REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To California State University, Stanislaus April 2-5, 2019

Kenyon S. Chan, Chair
Chancellor Emeritus
University of Washington
Bothell, WA

Eric M. Frank, Assistant Chair
Professor of Art History
Chair, Department of Art and Art History
Occidental College
Los Angeles, CA

Deborah S. Adishian-Astone
Vice President for Administration/Chief Financial Officer
California State University, Fresno
Fresno, CA

Junelyn Peeples
Director of Assessment and Institutional Research
WSCUC Accreditation Liaison Office
Scripps College Claremont, CA

Ken O'Donnell
Vice Provost
California State University, Dominguez Hills Carson, CA

Tamara Hawley
Vice President WSCUC
Staff Liaison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I- OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, asRelevant

California State University, Stanislaus was established as Stanislaus State College in 1957 (opened in 1960) in Turlock, California. It was, then, the 15th campus of the California State University System. The institution moved to its current site in 1965, gained University status from the State Legislature and the State University Board of Trustees in 1986. The Stockton Center was established an educational presence in 1974, and incrementally expanded until the current campus was opened in 1998. Stanislaus State College was first accredited by WSCUS as an autonomous institution in 1963 and received its most recent full accreditation in 2010. Following discussion with the institution, in October 2013 it was agreed that the OSR would take place in the fall 2018 and the visit in the spring 2019.

The Stanislaus Campus has approximately 10,000 students and is comprised of four colleges (College of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; College of Education, Kinesiology and Social Work; College of Science, College of Business Administration) which together offer 43 undergraduate programs, 16 master's programs, and a doctoral program in educational leadership. Particularly noteworthy are its nursing program, business administration, and teacher education programs. Additionally, Stanislaus State offers distance learning options as well as professional enhancement programs in 12 other locations. The Stockton Center currently enrolls about 670 students in 13 degree granting programs (baccalaureate and master's) and several credential programs.

The Turlock campus is the major center for educational and cultural activity for the greater Central Valley ant its student body reflects the demographic diversity of this region of California (53% of its student body identify as Hispanic/Latino). The Stockton Center principally serves

returning students employed full-time, who are seeking an undergraduate or graduate degree, or a credential/certificate.

The current Mission of the university was approved by the Academic Senate (April 18, 2017) and approved by the President Ellen Junn on May 31, 2017. It states that:

> "The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of California State University, Stanislaus are committed to creating an inclusive learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative, and social horizons. We challenge one another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning."

This relatively new and expansive *Mission Statement*, attendant *Vision Statement*, and the articulation of *University Values,* and *Statement on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice* (institutional report, p.6) clearly defines what makes graduates of Stanislaus unique, clearly frames its dedication to diversity, and clearly details its ambition to contribute to the public good (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.4).

B. Description of the Team's Review Process

The team's process for gathering information in preparation for the Offsite Review (OSR) included the review of materials submitted by the institution including the institutional report and appendices, previous visiting team reports and Commission action Letters. The team conference call on November 2, 2018, discussed the current context of the university and the issues identified in these documents. This conference call was generally unremarkable, but the team did decide that a sub-group should make a separate visit to the Stockton Center. During the OSR (November 28-29 2018), the team identified lines of inquiry built upon the issues raised in prior

WSCUC team reports and action letters. It was determined that a major focus of the Accreditation Visit (AV) would be, among other things, the nature of the relationship between the Stanislaus Campus and the Stockton Center, the state of campus climate, shared governance effectiveness, strategic planning, issues regarding Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and progress toward institutionalizing a culture of assessment and planning. In January 2019 the team finalized which documents the team would require based on the Lines of Inquiry which were sent to CSUS on December 19, 2018 after productive conversation with the ALO, AVP Shawna Young. A preparatory conference call in anticipation of the AV was held on March 6, 2019. The AV was conducted April 2-5, 2019.

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

The report prepared by the institution was exceptionally thorough and reflective. It demonstrated transparency and the sincerity and of the institution in addressing the recommendations of the Commission and the underlying issues those recommendations addressed in 2010. Well organized and smartly presented, we concluded that the report accurately portrayed the current state of the Stanislaus campus. Access to the underlying data was openly and efficiently offered to the members of the Committee including off campus access to the Stanislaus dashboard portal, which was much appreciated by the Committee. The process involved many components and units of the university community, with a clear and integrative approach by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and her team. The university should be commended for the quality of the report and their cooperation in providing all required data and persons to interview.

All in all, the broad base of the review process and the rigorous character of the report itself should lay the groundwork for renewed strategic thinking about how to address institutional challenges in the future.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission actions

The last comprehensive review of CSU Stanislaus occurred in 2010. At that time the Commission reaffirmed the accreditation of the campus with a special visit scheduled for fall 2011. The visit focused on 1) campus climate and trust, 2) shared governance, 3) strategic planning, and 4) retention, promotion and tenure policies. Some progress was noted in the commission letter summarizing the special visit in fall 2011 but the commission required another special visit in fall 2014 to review progress on these same issues of concern to the commission. Progress since the 2014 special visit related to these four areas of concern seemed to be significant and deserve commendation. Although the campus has undergone three presidential changes within the 2010-2018 period, these potentially destabilizing events have actually strengthened the campus and may have played a large part in the significant progress the campus has made in these four areas of concern.

1. Campus Climate and Trust. The visiting team noted that there appears to have been significant campus involvement in preparation for this accrediting visit. Because of better and positive collaboration between faculty, administration, and the current president, the campus abolished the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee. The relatively new president, Dr. Ellen Junn has worked hard to establish positive communications with all segments of the campus with particular attention in improving relationships with the faculty and faculty leadership.

The team met with a full array of campus constituents during our four day site visit. We met with multiple administrative, faculty, student, and staff groups both part of the established governance structures and in open meeting. At each session, we directly raised the issue of campus climate and trust. The responses were amazingly uniform and we deemed quite genuine. Almost all those who have been on the campus for 5 years or more commented on the trauma they experienced because of the conflict between former campus leadership and the faculty, students and staff. Understandably so, there are some residual feelings from having been through such a stressful time in the institution's history, and many expressed that they consider themselves survivors from that period of institutional stress. At the same time, the faculty, staff, and administrators, believe that their campus has returned to a respectful and trusting environment led by a president and provost who they "love" and respect. Demonstration of this new mood is the successful completion of their ambitious strategic plan. Our interviews revealed wide participation in the strategic planning process and deep commitment to this plan. Everyone on the campus takes great pride in this plan and we see it being applied in in the current budget process.

The campus should be COMMENDED for the palpable change in campus climate and trust that has been restored between the senior administration and the campus community.

2. <u>Shared governance</u>. In 2011, the campus had a number of ad hoc committees organized outside regular committee structures as a product of distrust throughout the campus. Currently, the relationships between the administration and faculty seem typical of most large universities and issues are now reviewed within the regular structures of the faculty

senate and university committees. Committee appointments and the breadth of membership on committees appear to be appropriate and a product of a more positive relationship among everyone on campus. The team met with faculty leadership and multiple levels of faculty who uniformly expressed their support for the president's and provost's commitment to shared governance. The campus deserves to be COMMENDED on returning to a more typical shared governance environment.

3. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Policies (RPT). Since 2012, the campus has made significant progress on delineating policies and procedures related to faculty retention, promotion, and tenure. The team met separately with assistant, associate, and full professors who were randomly selected by the team from every college in the university. Each group unanimously believe that the process and criteria for faculty review, promotion, and tenure at the department, college, and university levels are clear and well known. Assistant and Associate professors, in particular, reported that they receive strong mentoring, workshops, and advising about the promotion and tenure process along with understanding the "elaborations" of the criteria for tenure that is unique to each department. Further, there is uniform trust that the provost and president are fully engaged in the process and apply criteria in a manner consistent with the criteria used in the faculty review process. The campus should be COMMENNDED for its collaborative and open RPT process and providing clear and consistent elaborations of criteria by fields that is easily understood by faculty undergoing promotion and tenure review. The team noted, however, that detailed specific explanations for requirements for promotion and tenure (locally called "elaborations") within some departments should be updated,

revised, and/or trimmed to include only the most essential criteria for promotion and tenure.

4. <u>Strategic Planning</u>. In 2012, the commission was concerned with the apparent lack of progress in developing a comprehensive strategic plan and the breadth and depth of campus participation in the strategic planning process. Since that time, under the leadership of President Junn and Provost Kimberly Greer and the participation of many faculty, students, and staff/administration, the campus has developed a new strategic plan. Although only newly adopted, it can provide a purposeful blueprint for the university. It is premature at this time to assess the effectiveness of the plan.

At almost every interview, the team asked about the process of creating the new campus strategic plan and its implementation. We found widespread belief that the strategic planning processes was inclusive and exhaustive. The general belief is that the process brought together all segments of the campus to focus on student learning and that the plan is widely endorsed. We heard strong evidence that the plan is used to determine budget and programmatic priorities and is a living/working document.

The campus should be COMMENDED for the development and implementation of their new strategic plan and we urge the campus to continue to use the plan to determine budget and programmatic priorities and continually review and track the status of each priority objective.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal Requirements: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard One: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The team found that CSU Stanislaus has well-articulated statements of mission, vision and values (CFR 1.1) along with a strong statement on diversity and inclusion (CFR 1.4). Like most universities, CSU Stanislaus uses a robust website to provide substantial information to the public, which were consistent with printed documents reviewed by the team.

The mission statement of the campus outlines a commitment to create "…an inclusive learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative, and social horizons." The campus vision, values, and diversity statements logically flow from their mission statement. Their recent strategic plan also mirrors their mission, vision, and values.

In addition, the campus provided the team with published documents on educational objectives (CFR 1.2), commitment to academic freedom (CFR 1.3), the role of their governing board (CFR 1.5), policies and procedures regarding student grievances, complaints, refunds and academic affairs policies (CFR 1.6), and evidence of an open and honest relationship with its accreditors (CFR 1.8). The campus provided evidence of an open and transparent process related to business and administrative practices (CFR 1.7) as well. During the campus assessment, we reviewed how these documents were implemented in practice and found them to be well within best practices.

Standard Two: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

Examination of the university's on-line catalog and related materials indicates that programs are appropriate in content, standards, and degree level (CFR 2.1). Degrees are clearly defined (CFR 2.2) for both undergraduates (CFR 2.2a) and graduates (CFR 2.2b). The institution has laid

out clearly defined degrees with respect to admission requirements, and levels of achievement for graduation (CFR 2.2).

Through its Office of Assessment in the Provost's Office, CSU Stanislaus has created and executed a solid plan for program review, which examines student learning outcomes and retention/graduation data, and makes use of external evidence and evaluators (CFR 2.7).

The structure of assessment committees looks very strong, and the expectations are explicit and complete (CFR 2.4). But faculty responsibility for assessing is less clear from the online materials or Institutional Report, as are the faculty's long-term responsibilities and interactions. The process of integrating SLOs to capture learning and challenge students is a work in progress (CFR 2.5). The team found good evidence that the institution monitors this at the course level, but by its own admission in the Institutional Report, the Faculty Learning Communities organized around the Core Competencies are at different stages of their development. The university has created Student Learning Outcomes, but it has not demonstrated that all programs have been assessed or that these expectations have been met (CFR 2.3). As a result, the university has incomplete evidence of graduates meeting the stated levels of attainment (CFR 2.6), particularly at the Stockton location.

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Throughout the institution's published materials, the Institutional Report, and the team accreditation visit, CSU Stanislaus presented ample evidence that scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation for both students and faculty are valued and supported (CFR 2.8). Faculty evaluation criteria provided to the accreditation team call for appropriate commitments to scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service (CFR 2.9).

Student Learning and Success

On its Turlock campus, CSU Stanislaus provides robust and comprehensive support for student learning and success. It identifies and supports the needs of its students; tracks aggregated and disaggregated student achievement, satisfaction and campus climate; and promotes students' timely progress to degree (CFR 2.10). The institution provides its students with useful and complete program information and advising (CFR 2.12), monitoring and adjusting these processes at multiple points, and then impressively sharing the findings through the Graduation Rate Excellence and Assessment Team (GREAT) committee.

Through its multiple, overlapping assessment structures and SPEMI office, the university ensures that its co-curricular programs are aligned with academic goals and regularly assessed (CFR 2.11). In this way, appropriate student support services are continuously conceived, implemented, and evaluated (CFR 2.13), for freshmen and transfers alike (CFR 2.14).

However, the team was concerned that the structures ensuring compliance with these Standards for Student Learning and Success, while extensive and thriving on the Turlock campus, are not as robust at the Stockton Center. Advising and student support offices at both locations are staffed with the some of the same people, who report spending nearly all of their time in Turlock. In meetings during the site visit, Stockton employees described personnel, infrastructure, and staffing levels that were inadequate to provide students there with a complete college experience.

Among students interviewed from the Stockton Center the sentiment was nearly uniformly negative when asked about learning support. They described almost non-existent advising and academic support in clear contradiction of the marketing "one university, two campuses to serve you." Except for senior leadership, all groups including faculty, students, and staff associated with the Stockton campus expressed unanimous concern about the lack of support students

received in Stockton. From this evidence the team concludes that, at least for the 19% state supported students at Stockton students who take all of their courses in Stockton, CFRs- 2.10- 2.14 are not being met.

The team encourages the university, and in particular the senior leadership team, to take a close look at its Stockton operation, and clearly align it to the new Strategic Plan, most urgently to evaluate and expand the breadth of student support services. Almost as urgently, campus leadership in should disaggregate the Stockton location's records of learning outcomes assessment, student enrollment patterns, and academic program review, to identify and "soft spots" and immediate opportunities for improvement. Teaching support, levels of administrative staffing, and the center's budgetary/financial plan (budget plan should be based upon the appropriate allocation of enrollment funding and tuition revenue generated by the students/FTE who are served at the Stockton Center) should also be revisited, in light of a comprehensive and realistic evaluation of the location's purpose and potential. Campus leadership should forecast the additional fiscal support (one time and recurring) required to adequately serve the students at the Stockton Center and determine if that incremental fiscal support will have a negative budgetary impact for the Turlock campus given its increased enrollment.

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

From the Fall 2017 census, CSU Stanislaus has 645 faculty including tenure/tenure track and lecturers and a tenure density of 60.4% (all data in this section was gathered from the university's WSCUC Institutional Report). This level of tenure density ensures that faculty roles and governance responsibilities are able to be fulfilled and that faculty have the appropriate backgrounds by discipline. (CFR 3.1) In addition, the campus has 465 staff and 94 administrators and overall the workforce of the University has

become more diverse and reflective of its service region. Since 2013, a higher percentage of faculty and staff self-identified as being non-white and female.

The campus provided the team with links to published policies and procedures for recruitment and evaluation of faculty, staff, and managers including faculty retention, promotion and tenure (CFR 3.2). Tenure policies was one of the three issues identified in the Commission's March 6, 2015 letter. During the campus visit, we were able to confirm that the campus has increased its efforts in the training of all stakeholders in the RPT process and that there is transparency and trust with the decision-making process. The team was advised that the RPT letters are now more personalized and includes personal achievements by the faculty.

In regards to sufficiently supporting faculty and staff development activities, both faculty and staff have access to online training through Lynda.com and the CSU's new system-wide platform SumTotal. Staff have the opportunity to participate in the Academic Resources Conference for CSU professional staff. Faculty also have professional development opportunities through the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. During the session with staff, they expressed a desire for a more robust in-person training and professional development opportunities in addition to existing online resources. (CFR 3.3.)

The data from the employee climate survey conducted during spring 2018 is still be evaluated and reviewed by the senior administration and will provide a good baseline for tracking of employee satisfaction and staff, in particular, are appreciative of the administration's commitment to improving the work environment. The Staff Council is engaged and plans various events and activities that provide support students and the entire campus community. They shared that the campus president recognizes and appreciates the staff and has created a very inclusive, family-oriented campus with a strong sense of community.

The campus provided the team with published documents that support that the campus has functioned without an operational deficit for the last three years (CFR 3.4). Since 2012, the University has increased its reserves to $25 million of which approximately $9 million is set aside in reserves for capital projects and contingency for unforeseen operational needs. There appears to be a transparent, deliberative and consultative process in place (University Budget Advisory Committee) to ensure that the allocation of any new permanent base funding is aligned with the strategic plan priorities and that the academic colleges and schools are now being incentivized in order to retain their carryforward balances. During the campus visit, the team was able to confirm that by fiscal year 2021-22 any recurring salary expense currently being funded by reserves or one-time dollars ($3 million of unfunded obligations) will be integrated into the general fund base budget incrementally over the next three years. Based upon the published documents provided to the team, it appears that budget planning has been realistic based upon enrollment targets and that the percentage of over-enrollment (currently 10% for AY 2018-19) has not negatively impacted the financial sustainability of campus as the campus administration is committed to accepting students who meet the required CSU criteria for admission.

The focus on technology is evident throughout the new strategic plan in order to support the faculty's use of technology in instruction (CFR 3.5). The campus has invested significantly with one-time dollars in the upgrade of technology in classrooms both at the Turlock and Stockton campuses. During the campus visit, the team learned that in the last three years additional fiscal resources have been allocated to the Office of Information Technology who is seen as a strategic partner for many key campus initiatives.

The campus is challenged with limited classroom space given enrollment increases and the need for additional course offerings to meet enrollment demand and graduation rate goals. The decision to prioritize projects that are included in the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program is ultimately made by the campus president.

President Junn's leadership and extensive experience in higher education together with the senior leadership team she has assembled has definitely elevated the stature of this campus. Since her arrival in July 2016, the campus has also received many national accolades for its quality, affordability, and access. The Commission's recommendations from 2015 cite progress in reestablishing a climate of trust and collegiality and in 2017 the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee was disbanded. Another recommendation was to accelerate the work of strategic planning focusing on the changing economic, demographic, and political environment and in November 2017, the campus adopted its new Strategic Plan 2017-2025: A Sense of Place, Inclusion, Transformation, and Future (CFR 3.6).

During the campus visit, the team was able to determine that the campus's organizational structure and decision-making processes were clear and consistent with their mission, vision, and values. There was confidence expressed by students, faculty, and staff that the current administration genuinely supports and models shared governance and the campus climate is positive and energized by the new senior leadership team. The spirit of collaboration has been a "breath of fresh air" and there is a strong "sense of Warrior pride" exhibited by those we met with. (CFR 3.7).

The campus organization chart provided to the team is current appears to adequately support the campus mission. The chief executive officer is the campus president and the chief financial officer reports directly the campus president. The duties and responsibilities of these two

positions are accurately reflected in the respective position descriptions (CFR 3.8). The campus president is visible in the community and the community is actively engaged with the campus.

The 25 member CSU Board of Trustees adopts regulations and policies governing all 23 campuses within the CSU system. The CSU Chancellor reports to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees of the CSU, in partnership with the Chancellor, is responsible for the recruitment, selection and appointment of CSU campus presidents. Campus presidents report to the Chancellor and undergo a review every three years by the Board of Trustees. The 23 CSU campus presidents have numerous responsibilities as the primary liaison between the university and the greater community. (CFR 3.9).

The campus provided the team with links to various documents that define the governance roles, rights and responsibilities of the faculty. Included were the Faculty Handbook, Constitution of the General Faculty, and the governing documents for the Academic Senate (CFR 3.10).

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

Quality Assurance Processes

Quality-assurance processes (4.1) in place to collect, analyze, and interpret data; track results overtime; use comparative data; and make improvements and (4.2); Sufficient institutional research (IR) capacity; data disseminated and incorporated in planning and decision-making; IR effectiveness assessed.

CSU Stanislaus meets this standard but is fairly new in systematizing the process of using data to make improvements and has not yet demonstrated whether actions they have taken will produce positive outcomes. Good work has commenced in making processes compatible with the

new Strategic Plan that apply to appropriate practices approved through appropriate stakeholders. Several key initiatives are underway as well as new divisions and committees mean to enhance the quality of learning and institutional improvement.

SPEMI has done and continues to do great work on building relationships across divisions and providing a data tool to the university so they can access an array of data that helps inform their decision-making process; hence, promoting a data evidence-based ethos.

Special recognition should go to the Director of Institutional Research (IR) his team who served as the architect to the many dashboards now accessible to the campus community. Although, with the hire of the IR Director only two years ago, this office has needed to spend the time organizing its personnel, roles, and responsibilities. The ability to collect data, analyze, and track data is evident but teaching the campus community how to interpret data they have accessed will need more time to determine the process this unit has begun to embed throughout the institution will have a foothold with the various college constituents.

IR will also need to consider helping the college move from descriptive comparative data analysis to evaluations that measure correlational and causational outcomes to help support the work of identifying programs that can be designated as High Impact Practice to better align services given to students that produce a large impact across more populations with a high degree of success.

The GREAT Committee's Steering Committee is responsible for overseeing the workgroups who support and monitor various student success efforts campus-wide. The workgroups operate with critical consideration of long-term and systematic implementation of HIP's to ensure the quality of projects they take on move the efforts of the institution's desire to promote a positive student experience through degree completion.

The Student Affairs Council is a representative group of Student Affairs professionals who embody the exemplar attitude of supporting student success through consistent services they provide that tracks the outcomes of program participation and overall college experience through direct and indirect assessment instruments in accordance to the CAS standards (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education). These embedded standards help the division of Student Affairs continuously measure their performance over time to track both their progress and student outcomes by program.

Institutional Learning and Improvement

The team found that CSU Stanislaus is committed to improvement based on data and evidence; systematic assessment of teaching and learning (CFR 4.3) and a campus environment that utilizes the results of their assessments (CFR 4.4). The team noted ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment (CFR 4.5); appropriate stakeholders are involved in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness.

The CSU Stanislaus WASC Steering Committee is a vibrant collection of faculty, administrators, and staff who are dedicated to seeing both the students and the institution succeed through their efforts in producing the institutional self-study, and the many ways they have connected to other relevant committees who will continue the work on student success and institutional effectiveness. This committee will not continue in its current format but will pass the work on to the committees overseeing the Strategic Plan, GREAT, SPEMI, Student Affairs Council, and the like, including faculty who are directly responsible for curricular assessment to demonstrate learning and improvement across the institution.

The culture of assessment has improved, and it shows through faculty's commitment to the assessment process and the integration of student learning outcomes in the Academic Program Review (APR).

The signature role of the Faculty Assessment Fellow along with the tremendous support of the Assessment Specialist has fostered the institutional culture of assessment through dialogue, relationship building, and faculty support in completing annual assessment reports and their APR.

The development and attention to Student Learning Outcomes at the course-level, program-level, with attention to the five WASC core competencies of Written and Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, and Information Literacy including a sixth competency in Civic Engagement demonstrates the collaborative assessment culture across the colleges and disciplines of the university.

The enhanced and improved Academic Program Review process that incorporates greater inclusion of findings of student learning outcomes and the Provost's response to the conclusion of the self-study that recognizes an implementation plan with action items to close the loop on a department's APR, so faculty can move forward with next steps from their review. Faculty does not want this newly adopted practice to change, they see real benefit in the process as it clearly closes the loop of the APR.

The team also reviewed evidence supporting CFR 4.6. CSU Stanislaus engages planning with institutional reflection among multiple constituencies, indeed, the engagement with a variety of constituencies as much as possible is a signature component of the university's planning process. The Strategic Plan is aligned with the mission of the university (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

CSU Stanislaus meets this standard through its new Strategic Plan and various new committees formed that focus on High Impact Practices as the focus to helping students succeed and how the institution intends to prepare both the college and its stakeholders for the climate and budgetary changes that may come.

C. Component Three: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees

The university deliberately promotes student success with focused attention to identifying High Impact Practices that best serve its student population. The institution conducts both direct and indirect assessment and evaluation in its curricular and co-curricular programs. Curricular assessment is developed and assessed by the faculty, who measure the value of Stanislaus's curriculum delivery and embed this through their Academic Program Review process to ensure any issues that need to be addressed are incorporated through the implementation action plan. Additionally, the CAS standards help track the co-curricular assessment activities outcomes on student experiences outside of the classroom.

The creation of the course, program, and institutional level learning outcomes in conjunction with assessing the GE curriculum corresponds to the institution's commitment providing a valuable and meaningful educational experience for its students.

The IR office has generated several dashboards at the institutional level that interact in storytelling about student enrollment, composition, retention and graduation rates, to mention a few. The office has equipped the institution with data analytics to help campus constituents access to data dashboards similar to the institutional ones that supplement tracking student performances in their degree completion pathway. The team recommends that both Institutional Research and SPEMI should now build on that foundation, by providing the university and its leadership with separate reports of performance at the Stockton location.

D. Component Four: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Student Learning

The university seeks to measure student learning in a number of ways, including NSSE and CLA+ for national benchmarking, and multiple faculty learning communities, a showcase event series, and assessment committees for deeper examination at the institutional level.

Results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA+) are acceptable. The most recent report shows student gains in higher-order learning are slightly above expectations derived from the CLA+ Value Added Model. Similarly, the results of the 2017 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicate that students perceive their own growth positively, and slightly above the average responses for the CSU system and NSSE comparison groups (CFR 2.6).

The institution gave reviewers access to its Campus Labs software for storing and organizing student learning outcomes assessments, and provided sample materials in response to the lines of inquiry that developed during the off-site review of November 29, 2018. The samples indicate that student learning is assessed via embedded classroom assignments (for example in Ethnic Studies 2040, Introduction to Ethnic Studies). The candid evaluation of the sociology program submitted on January 11, 2019 relies on 30 student journals and postgraduation outcomes to assess multiple learning outcomes. The department finds that its goals of social mobility seem largely met, but concedes that evidence of proficiency is weaker in areas that relate to its "core sociology courses - theory, method and sociological writing."

These various materials indicate that the university engages in meaningful assessment of student learning. During our visit the team found that even students at the Stockton location, who

were dissatisfied with the support services available to them, were happy with the quality of the education they were receiving. They believed the university prepared them well for life after graduation. The institution should ensure that all assessment reports and findings of student learning outcomes and actions taken across all disciplines are posted publicly for easy access to reference all the good work being conducted.

Core Competencies

For each Core Competency CSU Stanislaus has developed a faculty learning community. The community and working group leads meet monthly to coordinate and integrate their efforts. To the five WSCUC competencies, the university has added a sixth for civic engagement, and posted all activity on its public website. Materials there confirm the account in the Institutional Report that current work across the groups is at different stages, given their different charges and histories

Oral Communication: is nearing the end of the two-year activity plan, and preparing a final report. The Institutional Report adds that the group has developed a custom rubric for use in classroom evaluation of oral communication, pilot tested in Fall 2018.

Written Communication: no activity posted online. According to the Institutional Report, the group is one of the newest, beginning with a review of current supports for student writing, and a survey to the campus community.

Creative and Analytical Problem Solving: online materials haven't been updated since a final report of August 15, 2013. The Institutional Report recounts some challenges in this area, and ongoing campus discussions about how to define and assess this competency.

Information Literacy: Prepared detailed and well supported recommendations in fall 2018.

Quantitative Reasoning: This working group has gone beyond posting a report to make full use of its web page as a source of research, teaching materials, and exercises that develop this core competency across a range of disciplines. Their work informed the influential CSU Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, convened by the system-level academic senate in 2015-16.

Civic Engagement: convened stakeholders in spring 2018 to inform work in the 2018-19 academic year. It planned to administer a faculty survey in Fall 2018.

Standards of Performance at Graduation

The university embeds assessment of student learning at the program level. All majors and departments are expected to relate their annual assessment reporting to at least some of the institution's six core competencies. As the Institutional Report acknowledges: "Recognizing that not all core competencies are assessed through embedded program-level assessment and may not always be applicable, structures are in place to continue to embed core competencies and assess at or near graduation. The six Core Competencies FLCs will contribute to this integration through resources developed for and shared with the university community." (p30)

The report argues that because students take most of the major coursework in the upper division, locating assessment in departments amounts to assessing standards of performance at graduation. Materials on Campus Labs support this; for example, the BA and BFA degrees in Art reported on July 25, 2018 that the department uses performance at exit to assess its programs: "A direct assessment exercise was applied to the Studio Arts capstone project – the senior exhibition. All tenure-track faculty participated in the exercise. Findings indicate that students attain average competency on most objectives and their strongest accomplishment is in the professional presentation of their work."

Similarly, the history department locates learning outcomes assessment in its Senior Seminar (HIST 4960). The draft Psychology Undergraduate Program Revision submitted to the provost on January 10, 2019, and provided to WSCUC reviewers after the off-site review, epitomizes this approach. It proposes building assessment considerations into a redesigned curriculum anchored by the senior-level capstone courses.

To support such work institution-wide, the university plans to turn next to scaffolding assessment across the student's academic career, to strengthen its collection of formative data that could inform and strengthen student proficiency at graduation.

Across these multiple areas; Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation – the university is either well on track to perform at high levels, or already there. Further disaggregation between the Turlock and Stockton locations will ensure there are no disparities across the student populations.

E. Component Five: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Under President Junn, CSU Stanislaus has become an exceptionally data driven institution, as is clear by an examination of institutional dashboards, their own *Book of Trends* and their reflective Essay 5 in the *Institutional Report*. The university undertook an extensive two-year self-study that was completed in 2018. The Committee notes that data collected from this, and many other initiatives is relatively new. For example, the *Definition of Student Success* (see IR p. 32) was approved by the Academic Senate in March of 2018 is robust, aligned with the mission and assessable, but the success of the institution in meeting this definition will lie in the future (CFR 2.3, 2.4).

Another example of the of the institution's preparing an infrastructure for the assessment of student learning is the establishment of the *Graduation Rate Excellence And Assessment Team*

(GREAT) which was formed in October of 2016. This committee, which comprises 80 faculty, students, staff, and administrators from across the university, is charged with monitoring and gathering data to addressing issues of student success, and implementing effective solutions leading to improvement in this area. While the establishment of the *GREAT* committee clearly establishes a potential for significant improvement and institutional self-reflection over time, the success of this committee also will be determined in the future.

In addition, CSU Stanislaus's IR office has implemented a new system for the assessment and review of student success, program-level review, and institutional data, but this was developed in 2017-18 and the integration of this data in decision making processes is in the early stages.

It is clear that evidence-based strategies for student success are embedded throughout the university. In addition to the units cited above, other components were added to the infrastructure that included the *Faculty Fellow for Assessment* and *College Assessment Faculty Learning Communities* (FLCs) were added in 2017-18, and the annual review of academic program reports made more robust and communicative with other units such as the Office of Assessment in 2016. Of course, in accordance with the CSU Academic Program Review, undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, Honors, and the GE program are systematically reviewed in addition to the internal review processes cited above (CFR 2.7, 4.1).

The team finds that CSU Stanislaus has a thorough and committed apparatus for monitoring educational quality (CFR 1.2, 2.7, 2.13). However, there are two challenges that come with this ambitious approach based on the set of committees and individuals that make up this process. Firstly, the team complements the university for recognizing the need for establishing a culture of assessment in the academic program dedicated to student success. However, it also recognized the challenge of coordinating and sharing this information within a bureaucratic structure that

will afford them the ability to implement change in a systemic way. Secondly, many of these committees are relatively new (from 2016-2018) and their actual efficacy must be closely monitored.

The university is very sensitive to graduation rates and has a sophisticated dashboard that tracks these rates with "precision and dexterity" (IR p. 40). Student subpopulations are disaggregated sensitively (by first generation, Pell eligibility, remediation needed, special admits, sex, underrepresented, and ethnicity) (CFR 2.3, 2.10-14). They are also tracked more generally by cohort (CFR 4.1).

Finally, the team does have concerns about the alignment of student learning goals, retention and graduation rates between the Stockton location and the Turlock campus. Students at the Stockton location do not have the same access to the full functionality of a university campus as the Turlock students do. This is true both for access to faculty and access to all of the support services and co-curricular opportunities that are available in Turlock (CFR 2.3). While we undoubtedly understand the potential in the Stockton location, and are impressed with the credentials and dedication of its new dean, we question whether obtaining a CSU Stanislaus degree is equivalent with a Turlock degree. The university should promptly evaluate performance there, in terms of academic program quality, academic support for students and faculty, student support services, and student success (i.e. persistence and graduation rates). These evaluations should separate performance at Stockton from that of the larger programs at the Turlock campus.

Component Six: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence

The revised APR now connects the strengths of the program, student learning outcomes, and the program's educational quality proposed in an implementation action plan. Upon the completion of the self-study review, the VP for Academic Affairs provides a thoughtful response with budgetary considerations that offers actions to the program's implementation plan. A program review occurs every seven years with summary findings of annual assessment reports during those years associated to the timing of the self-study.

Faculty report that they do not want a change in the APR procedures because they believe it is working better than ever and are finally showing signs of the fruits of their labor in conducting a self-study. Additional work to move PLOs so they use direct assessment measures will help move the APR process of using SLOs beyond its current structure.

The Faculty Assessment Fellow is a significant support to the assessment process that could be converted to a position that is more permanent. For instance, with the assessment of GE underway, having someone who oversees the integration and acclimation of this important assessment of the institution's general education requires a constant presence to ensure its successful implementation.

Support Unit Review (SUR) oversees the review of administrative units, while the Centers and Institutes Review (CIR) conducts reviews for designated centers for the institution. Units and Centers submit annual assessment reports and undergo review every five years.

Closing the loop on assessment activities is uneven. Some programs, units, and centers are further ahead in producing evidence than others and even more so when it comes to using the data to drive decision making. Only the curricular programs that have undergone recent program review will have some evidence of assessment outcomes and program quality information, but in

a few years the cycle of the APR will generate nearly the majority of academic programs that can demonstrate assessment outcomes for multiple years.

The University Strategic Planning Council, SPEMI, Office of Assessment, GREAT, and Student Affairs Council all use data to drive their decision making or to inform institutional improvement.

Some noteworthy departments also contributing to the success of students include the Academic Success Center, Career and Professional Development Center, and Student Support Services. The invigoration of the Academic Success Center helps the success of CSU Stanislaus students. Moreover, the reignition of the Career and Professional Development Center helps students bridge the gap between degree completion to career mindedness by capturing them earlier in their undergraduate education. As an example, the Director of the Center developed the Warrior Wardrobe as a way for students to access business clothing for various purposes from class presentations to job interviews. This offering has given students confidence and self-authorship in navigating away from the notion of "job survival" to professional career. Likewise, the Student Support Services helps first-generation low-income students integrate into an educational setting with mentoring, writing, tutoring, and advising support throughout their undergraduate career. These are just some examples of departments that bridge academic and social experiences of students at the university.

There is demonstrated genuine care for students and pride in being a Warrior. Many staff are also alumni and proud to work and serve at the university. Staff work collaboratively and assist each other, while faculty and staff believe in the mission and serving under-represented students.

Overall, the emphasis of using data to drive decision making has allowed CSU Stanislaus to shift its practices, using assessment and evaluation outcomes of student learning across curricular and co-curricular programs to capture HIPs to act with deliberate and intentional engagement in

student success efforts. The recently revised APR, SUR, and CIR complement measuring institutional effectiveness in curricular, co-curricular, and administrative areas. The newly created SPEMI, which includes the office of IR is a great source of data support and access for the university to engage in data analytics to help tell the story of how it helps students succeed.

Senior administration has advocated in relying on information gathering and use of data findings, and it is with the help of administrative positions such as the Faculty Assessment Fellow, Assessment Specialist, IR Director, and Student Affairs Council who have contributed in promoting this cultural shift in the institutional ethos.

G. Component Seven: Sustainability: Financial Viability; Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

CSU Stanislaus is financially stable and has functioned without an operating deficit for at least three years. The University's general operating base budget for fiscal year 2018-19 including tuition fee revenue was approximately $123 million and increase of approximately $7 million from fiscal year 2017-18. Since 2012, the University increased its reserves from approximately $16 million to $25 million. Approximately $9 million of the $25 million is allocated to reserves for capital projects and contingency. Another $3.8 million of the reserves includes carry-forward balances that each Division is now able to retain which encourages and incentivizes sound budget planning and prudent spending. Assuming that the CSU continues to allocate new enrollment growth funding over the next three years, the University has a proposed plan that will move unfunded ongoing commitments of $3 million into the base budget which primarily include benefits and temporary faculty salaries which have historically been funded using reserves or one-time funds. (CFR 3.4.)

The University has established an annual budget call process that is inclusive and transparent. Each division prioritizes their respective budgetary line item requests that must be in alignment with the University's strategic plan priorities. Once divisions have identified their top five priorities, the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) makes recommendations to the President for final approval of any new recurring base funding allocations. The UBAC has been in place for over 20 years and has representation from students, faculty, and administrators from each divisional area. Its charter was amended in 2013 to include faculty and students. UBAC holds public forums soliciting feedback from the university community (typically 50-100 members from the campus community will attend) and also consults and seeks input from the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC). Overall, the team found the process to be consultative and an excellent example of shared governance. One concern expressed during the site visit is the potential future California economic downturn could affect the campus's ability to adequately serve the Stockton location.

The University's fundraising efforts continue to increase raising over $9 million in the last two years moving them up to #19 in the CSU system. In addition, Stanislaus State was awarded approximately $6 million in sponsored program funding in 2017-18 which helps to support external partnerships and scholarly research.

With the appointment of Dr. Ellen Junn as campus president in July 2016, she brought over 30 years of CSU experience to Stanislaus State. The entire composition of the cabinet has transitioned since her arrival and added a new position: Vice President for Strategic Planning, Enrollment Management, and Innovation. The team noted that the presidential transition was effective and there is respect and trust with this new administration. The team witnessed that the new cabinet appears to work collaboratively and strategically together for the greater good of the

university and its students. The new leadership team comprise extensive higher education and CSU experience that has afforded the opportunity for the implementation of many initiatives and process improvements along with the extensive use of data and assessment to help their drive decision-making. (CFR 3.7.)

At the university all academic programs undergo a regular review every seven years as part of the Academic Program Revenue (APR) process and the review occurs at several levels including department curriculum committees, college-level designated committees, college deans, GE Subcommittee, and the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs. All administrative units undergo a five-year review as part of the Support Unit Review (SUR) process. The SUR process includes a self- study, campus stakeholder surveys, an external reviewer (Subject Matter Expert) and the plan is reviewed by SUR and then provided to the department head and the division Vice President for implementation and execution of recommendations. Approximately ten Support Unit Reviews are completed each academic year. (CFR 4.1.)

The university provided the team with documentation that supports their commitment to evidence-based continuous improvement through regular assessment, evaluation, and use of data to inform decisions. Based on the results of a self-assessment and peer review, the campus acknowledged that they needed to strengthen a bridge between program-level review and institutional level assessment so two components were added in 2016-17: the Faculty Fellow for Assessment and College Assessment Faculty Learning Communities. All course learning outcomes are reviewed by the Assessment Specialist and any revisions to the established assessment policies and procedures are developed and reviewed by the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee and then forwarded through appropriate governance channels. (CFR 4.3, 4.5.). Other institutional-level assessment includes the National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). This data is shared broadly with the University community at events such as the Data-Sharing & Assessment Showcase Event Series. (CFR 4.4.)

The university's new strategic plan entitled "A Sense of Place, Inclusion, Transformation, and Future" was adopted in November 2017 and is an 8-year plan (2017-2025). The plan was unanimously approved by the Academic Senate. The year-long process to develop the plan served more than producing the plan; it was a process that helped restore campus climate and trust among all stakeholders. The strategic plan has five goals: 1) be a student ready university; 2) provide transformational learning experiences driven by faculty success; 3) boldly pursue innovation and creativity; 4) hone administrative efficacy through thoughtful stewardship of resources; and 5) forge and strengthen bonds with our communities rooted in a shared future. The University will work together to outline how strategic priorities will be accomplished through 2025 and has developed monitoring and annual reporting of progress that has representation from all university divisions. (CFR 4.6, 4.7.)

The university has a number of committees that have broad representation of students, faculty, staff and administrators including the President's Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, GREAT, SUR, and the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC).

CSU Stanislaus provides state supported FTES targets to each campus. A campus can decide to cap their enrollment at about 103% of their target and declare that their campus is "impacted" and can no longer accept CSU eligible students On the other hand, a campus can choice to over enroll beyond 103%, not declare the campus impacted, but must admit all CSU eligible students who complete the application process leaving the campus open to unknown risk on the size of the eventual new cohort of students.

Even though CSU Stanislaus has regularly met and exceeded its state funded enrollment target, it has decided not to declare the campus impacted in order to be open to accepting all CSU eligible students who apply. Their decision to remain open to all qualified students is clearly supported by their mission, vision, and values statements. The team paid specific attention to the impact of this decision on academic planning, budget, learning quality, and other matters. The team found widespread support for the campus decision to remain open to all CSU eligible applications despite the pressure this decisions places on academic planning, the budget, and classroom space. Currently, the campus is overenrolled by 10% for AY 2018-19 and will likely to be overenrolled by at least this amount for the foreseeable future. The campus only receives tuition dollars for students over the state budgeted FTES. There is unanimous agreement from the academic leadership and faculty that this level of over enrollment can be accommodated by adding some part-time lecturers and adding a few students to certain class sections. The campus is aware, however, that they will soon run out of classroom space to add sections and will at some point exhaust their local pool of faculty talent. To mitigate these challenges, the campus hopes to receive additional funds from the Chancellor's office, grow their Stockton location, and improve their graduation rate.

Based upon the published documents provided to the team, it appears that budget planning has been realistic based upon enrollment targets and that the percentage of over-enrollment (currently 10% for AY 2018-19) has not negatively impacted the financial sustainability of campus as the campus administration is committed to accepting students who meet the required CSU criteria for admission.

The team commends the campus for their commitment to serving the students in their area and to keeping their doors open to as many students as they can but recommends that the campus

develop very specific assessment tools to monitor the direct and indirect effects of their over enrollment on all aspects of the university and to develop a long range forecast that would alert them to fiscal and quality concerns that could result in continuous growth and criteria or benchmarks available to the campus that would signal to them that a change in this policy would be necessary.

H. Component Eight: Optional Essay on institution-based themes (n/a)

I. Component Nine: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The institutional report and our conversations with leadership, faculty and staff demonstrate the sincere reflection in which the university community has engaged over the past few years and in preparing for this reaffirmation effort. The institutional report was open and reflective in dealing with the challenges the institution has encountered during the last few years. The loyalty of the faculty and staff to the institution is evidenced by the willingness and positive spirit in which they openly speak about the character and future of the university. There is very broad support and respect for the President and the Provost in their leadership in curriculum reform, policy development, problem solving and collaboration with faculty and other leaders (CFRs 2.4, 4.2, 4.3). This was affirmed by the board, president, senior leadership, faculty and staff. There is also strong mutual support among all the senior leadership (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 4.3).

The university has a clear and pervasive vision for the alignment of its mission with the learning goals and professional aspirations of its students (CFRs 1.2,1.4, 2.4, 2.11, 3.1). By any measure, the student body at the Turlock campus understands the dedication and commitment that faculty, staff, and administration have to their academic success.

CSU Stanislaus is to be commended on becoming an institution whose decision-making process is pervasively data based which is widely disseminated and readily available (CFR 1.2,

2.4 , 2.6, 2.10, 4.2). Under President Junn's leadership, this culture of data based institutional examination and reflection for implementing change is widely and confidently accepted.

However, the team believes that the university must stay vigilant in two important arenas. As we have pointed out earlier, many of the new initiatives, committee, task forces, teams, etc. are relatively new. In order to have the good work of these entities affect institutional change and improvement, they must be coordinated and supported over time. This will be a challenging task, but one that is very important for the medium term future. The institutional climate is currently in a very positive place. Therefore, these new entities charged with institutional change improvement have been given an opportunity that they should relish.

Somewhat more problematic is the relationship between the Turlock campus and its educational ambitions for the Stockton location. This is quite clearly set forth in the Strategic Plan for the Stockton location:

> "To fulfill or commitment and excel in the goals set forth in the University
> Strategic Plan, the Stockton location must transition to a vibrant, collaborative,
> and responsive 21st Century Learning Community. The areas that need to
> improve… include (1) Updating infrastructure, (2) Student support and engagement
> services, and (3) Enrollment growth and program offerings. Other areas not outlined
> in this plan include identifying and integrating additional innovative high demand
> programs and partnerships; marketing existing programs, hiring enough faculty to
> meet the demand, diversifying our portfolio, and securing additional resources and
> partnerships; and advancing scholarship which are all a continuous improvement
> process for San State's mission"
> (Strategic Plan: Five-Year:2018-2023; The state of the Stockton Center, p.21).

The team believes this is a clear-eyed assessment of the challenges facing the Stockton location and seriously question whether there is an institutional commitment both in terms of staffing and resources that will achieve these ambitious outcomes.

CSU Stanislaus is deeply reflective of its strengths and challenges, enjoys positive support as a university community with dedicated faculty, administration, and staff members. Given this open and reflective climate, the university has the opportunity to address its challenges and frame its identity as an institution through dialog and visionary leadership in the academic sector.

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

<u>Commendations</u>

1. The university has moved away from the difficult environment of ten years ago and returned to a very positive campus climate. The President and Provost have restored a sense of trust and collaboration across the entire campus while strong faculty leadership and faculty in general have created a vibrant and exciting learning institution.

2. The university made significant progress on all issues raised in the last accreditation review. It has effective shared governance. It has clarified its RPT processes and criteria. It has developed and implemented a new strategic plan with strong support across the campus.

3. There is a high level of commitment for the assessment process across all aspects of the university. The university is commended for being a data-driven campus where decisions are made based on evidence and student learning outcomes.

4. The budget process is consultative, transparent, and aligned with the new strategic plan.

5. The GREAT committee and the Faculty Fellows program show significant promise.

6. Students and student leaders on the Turlock campus are enthusiastic about their university.

7. The team commends the university for its commitment to its student and community. It has intentionally kept its admissions "unimpacted" in order to serve as many students from their catchment area as they can accommodate.

Recommendations

1. Many of the initiatives, particularly in the area of data-driven decision-making and assessment are relatively new to the campus. Therefore, the team recommends that the university closely monitor, track, and support these new efforts to ensure that they remain part of the university culture. Further, these new efforts require continued coordination, a clear cycle of annual reporting across all disciplines, and assured financial support. (CFRs 1.2, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6)

2. The team noted excellent progress in clarifying the RPT process, but noted that in some departments the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, locally known as elaborations, are sometimes too general or a list of many things without priority or value. Is a presentation at a scholarly meeting the same as a published article in a blinded-reviewed journal? The team recommends that the campus carefully review department elaborations to ensure that they are meaningful and trustworthy for those under review. (CFRs 2.8, 3.2)

3. The team recommends that the university develop specific assessment tools to monitor and track the direct and indirect effects of their over enrollment policies (remaining not impacted) on all aspects of the university. Additionally, developing a long-range forecast to alert any fiscal and quality concerns, which may result in continuous growth and

criteria to make available appropriate benchmarks to the campus that would signal whether a change in this policy would be necessary to support the institution's mission and newly crafted strategic plan. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 3.4, 4.6, 4.7)

4. The team's primary concern was the educational experience at the Stockton location. The team recommends that the university, promptly evaluate all aspects of the Stockton location including academic program quality, academic support for students and faculty, student support services, and student success (i.e. persistence and graduation rates). We recommend that assessment, evaluation, and financial planning should separate Stockton from the Turlock campus. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 3.1-3, 4.3, 4.4)

5. Finally, we recommend that the university develop a specific short, medium, and long range plan and benchmarks for Stockton for both academic quality, student and faculty support, physical plant, technology, and fiscal security that would include evidence of progress or lack of progress to determine if the Stockton enterprise is viable in the long run or that a change in objective or any policies would be necessary. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 3.1-3, 4.3, 4.4)

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: CSU Stanislaus

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Name of reviewer/s: Ken O'Donnell and Junelyn Peeples

Date/s of review: April 2, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[1]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

   CSU Stanislaus

   Stockton Campus

   612 E Magnolia Street

   Stockton, CA 95202

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 branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

---

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

The Stockton Campus began in 1974 as a series of courses offered by CSU Stanislaus in downtown Stockton. The campus moved to Locke Center at San Joaquin Delta College in 1981, then moved to its present location in 1998. (https://www.csustan.edu/stockton-campus/about-us) The Stockton Campus is an "off-campus site" of CSU Stanislaus. It offers 9 undergraduate degrees and 4 masters degrees. (https://www.csustan.edu/stockton-campus/majors-programs)

The Stockton and Turlock sites freely share students and faculty, seeing themselves as one university with "two campuses to serve you." The 2017-18 Book of Trends and other institutional research data don't separate headcounts of students and faculty. (See for example http://www.csustan.edu/about/fast-facts.) This was corroborated on the site visit during interviews with students, faculty, and staff at Stockton.

Online Institutional Research dashboards show that in Fall 2018, 670 students at CSU Stanislaus took at least one course on the Stockton Campus, of which 19% took all their courses there. Total FTES for the semester was 273.72. (http://www.csustan.edu/institutional-research/institutional-data/campus-profiles)

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
   The reviewers examined the Institutional Report, online documents, and the Book of Trends (an IR publication launched in 2018-19, the first of a planned annual series). We interviewed faculty and staff at the location on April 2, and students (via Zoom to the Turlock campus) on April 3.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	Currently the university sees the Stockton Campus as a vital resource for San Joaquin County, and is committed to supporting it. Leadership describes Stockton as a population center in need of higher college attainment, and described a sincere effort to develop the P-20 pipeline. The site plan makes good use of the inherited mental health care facility, and operations reflect a small but committed staff.	

Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Integration of the off-campus site into the main university is perceived differently by different stakeholders. The Stockton Campus benefits from a dedicated, talented dean, visibly incorporated into leadership teams at the Turlock Campus. Faculty teach Stockton-based courses in person at the Stockton campus, and hybrid courses in person on one campus and via video to the other, and periodically switch locations during the semester. However, Stockton students reported feeling underserved, observing that this wasn't the fault of individual staff members, but rather a symptom of too few staff to begin with. We noted during our in-person meeting with student support staff that all were also employed on the Turlock Campus, where they said they spend almost all of their time.	

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The physical environment was initially created to house mentally ill wards of the state. Some of that origin is still visible, for example in the heavy classroom doors with small inset windows, the perimeter gate, and the lack of informal meeting space. However, the university is allocating resources to improve on these areas, and the dean has specific plans to repurpose existing spaces.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Student support services at this site are currently inadequate, by the account of all parties we spoke to. Students in particular were extremely frustrated, especially with advising, which is mostly unavailable to them.	We recommend directing current Turlock staff resources to the Stockton Campus, especially in the areas of academic advising, the library, and student services.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Program oversight, faculty professional development, and instructional quality are all high. Because faculty move freely between the campuses, the Stockton Center faculty are indistinguishable from their peers in Turlock.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	Yes, programs and quality at the Stockton Campus are comparable in content, outcomes, and quality to those on the main campus.	

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	We heard mixed reports of how this is tracked. Formal, official accounts from IR don't distinguish students between the two campuses. However, there are informal internal reports available online that show predominantly Stockton-enrolled students persist and graduate at rates comparable to their peers on the Turlock Campus.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Learning and assessment results at the Stockton Campus are managed the same way as those on the Turlock Campus.	

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	The two campuses share curriculum, faculty, and processes for learning outcomes assessment and academic program review. However, during the visit focusing on faculty who teach at Stockton, we got little impression from either the written records or interviews that direct information about student learning is fed back into curriculum design or delivery. Mostly we heard of the means of gathering such evidence (e.g. capstone courses, portfolios), rather than what was changed as a result.	

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM
Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? **X** YES ❑ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? The University Credit Hour Policy is posted on three University website locations: 1) the Academic Programs webpage (https://www.csustan.edu/academic-programs), which provides information and resources for curriculum development, review, and approval; 2) the Faculty Handbook webpage (https://www.csustan.edu/faculty-handbook), which serves as a guide to academic policy and procedures; and 3) in the Academic Catalog, on the Academic Policies, Procedures, and Standards page. Details and **direct links** to the Credit Hour Policy are provided below.
	Comments: Academic Programs webpage: The Credit Hour Policy is explained and linked from the Courses (New & Modifications) webpage (https://www.csustan.edu/academic-programs/course-proposals-curricular-changes/course-proposals). Faculty Handbook webpage: The Credit Hour Policy is listed on the Policies webpage (https://www.csustan.edu/faculty-handbook/policies), and linked (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/u33601/credithour_policy_13-as-12-uepc.pdf). Academic Catalog: Academic Policies, Procedures, and Standards page (http://catalog.csustan.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=1593&hl=%22Academic+Policies%2C+Procedures%2C+and +Standards%22&returnto=search)
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? **X** YES ❑ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? **X** YES ❑ NO

	Comments: A review of credit hour assignments occurs through the University's new and modified course proposal process as well as during 7-year Academic Program Review.
	New and modified course proposals: When new courses are approved by department and college curricula committees, course credit hours assigned are evaluated for appropriateness based on a review of the course description, which includes learning outcomes, textbooks and other resources used, course requirements, and detailed course outlines. Academic Program Review: Application of the Credit Hour Policy is reviewed during the Academic Program Review process, via its Degree Audit step, to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, and appropriate to degree level. Evidence to support credit hour assignments include course syllabi, course learning outcomes, assignment schedules, and class schedules identifying the times that classes meet (if applicable).
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? **X** YES ❐ NO
	Comments: The schedule is available on the Class Schedule page (https://www.csustan.edu/class-schedule) of the University website.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	Type of courses reviewed: ❐ online ❐ hybrid
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? **X** YES ❐ NO
	Comments: The Academic Programs webpage and the Faculty Handbook page list and link the following related policies: • Syllabus Requirements (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/FacultyHandbook/Publications/Polices/Fac/policysyllabusrequirerevise d4-8-14.pdf) • Policy for Online and Technology Mediated Courses and Programs (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/FacultyHandbook/Publications/Polices/Fac/OTMPolicyUEPC.pdf) The Office of Assessment webpage provides resources for developing a syllabus (https://www.csustan.edu/office-assessment/assessment-planning/develop-your-syllabus).
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?

	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? **X** YES ❐ NO
	Comments: CSU Stanislaus should have all course syllabi across all disciplines accessible on-line, currently it depends on the department, and more so at the course level based on the faculty member whether the syllabus is posted.
Appendix 2.2: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet	Individual Study forms include a required performance contract, which must be reviewed and approved prior to enrollment. (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Enrollment%20Services/documents/revised_individual_study_request_12-7-15.pdf). The University's Syllabus Requirements policy applies to all courses that undergo the new and modified course proposal review and approval process, such as internships, labs, and clinical courses. (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/FacultyHandbook/Publications/Polices/Fac/policysyllabusrequirerevised4-8-14.pdf)
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed?
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? ☒ YES ❐ NO

49

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? **X** YES ☐ NO
	Comments: The University does not offer incentive compensation for the recruitment of students.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? **X** YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? **X** YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Information regarding length of time to degree is provided to students through the following: • 2-year and 4-year roadmaps (https://www.csustan.edu/roadmaps) are published on the University website and are used in conjunction with advising sessions. • STAN Planner (https://www.csustan.edu/myacademicpathway/stan-planner), an interactive course planning tool available to all Stanislaus State students through their myCSUSTAN portal, gives a visual presentation of a student's path to timely degree completion based on the student's corresponding 2-year or 4-year degree roadmap for their selected major. Information regarding overall cost of the degree is publically available on the University website (https://www.csustan.edu/financial-aid-scholarship/financial-aid-basics/cost-attendance) and includes the following information for undergraduate, credential, and graduate students: tuition/fees, books/supplies, room/board, transportation, personal/misc., and other fees as applicable. Information provided is a combination of actual costs for the year (e.g., tuition/fees) plus estimates (e.g., off-campus room/board).
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? **X** YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? **X** YES ☐ NO

	Comments:
	Information about the kinds of jobs for which graduates are qualified is available through the following:
	• The University's Career and Professional Development Center (https://www.csustan.edu/career) is designed to help students across all majors make academic and career decisions, and offers major and career exploration tools.
	• Individual departments/programs provide career/job information to students. Some website examples include:

	History (https://www.csustan.edu/history/history-major); Criminal Justice (https://www.csustan.edu/criminal-justice); Psychology (https://www.csustan.edu/psychology); Business Administration, Concentration in Computer Information Systems (https://www.csustan.edu/cba/business-administration/cis); Geology (https://www.csustan.edu/geology); and School Administration (https://www.csustan.edu/advanced-studies/school-administration/career-opportunities). Information about employment and salaries of Stanislaus State graduates is available on the Career and Professional Development webpage (https://www.csustan.edu/career/students-alumni-services/salary-information), which has a specific link to the PayScale report for Stanislaus State (https://www.payscale.com/research/US/School=California_State_University_-_Stanislaus/Salary).

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

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.
(See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? **X** YES ❏ NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? **X** YES ❏ NO If so, where? The applicable policies and procedures are located on the University website (see below for specific links).
	Comments: The University has an Associated Students, Inc. Student Resource Assistant who serves as a liaison for students with faculty and a Specific duties of the Student Resource Assistant include: • Assist students with grade appeal process • Serve as resource referral agent to students • Act as a liaison between the University and the Associated Students, Inc. pertaining to student rights and regulations • Assist students in the understanding of university policies and procedures • Assist students with the Student Petition for Exception to University-Wide Requirements process Below are the various University policies and procedures within the category of student complaints. • Grade Appeal policy and procedures is in the Academic Catalog on the Grading and Academic Standing page (http://catalog.csustan.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=1530), as well as in the Student Handbook (https://www.csustan.edu/judicial-affairs/student-responsibilities). • Accommodation Appeal Process information is located on the Disability Resource Services website (https://www.csustan.edu/disability-resource-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/accommodation-appeal-review-process). Disability Resource Services Grievance Procedure information is located on the Disability Resource Services website (https://www.csustan.edu/disability-resource-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/drs-grievance-procedure). • Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking complaint policy and procedural information is located on the University website, on the Student Handbook page (https://www.csustan.edu/judicial-affairs/student-responsibilities) and on the Title IX page (https://www.csustan.edu/compliance/title-ix). • Housing Administrative Policies and Regulations, which includes policy and procedural information regarding issues such as community living standards, conduct, and safety, is located on the Housing and Residential Life website (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Housing%20%26%20Residential%20Life/18-19/18_19.housing.policies.pdf).

Process(es)/ procedures	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? If so, please describe briefly Procedures for the various categories of student complaints are identified below.	**X**YES ❑ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?	**X** YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Below are the various University policies and procedures within the category of student complaints. • Grade Appeal policy and procedures is in the Academic Catalog on the Grading and Academic Standing page (http://catalog.csustan.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=1530), as well as in the Student Handbook (https://www.csustan.edu/judicial-affairs/student-responsibilities). • Accommodation Appeal Process information is located on the Disability Resource Services website (https://www.csustan.edu/disability-resource-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/accommodation-appeal-review-process). Disability Resource Services Grievance Procedure information is located on the Disability Resource Services website (https://www.csustan.edu/disability-resource-services/policies-procedures-guidelines/drs-grievance-procedure). • Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking complaint policy and procedural information is located on the University website, on the Student Handbook page (https://www.csustan.edu/judicial-affairs/student-responsibilities) and on the Title IX page (https://www.csustan.edu/compliance/title-ix). • Housing Administrative Policies and Regulations, which includes policy and procedural information regarding issues such as community living standards, conduct, and safety, is located on the Housing and Residential Life website (https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Housing%20%26%20Residential%20Life/18-19/18_19.housing.policies.pdf).	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? If so, where? • Grade Appeal hard copy records are securely maintained in the Academic Programs office within the Office of the Provost. • Accommodation Appeal Process records and Disability Resource Services Grievance Procedure records are maintained in Maxient, a cloud-based password-protected database. • Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking complaint records are securely maintained in Maxient, a cloud-based password-protected database, and any hard copies received by complainants are securely maintained in the Office of the Senior Associate Vice President of Human Resources, Equal Opportunity and Compliance. • Housing and Residential Life records pertaining to student complaints are maintained in two databases, StarRez (a password-protected database on the csustan.edu server) and Maxient (a cloud-based password-protected database).	**X** YES ❑ NO

	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?　　　　　　　　**X** YES ❒ NO
	If so, please describe briefly:
	- Grade Appeals are tracked in an internal Academic Programs office database, and reported annually by the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs to the Academic Senate (via the Speaker of the Faculty) and the University President. - Accommodation Appeal Process records and Disability Resource Services Grievances records are tracked through Maxient data analytic reports. - Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking complaint records are tracked over time through Maxient data analytic reports. - Housing and Residential Life complaint records are tracked through StarRez and Maxient analytic reports. Programming, communication, and procedures adaptations are made based on trends tracked over time.
	Comments:

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? **X** YES ❒ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? **X** YES ❒ NO If so, where? The policy is in the Academic Catalog posted on the University website (see below for specific links).
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? **X** YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Stanislaus State has ultimate authority in determining acceptance of transfer credit, but the institution closely adheres to CSU systemwide policies. Such authority is summarized in the University's Academic Catalog (http://catalog.csustan.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=1613) under section General Admission Procedures and Policies, subheading Transfer Policies of CSU campuses. More specific policies and procedures in the Academic Catalog are referenced on the Course Credit page (http://catalog.csustan.edu/content.php?catoid=22&navoid=1531&hl=%22course+credit%22&returnto=search#CLEP_GE_Credit_Allowances) under the following sections: • College Board Advanced Placement Examination Policy (AP) • College Level Examination Program (CLEP) General Examination Credit Allowances • College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Subject Credit Allowances • International Baccalaureate Credit (IB) • Evaluation of Transfer Credit • Transfer of Credit from a Community College • Credit for Noncollegiate Instruction • Distance Learning Courses • Military Service Credit In addition, the University has specific course-to-course articulation with California Community Colleges displayed at www.assist.org.

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.