint and grievance policies   | <a href="#">Complaint and grievance policies: Faculty Handbook p85-87</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.7b | Staff complaint and grievance policies   | <a href="#">Complaint and grievance policies: Staff Handbook p25</a>   | <b>XX</b> |
| 1.7c | Employee handbook  | <a href="#">Staff Handbook</a>   | <b>XX</b> |
| 2.8  | Faculty scholarship and creative activity policies   | <a href="#">Faculty Scholarship at FPU</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: School of Business</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: School of Education</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: School of HRSS</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: School of Natural Science</a> | <b>XX</b> |

|       |  |   |           |
|-------|--|---|-----------|
|       |  | <a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: Seminary</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Scholarship: Faculty Handbook p55</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Professional Development Funding</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Research Grants</a>   |           |
| 2.14a | Posted policies on receiving transfer credit and criteria for determining acceptance | <a href="#">Transfer credit: undergraduate</a><br><a href="#">Transfer credit: graduate</a><br><a href="http://registrar.fpu.edu/transferring-courses">http://registrar.fpu.edu/transferring-courses</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 2.14b | List of institutions with articulation agreements                                    | <a href="#">Articulation and transfer agreement list</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.2a  | Faculty hiring and evaluation policies and procedures                                | <a href="#">Faculty hiring: Faculty Handbook pp32-46</a><br><a href="#">Faculty evaluation: Faculty Handbook pp54-75</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.2b  | Staff hiring and evaluation policies and procedures                                  | <a href="#">Staff hiring &amp; evaluation: Staff Handbook pp23-24</a>   | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.2c  | Faculty orientation policies and procedures  | <a href="#">New Faculty Orientation agendas 2010-2014</a><br><a href="#">Online training for staff and faculty</a><br><a href="#">Faculty professional day agendas: 2010-2014</a><br><a href="#">Faculty professional day 2014 presentation</a><br><a href="#">Adjunct Hiring and Orientation Process</a><br><a href="#">Responsibilities for Program Directors &amp; Lead Instructors</a><br><a href="#">Nursing adjuncts orientation</a><br><a href="#">Health care adjuncts orientation</a>                            | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.2d  | Faculty handbook   | <a href="#">Faculty Handbook</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.3a  | Faculty and staff development policies   | <a href="#">Faculty Handbook, pp91-96</a><br><i>Example: Faculty Development 2013</i><br><i>Example: Faculty Development: TurnItIn</i><br><i>Examples: Writing Workshops</i><br><a href="#">Staff Development Policy Statement</a><br><i>Example: Staff Caucus Minutes August 2013</i><br><i>Example: Staff Caucus Minutes April 2014</i><br><i>Example: New Staff Orientation agendas 2010-2014</i><br><i>Examples: Online training for staff and faculty</i><br><i>Examples: Disability accommodation presentations</i> | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.8   | CEO biographical information   | <a href="#">President's biographical information</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.9a  | List of governing board members with affiliations                                    | <a href="#">Board of Trustees</a>   | <b>XX</b> |

|           |   |   |           |
|-----------|---|---|-----------|
| 3.9b      | List of governing board committees with members                     | <a href="#">Board of Trustees committees</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.9c      | Location of minutes of board meetings for last two years            | University Executive Suite  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.9d      | Governing board bylaws and operations manual                        | <a href="#">Board of Trustees Bylaws</a><br><a href="#">Board of Trustees Handbook</a>                | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.9e      | Policy and procedure for Board evaluation of president/CEO          | <a href="#">Review Process for President</a>  | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.10<br>a | Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority, if applicable | <a href="#">Faculty governance: Faculty Handbook pp17-29</a><br><a href="#">Faculty Senate Bylaws</a> | <b>XX</b> |
| 3.10<br>b | Faculty governance organization chart, if applicable                | <a href="#">Organizational Chart</a>  | <b>XX</b> |

**Fresno Pacific University**  
**Credit Hour Policy**  
May 2012

Each program will meet the DOE/Accreditation Credit Hour Policy in ways distinct to its programmatic structure, yet fully in compliance with all new regulations. The syllabus for each course will include a record of estimated times for the work of the class as a guide to students and to demonstrate compliance.

- Traditional Undergraduate: Both seat and homework times are met in the conventional ways, 15 hours seat time, plus 2 hours expected homework per hour of class (30 hours of homework per unit of credit). Total instructional and homework time will equal 45 hours per unit.
- Graduate: Both seat and homework times are met in the conventional ways,
- 15 hours seat time, plus 3 hours expected homework per hour of class. DOE requires 2 hours of homework time per hour of class; WASC recommends 3 hours; ATS require 2 hours of seat time. Total instructional and homework hours will equal 60 hours per unit.
- Degree Completion/Undergraduate: Seat time will be met by a combination of face-to-face, traditional classroom instruction regularized in the 2011-12 program modifications of DC programs (two weeks per unit of instruction), along with mediated/online instruction which has the effect of making all DC programs (General Education, elective, and cohort) hybrid/blended programs. Homework hours will continue to be 30 hours per unit of credit as has been the policy and practice. Total instructional and homework time will equal 45 hours per unit.
- Online Courses: Seat-time and homework time in online courses are difficult, if not

impossible to isolate. Total instructional and independent work will equal or exceed the total required time of traditional undergraduate and graduate courses respectively according to Carnegie standards. Course design will balance instructional activities and will be guided by best practices as developed in 2011-12 in the "Online/Blended Course Quality Initiative" by the Online Instruction Committee and the Center for Online Learning, and approved in May 2012.

- Internships, practica, studio and lab work, independent programs (e.g. IMAP) will include "at least an equivalent amount of work" (see WASC Credit Hour Policy) as required in classrooms, guided by standard higher education conventions.

Affirmed by Academic Cabinet: June 2013  
CFR 2.2 Credit hour policy FPU