REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To California State University, Monterey Bay

March 27-28, 2019

Team Roster
Denise E. Konan, Chair
Dean, College of Social Sciences
Professor of Economics
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Cheryl L. Ney, Assistant Chair
Dean, Charter College of Education
Professor of Chemistry
California State University, Los Angeles

Jeffrey Reeder
Chair, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Sonoma State University

Ysabel Trinidad
Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
California State University, Channel Islands

Clare Weber
Deputy Provost for Academic Programs
California State University, San Bernardino

WSCUC Staff
Mark Goor

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant
B. Description of Team's Review Process
C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment
H. Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes
I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

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

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms
    1. Credit Hour Review
    2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
    3. Student Complaints Review
    4. Transfer Policy Review
B. Distance Education
C. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. The Institution and Its Accreditation History

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB), is the 21st campus established in the 23-campus California State University (CSU) system. The university was founded in 1994 on the site of the former military base, Fort Ord. Its founding vision still resonates for "a multi-lingual, multi-cultural campus with collaboration across campus with the community for highly valued, novel interdisciplinary programs and other academic programs that use regional assets". The enrollment at CSUMB has grown steadily since 1994, reaching a total enrollment of more than 7,500 students in fall 2018. The university's student body displays considerable diversity with 71% under-represented minorities (URM) and Asian/Asian-Americans. CSUMB has been designated as an Asian American/Native American/Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI) and an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). CSUMB students are served by 166 tenure line faculty (who are 41% URM+Asian/Asian-American with 5% unknown race/ethnicity), 344 lecturers (who are 26% URM+Asian/Asian-American with 15% unknown race/ethnicity) and 477 staff and administrators (who are 40% URM + Asian/Asian-American).

Currently, the university is focused on several key strategic themes—student success, academic excellence, regional stewardship and institutional excellence. To achieve its mission and strategic themes, the university is organized into four divisions: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Services, Administration and Finance and University Development. Academic Affairs is organized into six colleges: College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Business, College of Education,

College of Health Sciences and Human Services, College of Science and the College of Extended Education and International Programs. Within Academic Affairs, there are two Associate Vice Presidents overseeing 10 non-college units. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs has 14 direct reports, including Information Technology. CSUMB offers 25 baccalaureate degrees, three teaching credentials and six master's degrees. Of these degree programs, three are offered completely online (BS Computer Science, MS in Instructional Science and Technology. The campus has three off-campus sites: one in North Salinas county, one at the King City site of Hartnell College, and one at the Paso Robles site of Cuesta College, where the following programs are offered: MS for Physician Assistant, BA degree completion in Liberal Studies and BSN completion. The campus refers to both online offerings and offerings at off-campus sites as distance education. (See appendix C.)

In 1998, the Commission approved the university's candidacy for accreditation, followed by initial accreditation with CPR/EER in 2001-2003 and re-affirmation of accreditation with CPR/EER in 2009-2011. An Interim Report was requested for 2014 to address progress in data analysis and use; improving retention and graduation rates and assessing the various initiatives to support students' completion; continuing improvements in assessment and program review; defining academic rigor and addressing the financial challenges arising from the state budget crisis. The Interim Report Committee received the report and scheduled the reaffirmation reviews (OSR in fall 2018, AV in spring 2019).

Since 2011, the WSCUC Off-Campus and Substantive Change Committee reviewed the following proposals: 1). MS for Physician Assistant (a new degree program approved

by the Commission in June 2018), 2). Three offsite locations (North Salinas County site and Hartnell College site in King City in May 2018 and Cuesta College site in Paso Robles in February 2017, 3). The BS in Computer Science and Information Technology by distance education in July 2013, and 4). The MS in Instructional Science and Technology by distance education in January 2012.

B. Description of Team's Process

The evaluation team reviewed all materials provided by the institution along with the Institutional report, Commission action letters, and additional materials that were requested after the OSR. The team found the institution's staff to be very responsive to all requests for information. The accreditation team—the chair, assistant chair, and three other members—began its work on March 25, 2019 by meeting with the institution's president followed by 23 meetings held through March 29, 2019, with various groups and individuals from across campus. Meetings with faculty, staff, administrative leaders, students and external partners helped team members better understand CSUMB and the institution's practices and performance, especially in areas that the team had identified as lines of inquiry during its offsite review (listed below). In addition, the team reviewed communications sent to the confidential e-mail account set up for the review and two team members visited one of three off-campus sites (North Salinas County). The "Lines of Inquiry" that were a focus of the team's site visit were:

- strategic plan alignment with institutional purposes,
- student learning and success for all students,
- fostering diversity and professional development of faculty and staff,
- distance education,
- assessment and resource allocation,
- leadership and decision-making and
- developing and applying resources to ensure quality and sustainability

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

The team found CSUMB's Institutional Report to be well organized and thorough, elaborating both the strengths and challenges in how the institution is currently addressing the Components. Responsibility for preparing the report, including the Self-Review under the Standards, was divided among five subcommittees of the campus WSCUC Steering Committee and existing administrative and faculty groups or committees. This work was reviewed by the WSCUC steering committee composed of administrators, staff and faculty representing the various committees of the Academic Senate. Co-chairs of the steering committee presented drafts of the report to college wide meetings in fall 2017 and again in spring 2018. There was wide campus engagement with the development of the report, in preparation for the visit and during the visit. Additional requests from the team for information and data subsequent to the Institutional Report were addressed in a thorough and timely manner.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In its communications following CSUMB's Capacity and Preparatory Review (2009) and Educational Effectiveness Review (2011), the Commission raised several issues for the university's attention and action particularly with respect to educational effectiveness and student learning. Five areas of concern were identified: collection and use of data for decision-making in assessment of student learning and program review; improving retention and graduation rates and assessing the various initiatives related to student success; teaching and learning in capstone courses; academic rigor; and financial resources.

CSUMB has made substantive progress in many of these areas under the leadership of a new President, Dr. Eduardo Ochoa beginning summer 2012. Most remarkably, CSUMB was rated by the Chronicle of Higher Education second in the nation among public institutions for their rapid improvements in six-year graduation rates, moving from 37.8% in 2011 (the lowest of the CSU campuses) to 53.4% in 2015 or a percentage point increase of 15.6. This substantial improvement in student success has been supported by significant institutional investments into improving data collection, analysis and assessment (CFR 2.10). The Institutional Assessment and Research (IAR) office serves as a hub for generating, collecting and disseminating data, and much user-friendly capacity has been added with a new data warehouse and dashboards, survey instruments, and alignment of data to program review (CRF 4.1, 4.2). Integration of data-driven academic decisions has been facilitated through innovations like college faculty serving as 'data fellows' to encourage integrity in decision-making (CFR 3.7). The institution has continued to strengthen the capstone experience, with faculty learning communities and synergistic civic engagement efforts (CFR 2.11). CSUMB also undertook impactful campus-wide conversations to define rigor and enhance it across the curriculum, with faculty oversight.

CSUMB has made less progress on addressing the financial challenges that they faced during the prior report, even with recent signs of augmentation from the state budget. CSUMB currently maintains an over-enrollment of students without a clear plan on how to make changes in enrollment management or achieve growth-oriented economies of scale. As will be seen in this report, the team continues to have concerns about the

alignment of the budget to strategic priorities, and to the opportunity to develop robust alternative funding streams (CFR 3.4, 3.5).

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

The team report will address the Standards and Criteria for Review (CFR) in multiple ways and in detail according to the Components below. Here the team offers general observations regarding CSUMB's fulfillment of the Standards as reflected in the Institutional Report and accompanying materials as well as the team's visit to the main campus and one off-campus site.

Standard I: *The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values, character, and ways in which it contributes to the public good.*

CSUMB is one of the 23 campuses within the California State University system. Its mission is "to build a multicultural learning community founded on academic excellence from which all partners in the educational process emerge prepared to contribute productively, responsibly, and ethically to California and the global community". The core values the institution is committed to are expressed in the Founding Vision Statement of 1994. They provide a set of focal points for its academic programming, enrollment efforts, budgeting, fundraising, and general operations, which are:

- Applied, active, and project-based learning activities
- Interdisciplinarity
- Multicultural and global perspectives
- Technological sophistication
- Service learning
- Ethical reflection and practice
- Collaboration

The current CSUMB Strategic Plan (2013-18), widely shared on campus, contains four themes, each with various strategies that have been identified and are monitored.

- Student success (four strategies)
- Academic Excellence (nine strategies)
- Regional Stewardship (five strategies)
- Institutional Capacity (six strategies)

The university is making substantive progress on all the strategic themes and the efforts have been systemic, intentional and meaningful (CFR1.1)

CSUMB has clearly and publically defined its vision, mission, values and strategic priorities and each of those are appropriate for an institution of higher education. The mission statement and strategic themes are widely shared among the campus community and embedded into the institution's formal decision-making process and its goals for student learning. Since the last comprehensive review, the campus has significantly improved its data collection and analytical capabilities to inform progress on institutional priorities. The staff of the Institutional Assessment and Research Office regularly collect, analyze and share data on student retention and graduation, student learning outcomes, program review and surveys. Various faculty committees, personnel in the colleges and administration are able to monitor and evaluate student outcomes in comparison with established goals. (CFR 1.2)

Faculty rights and responsibilities, including the commitment to academic integrity and academic freedom, are clearly stated on the website in the "Policies" section and in the Constitution of the Academic Assembly. The university catalog specifies the rights and responsibilities of students. These and other published policies and practices guide the adherence of the institution to its mission. The institution has an established system of shared governance. Faculty members are expected to participate in curricular and

important university decision-making processes using consultative procedures through engagement in the Academic Senate and its committees, and other ad hoc university committees (CFR 1.3)

The student body of CSUMB is racially and ethnically diverse. In fall 2018, 71% of the student body were under-represented minorities (URM) or Asian/Asian-American. In contrast, only 26% of the lecturers and 41% of the tenure line faculty are URM or Asian/Asian-American. Among staff, 40% are URM or Asian/Asian-American. In response to the increasing diversity of the CSUMB community, the Office of Inclusive Excellence was created in 2013 and several actions have been taken annually since then to respond to issues of diversity. The campus hired Halualani and Associates to conduct a very comprehensive Diversity Mapping Data Portrait, with results presented in January 2015. This was followed by a campus climate survey conducted by three CSUMB faculty who presented the results in spring 2016. Results indicated that most students are having positive experiences, however, students of color, LGBTQ students and students with disabilities are experiencing discrimination and don't feel a sense of belonging. Concerns among staff and faculty that were identified are: inclusion and diversity, communication, hierarchies and pay/recognition. As a result of this study, the President appointed an Advisory Committee on Equity and Inclusion co-chaired by the Provost and Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence and work on an Inclusive Excellence plan was initiated spring 2017 and completed in spring 2018. However, there is more work that needs to be done by the campus to fulfill the 2007 WASC Commission's recommendations on diversity (CFR 1.4).

Standard 2: *The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of the curriculum offered.*

CSUMB provides educational programs that are appropriate in content, scope, and rigor for the degree level awarded. The degree programs are of sufficient depth and breadth to prepare students in their academic fields of study, and the program of General Education is articulated and connected to the curriculum as a whole, including general requirements such as service learning and capstone. Academic expectations and learning outcomes are clearly stated to students in the catalog, in course syllabi, in transfer agreements, and in other published university and program materials, although there are reported difficulties with academic advising. (CFR 2.1-2.5, 2.13, 2.14).

The university has a high quality program review process that ensures that each academic program is regularly reviewed; this process is supported by a robust suite of evidentiary tools that are available to the campus community for assessment, planning, and program improvement purposes. There is a clear commitment to ongoing, evidence-based, innovations and improvements at the university (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 2.10).
Although tenure density remains a challenge for CSUMB, academic scholarship is supported by the university, albeit somewhat inconsistently across the disciplines because support for faculty research comes primarily at the college level. In many programs across CSUMB, research is also actively engaged in by students under faculty supervision and mentoring, a fact that adds to the evidence that the university values connections between scholarship and teaching (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

Support for student learning and success is an intentional and integrated part of the mission and function of the university. Efforts to treat students as whole, multi-faceted people and members of the university 'ecosystem' are evident and include meaningful and beneficial services provided by the university on behalf of students experiencing a range of needs, including academic, psychological, disability, housing, and many others; the university's concerted efforts in these areas is commendable and has resulted in an improved student experience for a large number of students (CFR 2.13).

Standard 3: *The institution sustains its operations and supports for the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

As a member of the 23-campus CSU system, CSUMB is governed by the CSU system's 20-member board of trustees appointed by the governor of California. The board of trustees is responsible for oversight of the California State University system and regularly participates in various activities to ensure effective oversight of a diverse and complex 23-campus system. As a growing institution of higher education, CSUMB should continue to evolve its organizational structure to employ effective academic and institutional leadership. The institution will need to see additional enrollment growth to achieve the economies of scale that create expected organizational efficiencies in operations (CFR 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 4.6).

CSUMB has maintained a stable financial net position with a positive year-end fund balance in its operating budget in each of the last five years despite lack of state support for recent enrollment growth. As funding from the state continues to catch up with additional appropriations to fully support existing enrollments, the university will be in a position to further invest in programs that support student success. Despite the challenges associated with the conversion of the campus from its former military base facilities, significant progress continues to be made with several capital project underway from academic to student co-curricular facilities in alignment with the physical master plan. The university should consider the linkages between institutional planning such as program review to resource allocation to make the process more explicit and transparent. Distance education either online or offsite currently plays a growing role in regional stewardship and will continue to do so into the future (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 3.7).

Through 2015-16, CSUMB experienced increasing enrollments and beginning 2016-17, enrollments were leveled off primarily due to the lack of adequate state support for additional enrollments to support growth. At its peak in 2014-15, unfunded enrollments accounted for approximately 15% of the total enrollment that year. CSUMB has used a strategy of flat enrollments, degree program impaction (a common CSU enrollment management tool) and increasing international student enrollment to offset the lack of resources. The majority of new funding received by the institution in the last four years has been invested in instruction and academic support though the percentage of tenure-track faculty still falls slightly below the CSU system average. CSUMB continues to maintain positive momentum in its commitment to diversity, including the hiring of a chief diversity officer and the president's establishment of an advisory Committee on

Equity and Inclusion. Robust programs to support faculty, student and staff development and training to improve, teaching, learning and assessment are offered by the Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

Standard 4: *Creating an organization committed to quality assurance, institutional learning and improvement.*

The leadership, faculty, and staff of CSUMB are committed to institutional learning and improvement based on evidence and ongoing evaluation as exemplified by the rigor incorporated into the academic program review process (CFR 4.1, 4.3). Activities such as the university's seven-year academic program review cycle and most other institutional programs that require decision-support information rely on institutional research to meet their data requirements. The Office of Institutional Research (IAR) effectively supports the planning and data informed decision-making for all levels of the university (CFR 4.2).

CSUMB demonstrates its commitment to a culture of assessment by the engagement of faculty in meaningful, program and institutional levels of assessment of student learning. (CFR 4.4) The team observed a variety of methods to involve alumni, faculty, staff and students as well as stakeholders from the surrounding community in institutional assessment and planning activities. (CFR 4.5, 4.6). As a growing institution in the CSU System, CSUMB regularly assesses its dynamic environment and recalibrates its growth and resource allocation plans to respond these changes (CFR 4.7)

Federal Compliance Forms, Distance Education Review and Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators: (See the appendix below.)

C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

The meaning of a CSUMB degree is reflective of the institution's vision, "[t]he curriculum of CSUMB will be student and society centered and of sufficient breadth and depth to meet statewide and regional needs, specifically those involving both inner-city and isolated rural populations, and needs relevant to communities in the immediate tri-county region (Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito)".

The CSUMB degree demonstrates a commitment to institutional practices that ensure students' multidisciplinary experiences and values of cohesiveness, collaboration, applied, and active learning. The team noted that CSUMB has effectively institutionalized a set of high impact practices that include a first-year seminar as part of its General Education curriculum, a service-learning requirement that fosters multicultural competence and social justice, a junior entry course, a discipline-specific capstone experience, and undergraduate student engagement in research. These high impact practices reflect a connection to relevant community needs.

The team noted the significant improvement in graduation rates from 23.1% in the 2011 cohort to 30.1% in the 2013 cohort. Additionally, CSUMB student's success team has made strides in closing the achievement gap for under-represented minority (URM) students. Furthermore, the team observed strong support for faculty to engage in faculty development at the Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment in part to achieve multi-disciplinary goals, high impact practices, and integration of social justice. All of which contribute to a cohesive meaning for the degree. The values of the University are expressed in well-defined institutional and degree program learning outcomes.

Furthermore, continuous improvement is evident in the development of the new General Education learning outcomes and the new General Education curriculum model to be implemented in fall 2019. CSUMB has taken steps to further develop its General Education learning outcomes with a director of General Education (GE) now in place. The University is completing its Graduate Learning Outcomes to ensure rigor and depth of degree appropriate to graduate course level work.

CSUMB demonstrates the quality of the degree through assessment and continuous improvement of academic programs, external accreditations, and indirect measures such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), student and faculty surveys, and diversity mapping. The University's Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment is well developed. The four undergraduate Institutional Learning Outcomes of Intellectual Skills; Personal, Social, and Professional Responsibility; Integrative Knowledge; and, Specialized Knowledge are on a two-year assessment cycle and tied to the core competencies.

The team noted that CSUMB ensures integrity through peer review and multiple levels of curricular review. There was a significant commitment to this process. CSUMB's seven core academic values include: applied, active, and project-based learning activities; interdisciplinarity; multicultural and global perspectives; technological sophistication; service learning; ethical reflection and practice; and, collaboration. These core values are linked to the broad academic goals of: effective and ethical communication in at least two languages with widely diverse audiences; cross-culturally competent citizenship in a pluralistic and global society; technological, aural, and visual literacy; creative expression in the service of transforming culture; ethics,

social justice, and care for one another; scientific sophistication and value for the earth and earth systems; holistic and creative sense of self. The University integrates the values and goals into the assessment process, based on data analysis and reflective of a comprehensive university committed to the integrity of the meaning and quality of the degree (CFRS 1.2, 2.2-4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

CSUMB has four clearly defined undergraduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that guide student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation. The team was pleased to see the level of detail in their examination of institution-level core competency assessment projects, particularly since 2014, with the development and implementation of a robust system of procedures to assess quantitative reasoning, written communication, and oral communication. In subsequent iterations of the assessment procedures, with the development of new rubrics and improved methodologies, the core competencies have been reassessed and assessments are now scheduled to repeat on an ongoing two-year cycle.

Evidence provided in the Institutional Report and interactions with students and faculty demonstrates that the university has a culture of successfully embedding ILOs into program and course requirements as well as successfully assessing outcomes for continuous program improvement. For example, students showed increases between 2014 and 2017 in their responses to questions on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) related to the extent to which they viewed CSUMB as contributing to their core competencies, and the students reported at higher than average levels on questions relating to information literacy.

Students also reported high levels of engagement with opportunities for critical thinking in senior-level courses, although interestingly, students rated their own level of preparation for the capstone as much higher than did the corresponding faculty, suggesting that work remains to be done around definitions and expectations with respect to core competencies. (CFR 1.2, 2.4, 2.6)

Improvements in educational quality and student achievement have been guided by a series of coordinated and interrelated steps. Among these steps is an effort to assess the extent to which core competencies are embedded in the GE curriculum, improvements in assessment validity and reliability by working directly with programs and faculty, continued focus on assessment design and other professional development opportunities and promoting a culture of assessment, among other efforts. (CFR 2.2a, 2.10)

With respect to ILO2, social, personal, and professional responsibility, the university has just recently developed standards and pilot assessments in this area, although the upper-division service learning courses are able to provide some evidence as to students performance in meeting this objective. NSSE results are comparable to other CSU institutions in this area, and internal service-learning surveys suggest that students are highly likely to have had their attitudes made more positive toward service as well as being more likely to experience greater feelings of engagement, exploration of social justice, and to acquire skills and knowledge that may become more relevant in their future careers. (CFR 2.3)

The team has noted favorably that program review occupies a prominent role in assessing and improving the quality of learning at CSUMB; this will be discussed in greater detail below. The university directs programs that their learning objectives and

core competencies should be aligned by explicitly identifying the objectives' connections to the core competencies so that student standards of performance at graduation are made clear. The team commends the university for establishing and fostering a robust and comprehensive culture of assessment, including the use of rubrics, student benchmarks, and engagement of faculty, along with an institutional investment in improving performance metrics, all of which form the underpinnings of the well-defined processes for ensuring that student learning, the core competencies, and the standards of performance at graduation reflect upon the mission of the university. (CFR 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, Retention, and Graduation

Student Success, Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation are primary and intentional priorities at CSUMB. The university has made remarkable progress with respect to concerted and integrated efforts between academic affairs and students affairs to develop the whole student. These efforts include, among others, support for students' basic needs, student disability resources, and the Personal Growth and Counseling Center. The campus' visionary and enlightened definition of student success as being one which encompasses the 'whole student', and its targeted efforts around the "Otter Promise" which articulates with the CSU system's Graduation Initiative 2025, are central to the positive results that exist in this area.

A noteworthy development related to the university's integrated efforts in student success is that the campus exceeded its target graduation rate from the prior 2009 CSU Graduation Initiative, and the campus continues to make considerable improvements in improving its graduation rates across demographic groups under the 2025 Graduation Initiative. Specific actions that have contributed to these improvements include

increasing staffing resources to the advising and career center, improving the student/counselor ratio and therefore student access to trained staff at the counseling center, support structures for students in financial crisis, and many other initiatives to support student success. These offices and their dedicated staffs have provided the leadership and expertise that have resulted in improved outcomes for CSUMB students, and the university is to be commended for the significant progress made since the last comprehensive review. (CFR 1.2)

CSUMB defines student success as the students' ability to persist, make continuous progress toward and complete a credential, certificate or degree program. For traditional undergraduate students, student success includes continuous enrollment and degree completion. Recognizing that non-traditional undergraduate and graduate students may experience family and career demands that require non-enrollment for a short period, the university defines success as maintained enrollment within an academic year rather than continuous, semester-by semester enrollment.

The institution has built an exemplary dashboard to provide data to enable comprehensive student success. The dashboard is constructed in a way that it provides meaningful, relevant, and timely data to staff, faculty, and administrative decision-makers in order to plan for improvement. The system is constructed in such a manner that it continuously updates with new data that is imported from campus data sources without the need for constant intervention, making it a sustainable venture. It is commendable that CSUMB has taken a comprehensive and focused effort to measure and share student success rates. The student success team has learned from many of its past and ongoing

initiatives and continues to explore multiple ways to improve the outcomes for students (CFR 2.10).

Using the available data, CSUMB has increased its efforts to retain second-year students with new initiatives targeting the needs of that specific population, such as the second-year SURGE, mandatory advising, and a more deliberate curricular integration of second-year requirements; these and other student focused efforts indicate that the university is diligently fulfilling its mission to minimize points in the student experience at which there are suboptimal retention rates.

Upper-division transfer (UDT) students are also the beneficiaries of several effective policies and favorable conditions that have led to a very high retention rate. Not only are UDT students likely to retain and persist, but there are no meaningful gaps in retention and persistence between the overall student cohort as compared to under-represented minority (URM) students and Pell-eligible students in the cohort. In 2016, the university conducted a 'Doubters and Departers' survey to gather information on the potential causes for students who were considering leaving; the survey pointed, among other things, that students felt that they were not well-prepared for the capstone requirement or who felt that the language requirement was not relevant to their needs. To this end, the university formed a Capstone Scholars Workgroup in 2017 to plan and update practices around the capstone requirement. In addition, the language requirement has recently been revised to a broader requirement for language and culture. Students interviewed during the team visit, appear to think this new requirement is closer and more relevant to their field of study. In addition to these curricular and support adaptations, several new funds to provide monetary support and scholarships were established to address issues

raised in the ‘Doubters and Departers’ survey; furthermore, additional efforts by the Associated Students, Inc., in conjunction with the university, such as the establishment of a food pantry to combat issues around food insecurity provide further support to students.

Among First Time Freshmen (FTF), the university reported growth in graduation rates among most populations, resulting in a four-year graduation rate of over 30% among FTF in the 2013 cohort. This increase in graduation rates was across all student population groups, and thus CSUMB maintains one of the lowest graduation rate achievement gaps among CSU campuses. A similar improvement in graduation rates among UDT students is also noteworthy and commendable, climbing to 42.4% in the 2015 cohort, up by nearly 10% in just two years over the rate reported for the 2013 cohort. At the same time the URM gap has narrowed to just a handful of students among that population, at only 2% among the 2015 cohort. Among graduate student cohorts, completion rates are highly variable, with a notably low three-year completion rate for the M.S. in Marine Science. Currently under review are ways that the organizational structures can be adjusted to improve graduate student outcomes along with the development of procedures and structures to increasingly support graduate studies.

Student preparation upon arrival is a concern to the university for many reasons, including that it potentially impacts completion and persistence rates. With this in mind, ‘Math Huge’ is an innovative and effective program established in 2007 that has been recognized with a substantial grant from the California Department of Finance for its success at preparing otherwise underprepared students for the rigors of college-level math and quantitative reasoning coursework. In the area of written communication, the university has been working on an approach since 2015 to integrate written and oral

communication using learning transfer theory; the subsequently developed yearlong course has thus far shown promising results for student preparation.

In meetings with students and student government leaders during the on-site visit, they nearly all reported that the available academic advising services from the Center for Advising, Career & Student Success (CACSS) have been problematic. Students reported that there were occasionally long wait times for appointments, that the advising was often erroneous and in some cases led students to take unnecessary courses, and that the advising was not always emotionally supportive. Advising issues were reported to be a "major problem area for student progression" in the 2018 Institutional Report; it appears from student input that it continues to be a problem area, and this report recommends improvements in the area of academic advising. (CFR 2.12)

Conversely, the Personal Growth & Counseling Center (PGCC) nearly universally received accolades from the students, who reported that they or persons known to them had used the service and reported high levels of satisfaction. The highly effective PGCC, the efforts of the Health and Wellness center, student disability resources, and the university's clear and continuing commitment to student basic needs is commendable and contributes to a positive and encouraging climate for student success. (CFR 2.13)

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

Since the 2011 reaccreditation, the CSUMB has modernized and strengthened program review processes (CFR 2.4, 2.7). In 2015, the Senate Assessment Committee led an effort to gather feedback on program review from faculty and department chairs. In an collaborative effort between the faculty and administration, the program review

process was revised to incorporate more faculty participation, systematic assessment activities, and meaningful outcomes in the form of a 2016 Program Review Manual. The current process is a seven-year cycle beginning with a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) that incorporates strategic directions, resource assessment and proposed program changes. All programs are given time to reflect and meaningfully build out a plan. The process also aligns institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) with the curriculum and incorporates annual assessment plans.

Another area of improvement has been in the quality and systematic use of data with support from the Institutional Assessment and Research (IAR) regarding student success indicators (CFR 4.1, 4.2). Most significantly, the revised Manual incorporates more deliberate and coordinated engagement of faculty in the program review process (CFR 2.4, 2.7).

Sample programs that have gone through this review process demonstrate that meaningful improvements are being made upon the basis of the review (CFR 4.1, 4.2). For example, the program review of student affairs identified a strong need to increase mental health services to students. Student input and an external evaluator identified the strong need to address shortfalls in mental health services. The university responded to these recommendations, including augmenting counselors so as to assure student access. In open student meetings as well as with student leaders, these decisions were lauded as responding to student needs. In another case, the Program Review process was used to identify shortcomings in course offerings in the Music Department, and faculty lines were added on the basis of the review.

The team questioned how distance-learning or online programs are reviewed, as the 2016 Program Review Manual does not specifically address these programs. It appears that some programs distinguish between online and traditional courses in their assessment efforts. Developing specific rubrics for quality assurance in online programs should be considered.

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

The team reviewed CSUMB's audited financials for the last three fiscal years. The statements for each year are included in the CSU System annual financial audit and accompanied by an opinion that the financial position is fairly presented. The Statements of Net Position and the Statement of Revenue, Expenses, and Change in Net Position for the periods ending June 30, 2015 through 2017 reflect a stable campus total position each year each year inclusive of all its auxiliaries. In each of the last five fiscal years, the campus operating budget reflected a positive ending fund balance. The institution also benefits from the increasing net position of the University Corporation at Monterey Bay. This is noteworthy as an alternative revenue source given the challenges of the CSU system to increase funded enrollments with limited available new funds and has provided the institution with additional financial flexibility. At its peak in 2014-15, CSUMB had an over-enrollment of approximately 904 full-time equivalent students with an actual enrollments to funded enrollments lag of approximately 15% (CFR 3.4). To address the lack of funding from the state to adequately serve these additional enrollments, the institution adopted a multi-pronged approach by maintaining relatively flat enrollments, declaring impaction at the program level, and by increasing the number of international students; strategies which the university has continued to follow. In 2017/18, actual

enrollments were 6,255 and funded enrollments were 5,836 which reduced the unfunded gap by approximately one-half from 2014-15. Over the last four years, the majority of new funds received were invested in instruction and academic support with a 37% increase in expenditures in these categories combined. In addition, over the last five years the endowment of the Foundation of CSU Monterey Bay has increased by 27% to support scholarships and other program needs. CSUMB is confident that the funding gap will continue to narrow with future state allocations and thus be in a better position to resume growth (CFR 3.4).

To coincide with CSUMB's 25th anniversary celebration, the institution has begun work to prepare a new strategic plan. The last strategic plan was completed in 2013 with a 5-year horizon. This planning is key to ensuring its sustainability over the next decade and was also encouraged in the Commission's letter (May 2014) in response to CSUMB's Interim Report. During the team visit, the institution shared its March 2019 Draft Strategic Plan. Significant consultation on this draft has occurred with stakeholders over the last several months. Sessions were held with various constituencies beginning with environmental scans and analyses. Four subcommittees were convened focused on the four strategic priorities that emerged: 1) student success, 2) inclusive excellence, 3) regional stewardship and global engagement, and 4) becoming a learning organization. The draft plan also clearly reinforces the institution's commitment to continuous improvement under its fourth strategy. The plan goes further to identify tactics and metrics, and the President indicated that targets will be added before the plan is finalized by the end of the current fiscal year. With the departure of the provost at the end of the spring 2019 semester, maintaining the momentum of this planning effort will be

important to help set the institution's course over the next several years. CSUMB recognizes that long-term programs such as Bright Futures, where the institution serves as a convener for a community-wide partnership to increase college completion, are critical to the region's success. With the implementation of the new strategic plan and the alignment of strategic priorities to resources, community programs such as Bright Futures will help to support the institution's vision as a premier regional comprehensive university going into the future. (CFR 3.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Presently, the CSUMB Strategic Budget Committee (SBC) represents a broad group of thirty campus stakeholders including a member from the local community. The institution notes its ongoing efforts to support CSU System's Graduation Initiative 2025. However, the team had found that the institution can strengthen its planning and resource allocation process by making more transparent and explicit how the resources are aligned with institutional priorities. The team notes that as the institution finalizes its strategic planning efforts, this is also an opportune time to enhance the linkages of the plan to resource allocation to increase transparency, incentivize new revenue streams and to support educational effectiveness an improvement for which the Strategic Budget Committee will play an important role (CFR 3.1, 4.3).

CSUMB has well-established programs and structures to help ensure sustained educational effectiveness. The assessment committee helps to strengthen new curricular proposals to ensure a high-quality for assessment planning. For example, the institution continues to cultivate a "culture of assessment" and recently shared its model of institutional assessment as reflective faculty engagement at the 2018 American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Annual Meeting. The same rigor of

program review and assessment applies equally to online and offsite programs. The institution also offers a variety of resources to students and faculty to enhance student achievement. One key unit that effectively provides support resources is the Center for Teaching, Learning & Assessment (TLA). The TLA supports efforts to increase educational effectiveness by offering programs and services to assist faculty, student affairs professionals, staff, students and community partners to increase and integrate curricular and co-curricular learning. As enrollment continues to grow, CSUMB acknowledges the need to enhance support services, particularly for graduate students, offsite programs and international students (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

During the past five years (Fall 2014 to Fall 2018) total enrollment increased approximately 12% with an enrollment peak in 2016. The most significant demographic shift included an increase of Hispanics of approximately 7% for the same period. In addition, during the same period the percentage of total faculty increased by approximately 10%, thus responding to the increases in enrollments. However, when the team compared demographic data of the student profile to the faculty profile, the faculty by race ethnicity data provided in the Institutional Report reflects the largest gap in the Hispanic/Latino category for the year-to-year comparison, or 41% Hispanic/Latino students to 14% Hispanic/Latino total faculty. The data regarding the 27% gap between Hispanic/Latino students to Hispanic/Latino total faculty suggest that as CSUMB continues to grow the institution should closely consider its recruitment policies and processes to help support the hiring of a diverse faculty. Permanent full-time faculty and staff represent approximately 72% of total faculty and staff. This is comparable to full-time faculty and staff at the California State University system level of 73% over the last

four years reported (2014 - 2017). Tenure-track faculty have continued to increase over the last five year which has help to improve tenure density. However, CSUMB's tenure density is below (50.3%) and the CSU system average of 55.4%. With future growth the opportunity exists to continue to improve upon both tenure density, diversity of faculty and organizational economies of scale as enrollments increase into the future (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.7).

The physical master plan initiated in 2015 provides a framework for the continuing capital expansion of CSUMB. As a campus focused on sustainability, the plan reflects this focus. A 58,000-square foot LEED-certified business and information technology facility is one of the newer additions to the campus. Two academic facilities are in various stages of design or construction and a student union broke ground in the fall 2018. During the on-site tour of the campus, the team was impressed with the transition of the campus' physical plant and the ongoing work to convert the former Ft. Ord military base structures to an academic campus, and yet honoring its history by simple acknowledgements such as maintaining street names that reflect its military past.
The team also learned that the institution has also employed different strategies to help meet the capital facilities needs such as a public/private partnership between University Corporation at Monterey Bay and a private developer for additional student housing. The corporation also purchased property and moved its operations to CSUMB@Ryan Ranch, thus freeing space in the academic core for program expansion. In addition, the corporation purchased the National Steinbeck Center building in Salinas and established CSUMB @ Salinas City Center to serve as a professional conference hall and event space for the community.

The institution delivers academic programs at several offsite locations in the region as well. In 2016, the corporation leased a building in Salinas approximately 25 miles from the main campus to offer full programs and classes there. CSUMB has also partnered with two nearby community colleges distance education sites (Hartnell and Cuesta) to offer select degree programs. These capital planning activities that include new spaces to come online on the main campus and the programs offered at off campus facilities will provide critically needed expansion space for CSUMB into the future (CFR 3.5)

H. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The concluding chapter in CSUMB's Institutional Report highlights progress since its 2011 reaccreditation around four themes that align with their CSUMB 2008-2018 Strategic Plan: student success; academic excellence; regional stewardship; and institutional capacity.

Student Success: The team is very impressed with the dramatic and lauded improvements in retention and graduation rates that CSUMB has advanced. Also commendable has been various efforts to support the 'whole student' in areas such as services to assure mental health, food insecurity, and inclusivity (Otter Cross Cultural Center). However, the team received student feedback in person and by confidential email that raised persistent concerns in the availability and supportiveness of student academic advising (CFR 2.12) and guidance for transfer students (CFR 2.14).

Promote Academic Excellence: CSUMB has meaningfully advanced institutional capacity through stronger program review, academic assessment, and a robust data warehouse. A culture of evidence has been facilitated by the ease and accessibility of data, and the support for faculty 'data fellows' in each unit (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

Continued commitment to high-impact practices has become a signature of a CSUMB education and greatly contributes to the meaning and quality of the degrees offered (CFR 2.5, 2.11, 4.4).

Regional Stewardship: The team endorses CSUMB's innovative programs that are responding to regional needs and opportunities including a new master's program in physician assistance and baccalaureate programs in nursing, computer science and hospitality management as well as partnerships with regional community colleges.

Institutional capacity: As discussed above, the team has identified opportunities to better align strategic planning efforts with budget planning.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As an institution, CSUMB will be 25 years old in fall 2019 and as such is a young institution. One of the emerging themes from the site visit is that the campus is experiencing "growing pains" in size, in degree programs, in off-campus locations and grappling with organizational structure issues, issues of diversity, and gaps in resource needs broadly defined. The University is responding to its maturation and managing change well in several areas: availability and use of assessment and data to improve academic and nonacademic programs, innovations in curricula, notably in general education, attention to student success and responding to regional needs and other imperatives from the CSU system and nationally. The team recommendations will focus the institution in bringing its structures, processes and resources in line with the current reality of the institution and its' near term future in the landscape of higher education in the region.

The peer review team reviewed CSUMB's accreditation history, the institutional report and supporting documents, and held meetings and conversations during the on-site visit to develop the following commendations and recommendations for the institution.

Commendations

The team commends CSUMB for the following five accomplishments and practices:

1. A highly engaged self-study procedure that identified key issues and accomplishments and an extraordinarily responsive process with targeted documentation and interviews aligned with Lines of Inquiry.
2. For remarkable improvements in 6-year graduation rates as evidenced by a 16% increase in 6-year graduation rates since 2011, to a high of 53.4% .
3. The commitment to the development of the whole student in which academic and student affairs collaborate, the personal growth and counseling center, student disability resources, and support for students' basic needs.
4. A culture of innovation that has developed a physician's assistant program with community partnerships, a 3-year computer science degree, the recent culture or language requirement, 2+2 community college pathways on location, and the Otter Cross Cultural Center.
5. Its' regional stewardship in offerings such as service learning and academic majors that respond to present and emerging workforce needs; in educational, nonprofit, private and governmental partnerships; with philanthropic support and in leveraging the transformation of former Ft. Ord into a vibrant campus community committed to sustainability.

6. An effective and systematic assessment and reflection for program improvement; well-defined processes for program review reflective of the mission of the University; the redesign of the General Education curriculum, including math/statistics and written communication; and the collection, analysis, dissemination, and application of data.

Recommendations

The team has identified the following five recommendations to focus CSUMB's ongoing and future efforts:

1. Strengthen outreach and recruitment efforts for faculty, staff, and administrators to reflect diversity; increase efforts to support retention, enhanced development, and professional growth of a diverse faculty and staff; and better respond to the needs of its diverse students, faculty, and staff (CFR 1.4, 3.1).
2. Support early career faculty development in their roles as researchers and scholars; and, provide a faculty development program for lecturers (CFR 2.8, 3.3).
3. Leverage activities associated with its new strategic planning process to drive integrated resource allocation in alignment with mission to facilitate student enrollment growth, incentivize new revenue streams, and achieve economies of scale while meeting established metrics and targets (CFR 3.4, 4.6, 4.7).
4. Enhance support for staff by providing increased training and professional development; reviewing and adjusting staffing levels; and including staff input as stakeholders in campus success (CFR 3.1, 3.3).
5. Improve academic advising for all students (CFR 2.3, 2.12).

APPENDIX

A. Federal Compliance Forms

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	**Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)**
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ❒ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? https://csumb.edu/policy/credit-hour-policy
	Comments: Effective date July 19, 2018. Policy includes clear statement for face-to-face, hybrid and online courses.
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: Policy reviewed every ten years. Certification through review by: Matriculation Committee, Policy Facilitation Team, Educational Planning and Policy Committee, Academic Senate, Associated Students, Enrollment Services and Student Affairs Leadership Team, Academic Affairs Council, and Provost. Annually, when new courses are proposed, they are reviewed by the Senate Curriculum Committee Council for alignment with the credit hour policy.
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: Schedule found here: https://csumb.edu/planning/schedule
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 11 (9 Undergrad, 2 Graduate level, Hybrid/f2f) and 5 Online (2 Undergrad And 3 Graduate level)
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Hybrid, face to face and online
	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS X BA/BS X MA ❒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Communications, Psych, HHS, Nursing, Business, Hospitality, Hu Development, Liberal Studies, Computer Science, Education, Physician Assistant, Info Sys, Kinesiology, Special education
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: n/a
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)	How many syllabi were reviewed? 6
	What kinds of courses? Science Lab, Psych Lab and Service Learning
	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS X BA/BS X MA ❒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Bio lab (BS), 2 Service Learning courses (BA), 2 Phys. Assistant labs (MS)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: n/a
Sample program information (catalog,	How many programs were reviewed? 5 Undergrad, 2 MS
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Face 2 Face/hybrid

website, or other program materials)	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS X BA/BS X MA/MS ❒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Business, Environmental Science, Humanities & Communication, Kinesiology, Math, Music, School Psychology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments :n/a

Review Completed By: Cheryl Ney Date: March 28, 2019

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	**Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.**
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: CSUMB follows the federal regulations on recruiting students.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X YES ❒ NO CSUMB has recently changed the way in which student's access information about degree pathways. All programs have been set up in Smart Planner, which students' access through their OASIS (student system) dashboard. Smart Planner takes into account courses that students might transfer in to provide a more accurate estimate of timeline. General degree pathways are being migrated to the advising website but that work is not yet complete. The catalog contains on each degree program page (e.g. https://csumb.edu/catalog/biology-bs) with a list of all courses with unit numbers.
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: https://csumb.edu/catalog/cost-need and https://csumb.edu/catalog/tuition-fees cost of attendance calculator found here: https://csumb.edu/financialaid/what-financial-aid#heading-cecef0e0-8c24-4e49-92fa-6f0ff231e109
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: Connect a major to a career: https://csumb.edu/career/connect-major-career Alumni surveys: https://csumb.edu/iar/alumni-overview Monterey Bay Hub for college and career exploration http://mbcareerconnect.org/ Pursuing possibility of reports from CA State Employment Development Department

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)
**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Cheryl Ney Date: March 28, 2019

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES ❒ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? https://csumb.edu/policy/student-grievance-policy https://csumb.edu/judicialaffairs/student-grievance-policy
	Comments: The first link above is to the repository on all campus policies. The more accessible access to students is through the judicial affairs site (the second link above).
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES ❒ NO If so, please describe briefly: https://csumb.edu/judicialaffairs/student-grievance-policy
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: The Student Grievance Policy specifies the procedure to be followed. This is also found on the website (see link above).
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES ❒ NO If so, where? Hardcopy files in Student Conduct Office
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X YES ❒ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	Comments: Record retention is carried out by the Student Records Office where currently records are kept on file in hard copy. Exploration of use of a case management technology is underway

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Cheryl Ney Date: March 28, 2019

B. Distance Education Review

Distance Education Review-Team Report

Institution: California State University-Monterey Bay (CSUMB)
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Clare Weber, Cheryl Ney
Date/s of review: March 28, 2019

1. **Programs and courses reviewed (please list)**

The campus has three offsite locations (North Salinas County, Hartnell College site in King City, Cuesta College site in Paso Robles).

The North Salinas County site where the new M.S. Physician Assistant program is offered (approved in June 2018), was visited by Drs. Weber and Ney on March 28, 2019 as part of the campus site visit.

The leased facility was formerly occupied by Heald College and is located at1450 North Main Street, Salinas, CA 93906

2. **Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)**

   Programs offered at off-campus sites:
   1. MS Physician Assistant, North Salinas County
   2. BSN completion, Cuesta College site in Paso Robles
   3. BA Liberal Studies degree completion, Hartnell College site in King City

   Programs offered fully online:
   1. BS in Computer Science and Information Technology (approved June 2013)
   2. MS in Instructional Science and Technology (approved January 2012)

3. **Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)**
   We met with Dr. Christopher Forest, the Founding Director of the Program, who provided a tour of the facility. We also met and interviewed Dr. Valerie Berry, MD, the Didactic Coordinator, Assistant Professor Nicole Reichhart, Didactic Faculty and Professor Sheila Siegel, Clinical Coordinator. We interviewed three students who are in the first cohort for the program.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Fits mission of being a regional steward, offering this high demand program in a well suited and equipped facility off-site (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.7 and 1.8)	None
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Staff from main campus have regularly scheduled times at off-site location. Students (cohort of 25) are oriented to main campus and services and indicated that they use these services. College Dean regularly visits the program. (CFR 2.10, 2.12, 2.13)	None
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Excellent lecture and lab facilities as well as equipment (one a high tech anatomy and physiology "cadaver"), IT needs appear to be met.	None
Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Students are clearly receiving the services they need to be support them academically and for the professional preparation. Four FT staff. Director very experienced in the field	None

Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Experienced Director as are four FT faculty, two PT medical directors. PT Clinical preceptors are hired to serve a total of 14 possible clinical rotations (9 are required). This is currently a provisionally accredited program by the ARC-PA, in its first year.	None
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Curriculum met the standards of the ARC-PA accrediting body. University curricular and program approval processes were followed. Program approved at CSU System level as well.	None
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	This program is in its first year.	None
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Accrediting body requires student outcome evaluation (standard C3). National certifying exam (PANCE) pass rates will be published.	None
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	N/A	None
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	Accredited programs at CSUBM are waived from the University's program review process.	None

C. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The team noted that CSUMB engages in systematic assessment and reflection for improvement of its programs. The university has clearly established processes for the evaluation and program review that is reflective of the value and character of the University. The university has developed processes to assess curricular programs as well as administrative functions to assure quality and provide documentation to support any curricular changes. The university has

adhered to the WSCUC substantive change review process when making more significant changes in structure, services, pedagogy, and curricula, and followed up appropriately to recommendations.

The institutional, program and course learning outcomes are well defined. In 2011, CSUMB revised its program review and assessment process. CSUMB systematically reviews academic programs and degrees in a cycle that is appropriate and thoughtful. Faculty are involved in the designing and implementation of the assessment plans through its "assessment as faculty development approach." Leading these efforts is the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment with a director, faculty fellows, and a senate assessment committee. CSUMB deploys its institutional research and planning resources throughout the university for decision support and academic planning. The assessment team is capable and valued across campus.

The general education (GE) program is in the developmental phase of aligning learning outcomes and assessing the program. "While some assessment of the core competencies in GE has been completed (see chapter 4), as yet there is no assessment of GE as a program". CSUMB has demonstrated effective use of data to "close the loop." The university appointed a director of general education to oversee further development of general education learning outcomes. The team noted that the graduate program learning outcomes are in the development phase. The university's assessment committee is engaged with student affairs to develop learning outcomes and assessment of co-curricular activities. As noted above, the infrastructure and culture of continuous improvement are in place to ensure the development and assessment of these learning outcomes. (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4).