

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

to Pacific Oaks College

March 1-3, 2016

Team Roster

Randal Wisbey, Chair; President, La Sierra University
Kay Llovio, Assistant Chair; Associate Provost, William Jessup University
Karen Davis, Vice President for Administration and Finance,
California Lutheran University
Christopher Sindt, Vice Provost of Graduate and Professional Studies,
Saint Mary's College of California
Dick Osborn, Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

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	3
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	7
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	8
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	9
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	9
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	12
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives....	12
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	15
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability.....	17
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement.....	23
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees	25
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	27
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation.....	30
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	32
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability; preparing for changing higher education environment	35
H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement	40
SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
APPENDIX A: FEDERAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLISTS	45
1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist.....	45
2 - Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist.....	48
3 - Student Complaints Review Checklist	49
4 - Transfer Credit Review Checklist	50
APPENDIX B: OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW	51
San Jose Branch Campus	51
Cerritos Instructional Site	54
Van Nuys Instructional Site	57
North Hollywood Instructional Site.....	60

PACIFIC OAKS COLLEGE ACCREDITATION VISIT

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

On March 1-3, 2016, a WSCUC evaluation team of four members visited Pacific Oaks College (POC) of Pasadena, California, for the Reaffirmation of Accreditation review as scheduled. The visiting team acknowledges the gracious hospitality, openness, and cooperation extended by the campus community. Preparation and accommodations for the site visit were most appropriate and served the team well.

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Pacific Oaks College has been distinguished since its founding for its historical mission to promote educational practices that “encourage learners to find their own voice, to take stands in the face of opposition, and to exercise competence in collaboration with others.” Emerging as an outgrowth of the renowned Pacific Oaks Children’s School, WASC first accredited Pacific Oaks College in 1959 to offer a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Arts degree in Human Development. On July 2009, the College and Children’s School became a corporate entity, Pacific Oaks Education Corporation (POEC). In June 2010, POEC formally affiliated with TCS Education System (TCSES), an affiliation that followed a due diligence period beginning in spring 2009, with a Master Agreement put into place in July 2009.

In May 2011, the Board of Trustees of the Pacific Oaks College and Children’s School approved a revised mission statement:

Grounded in its social justice heritage, Pacific Oaks College prepares students to be culturally intelligent agents of change serving diverse communities in the fields of human development, education, and related family studies.

The main campus of Pacific Oaks College is in Pasadena, with several other approved

off-site instructional locations, although at the time of the Off-Site Review it was unclear which active sites were. A branch campus in San Jose was approved by WSCUC in February 2016; nine satellite locations within a 25-mile radius of the main campus are also listed.

Programs offered at Pacific Oaks College include the BA and MA in Human Development, the MA in Marital and Family Therapy, the BA and MA in Early Childhood Education, the BA in Early Childhood Education with Teaching Credential, the MA in Education with Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential, and the MA in Education with Preliminary Education Specialist.

The demographics of POC students are distinctive and reflective of the College's mission, with 91.1% of the 1,235 students attending in spring 2016 being women; 90% of all students are part-time. Of the total enrollment, 51.4% (635 students) attend courses on the Pasadena campus; 24% (297 students) are enrolled in online programs, and 24.5% (303 students) are taking coursework at the branch campus or other off-campus instructional sites. The spring 2016 enrollment figures indicate nearly 15% overall growth, primarily in the online programs (52.7% growth) since the special visit conducted in fall 2013. A majority of the students identify as Hispanic/Latina (50.5%), 21.5% as White; 12.71% as Black or African American; and 5.3% as Asian; the mean age is 37. Pacific Oaks is a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

In the years since its affiliation with TCSES, Pacific Oaks has experienced numerous transitions in leadership. Dr. Patricia Breen came to POC as Provost in 2013 and replaced Dr. Ezat Parnia as President upon his retirement in spring 2015. Three of the five members of the Executive Cabinet have been hired by Dr. Breen. The establishment of three schools within the college elevated two faculty members to the positions of associate dean, while a third was newly hired.

Accreditation History

Pacific Oaks has faced a variety of accreditation challenges following the comprehensive WASC visit February 12-15, 2002. A Special Visit was held March 8-10, 2005, resulting in a Commission action letter (dated June 29, 2005) that requested a Progress Report in March 2008 on “Enrollment Growth and Financial Stability, Assessment of Student Learning, and Faculty Development and Support.” The report was received and a special visit was scheduled for summer 2008.

Prior to the Interim Report review, WASC staff received a formal complaint made by the full-time faculty about the administration’s conduct with regard to governance and communications. The complaint alleged that all collaborative decision-making structures and processes related to both the current operations and future planning had excluded substantive input by the core faculty. In April 2008, WASC staff added the investigation of the complaint to the scope of the Special Visit review.

The June 2008 Special Visit resulted in Commission actions as set forth in its letter of December 1, 2008, issuing an Order to Show Cause why the accreditation of Pacific Oaks College should not be terminated, effective April 15, 2010. The Show Cause visit on November 17-20, 2009, focused on progress in the seven critical areas outlined in the Commission's action letter of December 2008.

On April 1, 2009, Pacific Oaks College submitted an interim report addressing enrollment and finances. That report was reviewed and accepted by the Interim Report Committee in May 2009. During a September 22, 2009 conference call, the Substantive Change Committee acted to proceed to a site visit prior to Commission review of a Substantive Change proposal regarding Change in Ownership (Structural Change) so that

POC would be affiliated with TCSES. The nature of this affiliation is described in Component 7 of this report (see p. 36).

At its February 17-19, 2010 meeting, the Commission took the following actions in regard to the Show Cause and the Change in Ownership visits: (1) Receive the Show Cause Visit report; (2) Remove the Order to Show Cause; (3) Reaffirm accreditation and issue a formal Notice of Concern; (4) Approve the change in ownership/transfer of control of Pacific Oaks College to TCSES with a six-month follow-up visit after full implementation; (5) Reschedule the next Capacity and Preparatory Review from spring 2012 to spring 2015 and the Educational Effectiveness from fall 2013 to fall 2016.

A Special Visit in fall 2011 was to review progress on areas cited in the action letter, focusing on five areas of concern that were the basis for the Notice of Concern: (1) governance, decision making, and the new relationship with TCSES; (2) operational integrity, and accuracy and use of data; (3) financial sustainability, management, and planning; (4) communication among constituents; and (5) educational effectiveness, assessment, and program review. The Commission acted to continue the Notice of Concern, schedule another Special Visit in fall 2013, and reschedule the next comprehensive review, with an off-site review in spring 2015 and a visit in fall 2015 (later moved to spring 2016).

The fall 2013 Special Visit was required to focus on four issues: (1) organizational structure (2) communication challenges, (3) the relationship with TCS Education System, and (4) Financial sustainability, management, resource alignment, and planning (CAL, dated March 7, 2014, p. 1). The Commission acted to remove the Notice of Concern and to request a progress report by June 2014 regarding progress in filling full-time faculty positions; this report was received and accepted. The Commission commended Pacific Oaks for positive

developments in key indicators of institutional health and resolutions in core institutional dynamics; concerns were expressed for “the remaining challenges relative to the partnership with TCSES, progress in further developing faculty governance,” and academic program and financial sustainability (CAL dated March 7, 2014, p. 2).

B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The Off-site Review was conducted at WSCUC offices on May 18-19, 2015, where the team reviewed a 75-page report based upon a self-study conducted under the standards and organized by the nine components required by WSCUC. Approximately 2,000 pages of supplemental material were also reviewed in support of the Self-Study Report. Eighteen lines of inquiry were identified and additional financial and demographic information was requested and received.

Pacific Oaks did not explore any additional topic; therefore, Component 8 is not included in this report. Four off-campus locations were visited by team members: the San Jose branch campus, and three instructional sites. Reviews of these sites are included in Appendix B of this report.

During the Accreditation Visit, the team met with the President and her Executive Cabinet, members of the TCS Educational System in person and via remote, members of the WSCUC Steering Committee, academic leaders, enrollment services and student success personnel, the POC Board of Trustees, and the outside audit partners; in all, a total of 35 employees and 8 board members in seven different meetings. Additionally, the team attended a poster reception and open forums with faculty, staff, and students.

Although no negative comments were received via the confidential email account, one student present at the open forum who had issue with her degree program requirements was referred to the POC and WSCUC complaint processes. An earlier complaint made to WSCUC

by another student was also reviewed but lacked documentation or substantiation.

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

The Self-Study Report submitted by Pacific Oaks College, dated March 10, 2015, is thorough and consistent with the model required to respond to the 2013 Standards of Accreditation to provide evidence of preparedness for Reaffirmation of Accreditation. POC systematically addressed each Standard and Criterion for Review in the Self-Review under the Standards, and evidence was provided to support the compliance with the Standards. The data and documentation to support the report were available to the team on Box.com, with additional information requested by the team provided in a timely manner. The report was found to be a factual and accurate description of the institution; however, POC did not present evidence of student learning or demonstrate its ability to evaluate the results of student learning assessment in the core competencies and to make use of data derived from this work until the on-site visit. Due to the extended time between the Off-Site Review in May 2015 and the Accreditation Visit in March 2016, the team requested updated financial statements be provided at the end of summer 2015. In total, the team identified 18 specific lines of inquiry, to which the College quickly responded prior to the Visit.

A team of fourteen members of the administration, faculty, and staff led the Self-Study process at POC, engaging faculty, staff, and administration in self-review. As an organization committed to learning and improvement, POC regarded the review as an opportunity to extend its development and strengthen its sustainability, resources, and organizational structures. The team commends POC for its commitment to institutional excellence and its focus on substantive issues in the course of the self-study. POC not only learned much about its strengths and areas

for growth through the experience, but faculty, staff, and students repeatedly expressed hope and optimism for the future of the College.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

At the time of Reaffirmation in 2010, the Commission acted to remove an Order to Show Cause and issue a formal Notice of Concern. Two special visits - in fall 2011 and fall 2013 - were conducted to monitor progress in two sets of overarching issues: “organizational structures, communication, and the relationship with TCS Education System,” and second, “financial sustainability, management, resource alignment, and planning.” The visiting team further explored six concerns delineated by the Commission: 1) the relationship between POC and TCSES; 2) faculty-administration communication; 3) adequacy of faculty and administrative staffing; 4) planning results and progress; 5) progress toward financial stability; and 6) enrolment and revenue sources (CAL 3/8/2012; VTR 10/2013, pp. 7-8).

Although these issues were addressed by Pacific Oaks for the Special Visit conducted in fall 2013, the team nonetheless continued each concern as a recommendation in their report and highlighted an additional concern for “effective and respectful two-way communication” (p. 25). Continuing progress for most, but not all, of these recommendations was reported in the Institutional Report in spring 2015. The following section follows the outline of the fall 2013 Special Visit team recommendations.

(1). Give urgent attention to honoring the faculty’s role in shared governance so that the institution’s decision-making processes ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution’s educational purposes and character (CFR 3.11).

Under a new provost (now President), Pacific Oaks acted quickly to support faculty governance by reviving the Faculty Senate and committee functions in Development and

Evaluation, Assessment and Program Review, and Curriculum (see Pacific Oaks College Chart of College Governance Roles, Appendix I). POC has reactivated the sabbatical process, established a research grant program, and faculty classification system. Faculty committees oversee a new annual program review, and new program proposals. A new Pedagogy Workshop, which orients faculty and staff to POC values, ensures transmission of the institution's purposes and character.

(2). Hire and support a faculty sufficient in number and professional qualifications to achieve the institution's educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of the institution's academic programs wherever and however delivered (CFR 1.3, 3.1, 3.2).

The explanations provided by POC in their report were unclear (see pages 11 and 14).

The team received a chart of program, faculty, hire date, classification prior to the visit. POC has hired a number of new faculty, and the team recommends that the College continue to increase the number of full-time faculty. See Component 1, Standard 3, of this report for a more detailed discussion of faculty and reporting of faculty information.

(3). Further refine and align the various planning processes to ensure that the development of the institution's next strategic plan is broadly inclusive of all stakeholders (CFR 4.2, 4.3).

POC included a wide array of stakeholders in its strategic planning process (IR, p. 13) to articulate its vision, core values, and three goals:

- Prepare adult learners with expertise, confidence, and the commitment to make positive change
- Provide a student experience that ensures alignment of all instructional, co-curricular, and support functions with the PO values and needs of its adult learners.
- Ensure curricula that are current, relevant, and responsive to changes in the global educational landscape.

During the visit, the team explored the planning process and reviewed documentation of the plan's implementation. The team found that the strategic planning process had been inclusive and initially productive, and well monitored. The team also found that with multiple changes,

including the appointment of a new president, the strategic plan's vitality was waning. There was much enthusiasm for a new strategic planning process that reflects new leadership and refined assessment practices. The team suggests POC continue to be inclusive of all communities in its next strategic planning process, and to make best use of strategic plan assessment.

(4). Enhance effective and respectful two-way communication, valuing the roles, perspectives, and input of various constituencies so that a shared vision of the college's priorities and directions can be embraced (CFR 4.1).

The Special Visit team report expressed concern about the level of demands on small number of faculty and about "institutional leadership honoring the faculty's voice in decision-making relative to academic structures and policies" (p. 13). POC did not address this recommendation in the Institutional Report, but during the visit, the team reviewed results of two recently administered surveys that identified *communication* as a strength of the college, with clear reference to improvement since 2013. The 2016 Employee Engagement Survey, an aggregate score of the employees of both POC and The Children's School, identified communication as the overall most favorable category. More specifically, faculty and administration were surveyed in January 2016 to measure efforts to improve communication between employees from the academic and administrative units at POC. Despite the turnover in personnel, the majority of scores showed improvement. The Human Resources Director indicated plans to continue the focus as POC grows in facility and staffing.

(5). Continue to clarify the non-managerial role of TCSES and ensure that the boundaries between the provision of services and the management of the college are maintained (CFR 1.6). The relationship between Pacific Oaks and TCSES is described in more detail later in this report (see Component 7).

6). Monitor and sustain the college's recent positive revenue/expense ratios, and carefully plan the allocation of any budget surpluses to ensure the institution's financial sustainability (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2).

Financial sustainability is discussed in more detail later in this report (see Component 7).

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

Pacific Oaks College completed the Review under WSCUC Standards in March 2014 at an all-personnel meeting, as an opportunity for institutional improvement. For each standard, the college community identified important issues, institutional strengths, and areas of improvement. These issues emerging from the Self-Review were clearly evident in the future planning efforts of the College. The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) clearly describes the process and schedule of program assessment. Compliance with federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and recruitment, student complaints, and transfer policy is provided in the appendices to this report.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

In 2011, the Board of Trustees approved a revision of the institution's mission statement out of recognition of the expansion of the college's mission beyond early childhood education. It appears, throughout the Institutional Report as well as during the on-site visit, that there is wide-spread commitment by all segments of the campus community to the mission of Pacific Oaks (CFR 1.1). This is supported by the meaningful connection between learning outcomes, student behavioral expectations, and the institution's historic Quaker tradition—with particular focus on the values of inclusion, social justice, and diversity (CFR 1.2).

Integrity and Transparency

POC provides appropriate Academic Freedom statements for faculty and students (CFR 1.3). The *Academic Catalog* and the *Student Handbook* contain brief statements identifying a student's right to academic freedom. The library also includes a statement of academic freedom and privacy as part of their mission. Within the *Faculty Manual*, the following statement is provided:

- *7.2 Academic Freedom. Each member of the faculty is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results of that research, subject to the acceptable performance of her/his other academic duties. Research for pecuniary return conducted by a member of the faculty is subject to limitations and to prior approval. Each member of the faculty is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing her/his subject, and she should ensure that theory, pedagogy and discussion material will be related to the course description and outcomes. Each faculty member is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and representative of the College. When s/he speaks or writes as a citizen, s/he should be free from College censorship or discipline, but her/his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a person of learning and a professional educator, s/he should remember that the public may judge her/his profession and the College by her/his utterances. Hence, s/he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that s/he is not a College spokesperson.*

In conversations with the faculty, it is clear that academic freedom is a deeply held value within the learning community of Pacific Oaks. Repeatedly faculty spoke of the unique history of the institution and the long-standing commitment of faculty to freely express their views while upholding the unique pedagogy that guides their work.

POC's commitment to diversity is significant and far-reaching. It is a deeply held value, articulated in the mission of the institution, as well as within the college's student learning outcomes at various levels (CFR 1.4). As a Hispanic Serving Institution, POC has made progress in addressing the needs of its dynamic and diverse student body (nearly 63% are Latino/a or Black/African American). Likewise, with over 50% of its faculty and staff being people of color, the institution has embraced the opportunity to better reflect the students they

serve. In conversations with faculty, administration, trustees, and students, it was noted that this commitment to better meet the needs of the diverse POC student population has resulted in significant resources focused on the creation of better systems of financial support, learning, and social systems for students (CFR 1.5, 2.11, 2.13).

Initial concerns the team held regarding the relationship between POC and TCSES were appropriately addressed during the visit. In conversations with the Board, trustees asserted their commitment to governing as an independent entity (CFR 1.5, 3.9), pointing out that their collaboration with TCSES in no way impacted their ability to govern independently. From their perspective, TCSES was a significant partner who provided much needed infrastructure and administrative services that had made a dramatic difference to the college. Similar perspectives were shared with the team by faculty, staff, and administrators.

While the relationship with TCSES is proving to be a transformative partnership for POC, it will be important for the Board of Trustees and college administration to continue to regularly monitor the TCSES relationship for its ongoing service level support and financial sustainability.

POC's effort to openly represent academic goals, costs, and services embedded within their unique mission is an attempt to better embrace the core values of diversity, social justice, and participatory decision-making within the context of their historic Quaker tradition (CFR 1.6, 1.7).

It seems clear, throughout the Self Study and the accompanying materials provided by POC, as well as by the interactions between the visiting team and the members of the POC community, that there is a commitment to honesty and transparency (CFR 1.6, 1.8). Through the many reports, visits, and materials provided to the team in preparation for this Accreditation

Visit, as well as conversations with POC administrators, POC clearly demonstrates value for the accreditation process and a sincere relationship with WSCUC (CFR 1.8). The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 1.

Commendations:

- The team commends the Board of Trustees for entering into a transformative partnership with TCSES, enabling the college to embrace a newly invigorated future.
- The team commends Pacific Oaks College for its meaningful connection between learning outcomes, student behavioral expectations, and the Quaker heritage—with particular focus on social justice, diversity and inclusion.

Recommendation:

- The team recommends that the Board of Trustees and college leadership continue to regularly monitor the TCSES relationship for its ongoing service level support and financial sustainability.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

Pacific Oaks implements its clearly defined mission through a limited number of degree programs in human development, education, and marriage and family therapy. The two undergraduate (degree completion) and four graduate degrees conform to disciplinary standards and are appropriate in length (CFR 2.1). POC has completed an impressive review of program goals, utilizing the Degree Qualifications Profile (CFR 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3).

Both faculty and staff receive orientation in the mission, goals, and outcomes of Pacific Oaks in an annual Pedagogy Workshop (CFR 2.4). Faculty, including full-time and adjunct,

actively participate in curriculum mapping and assessment. Students regularly receive feedback regarding their performance in courses (CFR 2.5).

A robust assessment plan and program review process incorporate evidence of student learning that is reviewed by faculty and compared with alumni and external measures (CFR 2.6, 2.7).

Scholarship and Creative Activity

Recent revival of the Faculty Senate and committee for Faculty Development and Evaluation provides faculty with a pathway for faculty scholarship, as defined by the Boyer model (CFR 2.8), which suits the mission of the college. Traditional faculty ranking and tenure are not part of the POC community, which was attributed partly to their egalitarian heritage. However, since the Off-site Review, POC has designed criteria for core faculty hiring and promotion, where they have established three levels of core faculty status: early, mid, and senior (CFR 2.9). Promotion requires evidence of scholarship in investigation, teaching, and social justice and service. Immediately prior to the visit, policies for research grants, sabbaticals, and human subjects protection were approved as further support for the faculty research culture.

Student Learning and Success

POC tracks student success and incorporates findings in the program review process, and provided examples of changes made in each school to improve student learning; see Component 5 (CFR 2.10). Plans to improve academic support and the co-curricular, the result of a program review conducted in 2014-15, include enhancing the new student orientation program, writing and career assistance, improving communication, customer service, and technology support (CFR 2.11, 2.13).

A one-stop shop model of student support services provides students with timely information about academic programs and related services, such as financial aid, refunds, and complaints (CFR 2.12).

The Transfer Credit Policy is clearly available in the catalog and in summary form on the college website (CFR 2.14). The BA programs are degree completion and the General Education requirements for admission are clearly published on the website. POC offers up to 30 units of Credit for Learning from Life Experiences in its undergraduate programs.

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

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

Faculty and Staff

POC has 52 administrator and staff employees, nine of which were vacant at the time of the submission of the POC report (p. 5). Several key leadership positions were recently hired and many have been there less than six months. Although POC has successfully filled many positions over the last few years, the continued significant turnover is concerning to the stability of the organizational structure of POC. A few of the key new hires were previously employed by TCSES, an affiliated entity. More time will be needed to ensure the strength and stability of the POC leadership structure (CFR 3.1).

POC has 16 full-time core faculty and over 130 adjunct faculty. The POC number of core faculty has doubled from the time of the 2013 WSCUC report. Four of the existing core faculty were hired within the last few months. The number of courses taught by adjuncts in many programs is over 95%. The team received conflicting information on what the faculty-to-

student ratios were and staff seemed confused about what the formula is for calculating the faculty-to-student ratio. The team recommends that POC clarify its computation of faculty FTE and faculty-to-student ratio to conform to industry practice. More professionally qualified core faculty should be hired due to the growth in enrollment and to lower the number of courses being taught by part-time adjunct faculty. This will also provide the ability of faculty to participate more in the shared governance of the college and to deepen the college's diverse intellectual environment. POC reactivated its Faculty Senate committees which now meet monthly. The Faculty Senate is comprised of the entire core faculty but not the adjunct faculty. Full-time faculty are provided with \$3,000 per year for professional development and the sabbatical leave was recently restored. The core faculty expressed optimism with the new president's collaborative leadership approach and support of the faculty in shared governance (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7).

Commendation:

- The team commends the new president for her transformational leadership, recognized by all segments of the campus (CFR 3.6, 3.8).

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

The POC financial position has stabilized over the past three years since it emerged from financial exigency on February 8, 2013. The consolidated audited financial statements as of May 31, 2015, reflect a change in net assets of \$1.9 million from \$14.3 million in 2014 to \$16.2 million in 2015 and a healthy cash position of \$9.2 million. POC has no outstanding debt and is able to fund its operations within existing resources. POC is a tuition-driven institution with 98% of its total revenues generated by student tuition and fees. Net tuition revenue grew by 20% from \$17 million in fiscal 2014 to \$20.4 million in fiscal 2015 primarily due to enrollment

growth. POC has aggressive plans to continue its enrollment growth with expansion in northern California, additional new programs at new sites, and targeted outreach to military personnel, international students, and employer groups. Although POC has been successful in growing the enrollment for the last few years, contrary to national higher education trends, such growth may peak or decline. POC's ability to maintain its recent financial stability is still fragile. The POC leadership receives regular reports on its performance to budget to enable timely decision-making and continued financial oversight (CFR 3.4).

The institution expanded its Pasadena campus in spring 2014 by 9,000 square feet for classrooms, computer labs, a lounge, and additional offices. This new space provides improved student services with a "one-stop shop" for registrar, financial aid, student finance, and the CARE Office. The Pasadena buildings are modern, clean, and well maintained. The institution's learning management system was recently replaced with the implementation of the "Canvas" software system. Training is provided to assist students in the use of technology. The team site visits to cohort facilities disclosed that the classrooms at the cohort space do not always have the technology for instructional needs. The Van Nuys and North Hollywood cohort classrooms did not have any overhead projectors, screens, white boards, and lacked adequate internet capabilities. Faculty members at these sites do not have the ability to teach with the use of any of the equipment utilized in a classroom at the Pasadena campus. POC's plans to grow cohort locations needs to ensure that adequate resources are available at the new sites. Students attending online or cohort courses have online resources available to them (CFR 3.5).

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

TCS Education System. The institution is part of a system of private non-profit higher education institutions which are supported and coordinated by TCS Education System (TCSES), a non-profit organization founded in 2009 and recognized by the IRS as a Type II supporting organization. TCSES provides management and administrative services and conducts other support activities for the exclusive benefit of the supported organizations. TCSES is a network of shared expertise and comprehensive resources designed to maximize economies of scale, student-focused synchronicities, independent academic governance, and innovative alliances with its affiliated colleges. Each affiliated higher education college has its own board, independent accreditation, mission, and organization. The five colleges that are currently affiliated with TCSES each operate under a dual board structure. The fiduciary council serves as the corporate board entity, whereas the individual college board of trustees retains exclusive control of the oversight of the college, including direction/control of its campuses, educational programming, organizational structure, administrators, faculty, accreditation status, and strategic planning. The fiduciary council oversees the annual goal setting and budget process and holds operating review meetings with the colleges where service level service expectations are reinforced, assessed, and reviewed. Each college has a service agreement with TCSES that defines the scope of services being delegated to TCSES. The TCSES allocation is agreed upon annually as part of the annual budget process for each college. Service performance is reviewed bi-annually in operating reviews between the college and TCSES. The reviews monitor progress against plans utilizing metrics and analysis and leads to interventions addressing issues and new opportunities. Quarterly, the executive council comprised of TCSES executives and the presidents of the five colleges meets to address service needs and opportunities. Representatives of TCSES and the colleges work collectively in system-wide committees to provide advice on

procedures, practices, and policies that are shared throughout the system. TCSES coordinates cross-institutional meetings and events to deepen connections and collaborations with the affiliated institutions and leverage synergies and strengths. The TCSES *Management Framework: A Guide to the Operating Relationship between TCS Education System and its Colleges* articulates the governance structure and responsibilities of TCSES and its affiliates. TCSES plays an active role in each college's daily life to further the college's mission and provide high quality services to student, faculty and staff (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.9).

There are 11 board members at POC, six of whom are also board members at TCSES. The only board members receiving compensation from POC or TCSES are the president of POC, an ex-officio member, and the president of TCSES. The team met with the POC board and was assured by the members that they understood the fiduciary role on the POC board was to POC. The six POC board members that serve on both boards comprise one-third of the 18 member TCSES board, which is not a majority (CFR 3.9).

POC Leadership. POC has a full-time chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution. The president has been in this position since June 1, 2015, having previously served as the provost since December 2015 and as the senior vice president for academic affairs at TCSES for several years. The new president has focused on developing and strengthening the leadership structure of POC and has six direct reports that comprise the President's Executive Cabinet. Three of the executive cabinet members are new to POC within the last few months, and one, the Director of Advancement, is still vacant. The new executive cabinet members are all well qualified and should enable the president to effectively manage the operations of the college (CFR 3.6, 3.8).

The institution has a full-time chief financial officer (CFO) whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who has been in the position since September 2011. The CFO was hired at a time when POC was experiencing significant financial challenges and has assisted POC in its financial turnaround over the last several years. The CFO monitors the financial and accounting services delegated to TCSES which includes payroll processing, vendor payment processing, financial statement preparation, banking relationships, managing cash and investments, etc. The CFO works collaboratively with the TCSES CFO and the CFOs of the other colleges affiliated with TCSES to ensure that best practices are being utilized in its processes (CFR 3.8).

Faculty leadership. The institution has worked hard in the last few years to strengthen the faculty governance structure. The Faculty Senate committees were reactivated with the appointment of a new Faculty Senate chair in 2013. Each of the faculty committees is now fully functioning, with members and chairs appointed and regular meetings underway. The Faculty Senate chair attends all academic affairs staff meetings, the board of trustees' academic affairs committee meetings, and presents the faculty report to the board (Report, p. 10). The team heard from faculty that they now have hope for the future and are enthusiastic about the improvements in the shared governance role for faculty. POC leadership needs to continue to further strengthen the faculty voice, participation, and role in shared governance and future strategic planning processes (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

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

Commendation:

- The team commends the faculty for reforming the Faculty Senate and reenergizing

faculty engagement in shared governance (CFR 3.10).

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

Quality Assurance Processes

POC has quality-assurance processes in academic and non-academic operations in place, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. POC is notably strong on producing and reviewing graduation and retention data and student and alumni surveys. This strength is largely a result of institutional research data supplied by TCSES, and also by a culture of data-based decision making with leadership teams and among faculty and academic leaders in the program review process. POC is less developed in the area of learning outcomes assessment; it has a well-designed curriculum with aligned outcomes in courses, programs, and institutional levels, but not a strong culture of assessment or decision-making based on learning outcomes assessment (CFR 4.1).

POC has a strong institutional research capacity in TCSES, and in fall 2015 began producing a data file (called the “slicer” file) that uses a common enrollment data set to produce a wide range of disaggregated reports on enrollment, retention, graduation, and time to degree. This has proven to be a valuable resource for both academic and student support professionals in targeting interventions. This data set, as well as student survey data, is clearly used in program review and by administrative leadership. The team did not observe on the accreditation visit that the strategic planning processes were tied as closely to institutional research (CFR 4.2).

Institutional Learning and Improvement

Throughout the visit, leadership at all levels indicated a strong commitment to learning and improvement based on data and group reflection. The institution is gathering, analyzing, and

interpreting data to improve its pedagogy, student support, and mission. Faculty and academic leadership clearly participate in dialogue around student success data. POC has developed a culture of assessment, but as noted above, assessment of learning is not fully developed or incorporated into decision-making (CFR 4.3).

POC engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning. Faculty conduct annual program review, and there is a more extensive faculty-led program review and program assessment in place. These last two efforts have thus far yielded only preliminary results. The faculty of POC also routinely review grade distribution data (CFR 4.4).

POC states that one of its “core values is participatory decision making which is exercised by the inclusion of various community and internal stakeholders in the institution’s academic program review process.” POC has a strong and engaged Board of Trustees and seems to welcome feedback from multiple constituencies, including students, student government, faculty, the faculty senate, staff, alumni and the professional community. POC is also committed to reaching its offsite and online populations through online surveys and other forms of communication. The teams suggest POC continues to be inclusive of these communities in its next strategic planning process (CFR 4.5, 4.6).

POC has demonstrated that it is a learning organization, attuned to its stakeholders, and maintaining the capacity internally and through TCSES to be attentive to changes in its fields and in higher education generally. They are clearly interested in best practices in their disciplinary fields as well as best practices in delivering high quality education, particularly technology, market research, and marketing. The leadership team and faculty have an organized system of retreats and trainings, and they learn through collaboration with other colleges in the

TCSES system. POC has been through many changes in recent years, and it seems to have weathered them well (CFR 4.7).

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

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

Pacific Oaks College has noted its continued focus upon its core mission and learning outcomes—development, diversity, communication, research and practice. In 2011, the Board of Trustees approved a revision of the institution's mission statement out of recognition of the expansion of the college's mission beyond early childhood education. In 2013, to address the opportunity of growing enrollment, the School of Education, the School of Human Development, and the School of Cultural and Family Psychology were established. During the on-site visit, faculty and administration confirmed that this development has indeed been beneficial to their ability to address student learning needs and enrollment growth.

While it seems clear that significant time and attention has been given to the meaning of a Pacific Oaks degree through the work of the Meaning of Degrees Task Force, what is less clear from the institution's Self Study is the actual outcome of this work. This may be due, in part, to the actual focus of the work as identified: "Two of the challenges were: 1) putting a name to an intangible essence that all participants felt that was uniquely contained in or acquired by Pacific Oaks students and 2) identifying not just the disposition of students, but also what they could *do* with what they had acquired at Pacific Oaks" (Report, pp. 19-20). Eventually, the task force developed a set of broad statements that formed the basis of a survey to alumni.

Survey results affirm that the college is successfully enabling students to live out the POC mission. Likewise, results found that for the majority of graduates who responded to the survey, their employment situation had been positively impacted. As is noted in the Self Study,

and confirmed during the visit, POC now must fully embark upon the next stages of the development of an ongoing assessment process that will enable the institution to better understand the way in which students are able to most effectively embrace the “essence” of a POC degree—reflective of both the institution’s mission and its Quaker heritage (CFR 1.1, 2.10).

Another area of focus has been on the development of Program Learning Outcomes for each program of study—complete with curriculum maps that illustrate the opportunities available to students to achieve each PLO. The PLOs are also intended to serve as the basis for program assessment and evaluation. Together with the Student Learning Outcomes and the Institutional Learning Outcomes, the goal is to make certain all three are appropriately aligned with external standards.

POC is to be recognized for the work it has accomplished in identifying meaningful connection between the values of inclusion, social justice, and diversity. This work, in turn, is tied to an overarching commitment by trustees, administration, and faculty to creatively address student learning needs in a variety of learning experiences (on-site at the home campus, off site at satellite campuses, on-line, and summer intensives). This is in fulfillment of the institution’s Strategic Plan, as identified in Strategic Goal 3: “Ensure curricula that are current, relevant, and responsive to changes in the global educational landscape.” In conversations with core and adjunct faculty, as well as with students, the visiting team found that this commitment has resulted in curricular improvements and enhanced resources that students have found beneficial.

The institution has also focused on the work of continued assessment, annual review, and the introduction of training for faculty and adjunct faculty in both grading and the value of the degree (CFR 2.5). As noted in the Self Study and the on-site visit, the work of providing

feedback to students based upon the SLOs is ongoing, with the achieved outcome of students experiencing a better understanding of how their education and career aspirations are benefited by the opportunities to reflect upon, and be encouraged, by their personal progress (CFR 2.3).

Commendation:

- The team commends POC for its meaningful connection between learning outcomes, student behavioral expectations, and the Quaker tradition—with particular focus on inclusion, social justice, and diversity (CFR 1.2).

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

Section 4 of the Institutional Report describes a concerted effort through POC’s strategic plan to analyze learning goals and create external benchmarks. This work in particular focused on the core competencies: written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking (CFR 2.2a and 2.4). The essay suggests that bachelor’s degree students at POC have a strong foundation and education in specialized knowledge, applied learning, civic learning, and diversity. POC also has some general challenges stemming largely from the fact that POC students are transfer/degree completion students, and the large majority of their coursework is in the major. These areas of challenge include most of the core competencies, in particular quantitative reasoning and information literacy (CFR 2.2a).

POC conducted an analysis of its Bachelor of Arts programs in human development and early childhood education, studying learning outcomes in relation to the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile and the Educational Testing Service’s Proficiency Profile. This exercise yielded some gaps in the curriculum, notably communication, mathematical reasoning at upper division levels of competency, and cross-disciplinary learning. The team was pleased to

see an interest in differentiating learning and pedagogy at the bachelor's and master's degree levels (CFR 2.2a and 2.2b).

The essay describes three related interventions designed to address some of the challenges described above: 1) The development of a course in quantitative reasoning, made available online to students who wish to fulfill this general education requirement and/or refresh skills; 2) A proposal to create a Writing Center by 2015-2016; and 3) a capstone project in the School of Human Development that allows for more direct analysis of the core competencies. The team visited the Writing Center during the Accreditation Visit, and while it is still early in its development, it proves to make an impact on POC's students' written communication competency (CFR 2.2a).

At the time of the Off Site Review, the team initiated a line of inquiry focused on undergraduate core competencies. The team requested a report with a clear map of where they are located either in transfer or degree requirements, and additional information about how each core competency is assessed. POC responded to this request in a report entitled, "Pacific Oaks Response to WSCUC Lines of Inquiry: May 2015 Off-site review." This document compares POC's "traditional core competencies" (Development, Diversity, Communication, Research, and Praxis) to the WSCUC core competencies and provides a map of the alignment between the two sets of competencies. This map of alignment does not significantly satisfy the request for WSCUC's core competencies to be mapped and assessed at or near the time of degree attainment. Even if core competencies are satisfied primarily through transfer credit, POC still needs to address core competency attainment through its admission and assessment policies and strategies (CFR 2.2, 2.2a).

The essay also includes a description of work done by POC to assess graduate level outcomes in relation to the Degree Qualifications Profile. This exercise yielded useful results for the various master's level programs, with attention to developing proficiency and covering the breadth of learning described in the DQP. Programs and schools have been asked to address gaps in learning in their next program reviews (CFR 2.2b).

POC also described significant work in relation to the assessment of learning across its different schools and programs. The School of Cultural and Family Psychology has program learning outcomes aligned with licensure requirements, an assessment plan in place, and signs of making use of results. It is a notable sign of success that pass rates on the clinical vignette examination of risen from 50% in 2010 to 78% in 2013. The School of Human Development measures learning outcomes through program learning outcomes aligned with courses and signature assignments, particularly capstone and thesis projects. The School of Education has recently aligned outcomes and measurement with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The Institutional Report describes a particular issue with the Preliminary Education Specialist Program, which was suspended by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 2013, citing that POC was not sufficiently preparing students in several areas, including student assessment, transition and transition planning, reading and language arts, planning and instruction, and creating healthy learning environments. At the time of the accreditation visit, the team reviewed the CCTC's notice as of June 2015 that the suspension has been lifted (CFR 2.6).

During the accreditation visit, the team examined assessment evidence and program reviews, and discussed assessment with faculty and administration. The team concludes that learning outcomes assessment remains at lower stage of development: learning outcomes are

designed and the program review process tracks assessment, but there is little evidence of significant assessment studies or projects, and little evidence of use of results to improve teaching and/or learning methods. The staff and faculty seem to understand this, and there is a good plan and structure in place to build on (CFR 4.3).

Recommendations:

- The team recommends that the college more clearly articulate, map, and assess WSCUC core competencies (CFR 2.2a).
- The team recommends that the college put systems in place to maintain a comprehensive system for assessment of student learning, both at the program and institutional level (CFR 2.6, 4.1, 4.3).

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

POC's essay on Student Success defines student success as "students' mastery of faculty-developed learning outcomes, their progress through program completion, and their professional and life experiences after graduation." The Visiting Team found that curricular design and learning outcomes approach was apparent in documents and promotional materials throughout the campus, with institutional learning outcomes prominently displayed, and that student success was highly valued in the culture (CFR 1.2).

In its initial essay and supporting documents, POC supplied both general and disaggregated retention and completion data, starting with the 2011 cohort. According to the information provided, overall first-year retention showed improvement from 73.2% with the 2011 cohort to 82.4% for the 2013 cohort. POC measures a three-year graduation rate for both BA completion and MA programs. POC supplied the team with only 1 year of three-year

completion for the class of students beginning in 2011. The overall three-year completion rate for this group is 61.2% (CFR 2.10).

Disaggregated results reveal a range of first year retention rates, based on three years of data (2011-2013), as indicated above, retention has increased by nearly 9% in three years, and the most notable improvement is in the area of online programs which went from 56.6% for the incoming group in 2011 to 72.4% for the incoming group in 2013. The Off Site retention rates improved even more dramatically, moving from 78.6% to 96.6% (CFR 2.10).

Disaggregated results indicate a range of three-year graduation rates, with online students completing at 52.8%, Pasadena main campus students completing at 63.4%, and Off Site students completing at 71.4%. Master's degree students completed at 59.2% and bachelor's degree students completed at 68.4%, a notable difference. We assume that, based on the improved retention rates above, the three-year graduation rates will also improve for the subsequent cohorts (CFR 2.10).

Retention and completion rates disaggregated by demographic categories indicate very little difference among different ethnic groups. Black or African American students retain at a slightly higher rate (83.3%). than White or Caucasian (81.6%). Female students tend to persist and graduate at higher levels than male students (CFR 2.10).

During the visit, the team was introduced to the "slicer" report, a data file produced by TCSES that allows for disaggregated data on retention and graduation based on a number of granular factors, including demographic categories, schools, cohorts, sites, and modalities. This is an impressive and potentially impactful tool, but since it had only recently been created, there is not significant evidence that POC is using the tool to create interventions in targeted areas (CFR 2.10, 4.2).

POC's program review process (discussed in more depth in Component 6) does not prominently include retention and graduation data, but student success is a theme of that work, and the team suggests that as data, disaggregated by program, becomes more available in future years, that student success be a more explicit part of program review (CFR 2.7).

The team had the opportunity to review academic support structures, organized largely through CARE (Center for Achievement, Resources and Enrichment). Institutional interventions are largely data-driven and community-driven, responding to surveys and the program review process. POC provides adequate and diverse services in the areas of tutoring, career support, and student life (such as the promotion of cultural celebrations). Services are largely available online to offsite and online students, or they are provided in person by offsite personnel. Team members had the opportunity to visit the newly created Writing Center. Though the Center is small and has thus far only served seven students, it will almost certainly grow in time, particularly through the rollout of a writing skills class planned for the fall of 2016 (CFR 2.13).

Recommendation:

- The team recommends that continued progress be made in the use of graduation and retention data for curricular change and student support (CFR 2.10).

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

Academic program reviews are conducted in even years only, with each of the three schools scheduled to conduct full reviews of all its programs every six years, according to the Program Review Manual submitted with the report (CFR 2.7). The College may want to consider a shift to the common standard of five years or an even more frequent schedule, particularly for its graduate programs. For example, the Marriage and Family Therapy program,

which offers only graduate degrees, was reviewed in 2008 and 2014. The School of Human Development, scheduled in 2010, does not even appear on the new timeline.

Pacific Oaks recently adopted a new Annual Program Review (APR), “a ‘mini’ program review that allows analysis of learning on the data generated that year, as well as program effectiveness data on a more actionable basis” (POC Exhibit, 5.1.a APR Procedures). These annual reviews constitute considerable effort, as faculty plan, collect and analyze data, and document findings of both student learning and program effectiveness (CFR 4.1). Faculty and administration spoke enthusiastically of the last two steps, which included a meta-review, where the Associate Deans of each school share the findings, recommendations and proposed action plans to a Meta-Review Group. This group, comprised of the Deans, Assessment Committee members, the AVP of Student Services, the AVP of Enrollment Services, and the Provost, identify at least three college-wide action items for the upcoming year (CFR 4.3). When approved by the Board, the items are included in the planning and budgeting process of the College (CFR 4.2, 4.6). In review of the APR action items and recommendations for each school, the team noted the practical and ongoing nature of the recommendations and the progress made to improve student learning and support.

In the 2014 Meta-Review meeting, seven areas of need with significant overlap across the institution were identified: writing support, faculty training, cohort support, data collection, student training with library and technology resources, inter-departmental collaboration, and alumni support. Specific actions and implementation plans were recommended, and the team observed the fall 2015 status updates on each. Specific initiatives that resulted from this Meta-Review included the establishment of a student writing center, Pacific Oaks Pedagogy workshops for staff and faculty, and Canvas technology training for faculty and students.

In the 2015 Meta-Review meeting conducted shortly before the accreditation visit, fourteen specific items across the institution were identified within these areas of need: care and retention of underrepresented students; adjunct support; technology support; consistency of service delivery across all modalities; curriculum and assessment; research and collaboration. POC intends to follow the same prioritization process with these findings.

Student learning assessment is conducted within the annual program review. The team noted consistent references to capstone assessments, practicum supervisor evaluation narratives, and comparison among modalities, all which appeared to draw upon collection and analysis of data (CFR 4.4). The School of Education acknowledged the need to synthesize the higher education expectation of student learning outcomes at the institutional, program, and course levels with the standards required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the relationship with TCSES afford Pacific Oaks the opportunity to tap into an extensive data management system. While faculty and staff enthusiastically shared the variety of reports available to them, the team noted that much of the data had not yet been refined to provide targeted information. For example, simple factual information about academic programs and student demographics was difficult to obtain in a readable “facts-at-a-glance” format. It is expected that on future visits, teams will observe a maturing of their data collection and analysis (CFR 4.2).

Commendation:

- The team commends the college for its academic review programs, such as the meta-review and annual review of academic programs, and for operationalizing the flow of information from these reviews to strategy and budgeting (CFR 2.7).

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability; preparing for changing higher education environment

Financial viability. Previous WSCUC interactions with POC have placed a strong concern over POC's financial position. In December 2008, the board of trustees declared a state of financial exigency. The financial management was weak and the college faced significant financial difficulties. In fact, the Commission noted, "financial sustainability and planning are the most critical of the challenges that [the College] now faces" (CAL, March 2010). The 2011 WSCUC visiting team and the March 2012 Commission letter repeated the concerns: "The Commission expects to see substantial improvements in POC's financial strength by the time of the next review (October 2013)."

The POC Board of Trustees voted to end the financial exigency in February 2013. The U.S. Dept. of Education (USDE) released the requirement that POC have a letter of credit due to the improvement in the USDE's financial composite score for fiscal year 2013 and released POC's Title III account from a hold restriction. POC demonstrated improvements in the financial status for the October 2013 WSCUC special team visit.

POC's financial position has gradually improved, with operational surpluses beginning in fiscal year 2013 and continuing the two subsequent fiscal years. The growth in revenue during that time is primarily attributable to growth in student enrollment with the majority in online students or northern CA cohorts, and a shift from students at the Pasadena campus to cohorts within 25 miles of Pasadena. POC also started two new specialization programs.

The market for online learning is becoming more competitive and POC's ability to sustain and grow its market share will largely depend on the academic quality of its programs. POC will need to be able to adjust to the changing environment of its academic delivery

methods. POC has plans to grow its total enrollment by 10% per year which appears very aggressive in the current marketplace. However, POC is targeting the working adult population and has succeeded in growing its enrollment by moving the new cohorts to where the student demand is and improving its recruitment and marketing efforts. POC derives 98% of its annual revenues from tuition and fees and will need to ensure continued enrollment growth to maintain its operations.

The consolidated revenues grew by \$3.2 million from \$17.2 million in fiscal 2012-13 to \$20.4 million in fiscal 2014-15, an 18% increase. Total operating expenses also grew by \$3 million during this same period from \$16 million to \$19 million. POEC's primary reserve ratio increased from 0.42 to 0.48 and its net income ratio increased from 0.40 to 0.49 from fiscal 2012-13 to fiscal 2014-15. Many of the financial ratios are still below recommended standards but demonstrate significant improvement over the previous POEC financial challenges. The USDE composite score published for fiscal 2013-14 is 3.0. POEC had a healthy cash position of \$9.2 million as of May 31, 2015 enabling it to deposit its surplus operating funds into interest bearing accounts. The total net assets grew by \$2.9 million from \$13.3 million as of May 31, 2013 to \$16.2 million as of May 31, 2015 (CFR 3.4).

The advancement revenues have dropped from a high point in fiscal 2011-12 of \$765,902 to a low point in fiscal 2013-14 of \$171,812. The primary source of advancement revenues is the Children's School which recently experienced some licensure issues with the state. POC recently hired a new executive director for the Children's School, who has a three year goal to increase giving (\$450,000 expected in FY 2016).

POC management has been focusing on the cash flow needs of the college and has not had to borrow funds to meet its operating costs in several years. POC has no outstanding loans

but does have long term lease obligations for the space it utilizes. Management's attention to the financial strength and liquidity of the college over the past several years is truly commendable. POC is no longer in financial distress and is working towards continued improvement in its financial condition. Management is receiving regular and timely financial reports to measure the operational performance against budgeted goals. Management and the board of trustees would benefit from regular monitoring of financial ratios against benchmark targets to further strengthen oversight of the financial performance of POC. WSCUC utilizes standard financial ratios to measure the financial performance of accredited colleges which can be found at: <http://www.wascenior.org/content/2013-financial-ratio-worksheets>. POC should establish some targeted benchmarks for measuring its financial strength and routinely monitor its progress towards the goals it establishes (CFR 3.4).

Commendation:

- The team commends the college administration and staff for the success in strengthening POC's financial position, generating its positive operating results for the last 3 years, increasing its net assets, refining its budgeting processes, strategically focusing its expenditures, and growing its enrollment.

Affiliated entity. POC is affiliated with TCS Educational System (TCSES), which effective June 1, 2010 became the sole and exclusive member of Pacific Oaks Education Corporation (POEC), the legal entity that is comprised of POC and the Pacific Oaks Children's School. TCSES has significant control over POC and provides many of the administrative and management services for POC. These services include enrollment, admissions, student financial aid, student accounts, marketing, finance, accounting, accounts payable, payroll, compliance,

risk management, legal services, human resources, employee benefits, academic affairs support, institutional research, information technology, and strategic planning services.

There are many advantages to POC in affiliating with a larger service entity that provides administrative services to multiple higher education entities, for example, the economies of scale in sharing support staff and information systems. The affiliation with TCSES significantly contributed to POC's financial turnaround. However, the allocable costs of the services provided by TCSES to POC have grown each year from \$2.9 million in FY 2010-11 to \$4.5 million in FY 2015-16. POC does not fully control the TCSES costs or have much flexibility to adjust the allocation, which comprises 23.4% of POC's total budgeted expenditures in the current year. POC would not be able to afford the caliber of the services it receives from TCSES if it provided that level of service in-house. The expertise and support POC receives from TCSES has enabled POC to improve the quality of services provided to its students and enhance the quality of overall administrative support. This significantly enhances POC's ability to sustain its improved operational performance.

POC's affiliation with TCSES does place both entities in an inter-dependency relationship. POC cannot currently function independently without the services TCSES provides and TCSES is dependent on the revenues from POC to assist in covering its operational costs. This inter-dependency does provide incentives for TCSES to ensure it continues to provide high quality services at an affordable price to POC. However, the POC board and administration will need to continue to monitor the cost, benefit, and quality of the services it receives from TCSES for its ability to sustain its operational performance. The service agreement between the entities includes a termination provision with one year notice (CFR 1.5, 1.7, 3.6).

There is limited independence in evaluating whether or not POC should maintain the services of TCSES since POEC's sole member is TCSES. Six of POEC's 11 board members are also on the board of TCSES, which has 18 board members. The POEC board chair and vice chair are on the TCSES board. The annual management letter for the independent financial audit of POEC is signed by executives of TCSES, not by POEC. The team interviewed the independent auditors as to why the management letter was solely signed by TCSES leadership instead of POEC leadership and were told that since all of the accounting, financial aid, and information systems are controlled by TCSES they felt it was appropriate. This further demonstrates that TCSES has significant control over the POEC operations. In addition, the 2013 TCSES federal tax form 990 reviewed by the team identifies POEC as being directly controlled by TCSES (CFR 3.9).

Financial sustainability. TCSES is not an educational entity, and therefore, it is not accredited. The financial status of TCSES is not officially part of the WSCUC reaccreditation review of POC, yet should TCSES ever experience financial difficulties it could severely impact POC's ability to provide all of the services it currently receives from TCSES. This could negatively impact POC's ability to provide services to its students. The ability to evaluate whether or not POC has a financially sustainable model cannot be fully evaluated without knowing whether or not TCSES is also financially sustainable. POC needs to demonstrate that it has an ongoing method for ensuring that the TCSES services are sustainable as well. POC will need to continuously monitor the financial performance of TCSES to ensure continuity of the services it receives. This may be difficult since TCSES is the sole member of POEC. Further, there needs to be full transparency with the various accrediting bodies of the affiliated entities

regarding the ongoing financial performance and sustainability of TCSES due to the materiality of the TCSES services on the operations of the individual accredited entities.

POC is highly tuition dependent and needs to be able to adjust its expenditures in relation to the fluctuations in student enrollment. POC has experienced growth since its affiliation with TCSES. However, given the market realities in higher education, this rate of growth may slow down or decline for POC and/or the other TCSES affiliated institutions. The TCSES needs to be just as flexible in order to ensure that its allocated costs to each of the affiliated institutions does not ever become a disproportionate share to any of the affiliate's total operating costs and result in directing resources away from the primary mission of educating students to support the management of TCSES (CFRs 1.2, 1.5, 1.7, 3.4, 3.9).

H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

Pacific Oaks College, in its final essay, reflected upon the progress it has made in the years since the fall 2013 special visit. During these intervening years, significant improvement has occurred within the scope of the Commission's recommendations that POC focus energy on addressing challenges related to the TCSES partnership, make progress in further developing faculty governance, and continue to develop institutional planning. Likewise, the institution has made significant progress in moving toward financial stability, enabling the college to experience positive operating results for the last 3 years, increasing its net assets, refining its budgeting processes, strategically focusing its expenditures, and growing its enrollment. This, in turn, has enabled POC to address vital student and faculty support issues. It will now be important for the college to continue to strengthen its financial viability and staffing stability given the high dependency upon enrollment growth and needed resources to properly serve students, faculty and staff.

While the relationship with TCSES was of primary interest, as well as some concern, to the visiting team as it prepared for the visit, the team was quite impressed by the manner in which the Board of Trustees and the administration are utilizing the partnership with TCSES to bring stability, growth, and renewed vision to the college. As noted in this report, the team concurs with POC in affirming the positive outgrowth of this partnership. The team also believes that it is important for the Board of Trustees and college leadership to continue to monitor the TCSES relationship for its ongoing service level support and financial sustainability.

The visiting team agrees with the college's assertion that there is still substantial work to be accomplished. However, the team also believes that the college is now in a position to make significant progress. While the college continues to note its commitment to a "distinctive ethos," the team believes, after carefully listening to students, faculty, staff and trustees speak about the college's mission and unique history, that the college is successfully addressing this commitment.

The team agrees with the self-study's assertion that faculty must take a stronger leadership role in shared governance and academic innovation. The visit revealed that there is a genuine desire for this on the part of both the core and adjunct faculty of the institution. As noted in the recommendations, the team believes POC needs to increase the number of professionally qualified faculty to deepen the college's diverse intellectual environment and care for the expanding needs of students.

The team also agrees with POC's commitment to better establish learning goals and to see continued improvements in student learning exhibited in all areas of the college. While it is encouraging to see the formative work that has been accomplished, the team believes that it is

imperative that systems be fully in place to maintain a comprehensive system for assessment of student learning, both at the program and institutional level. Likewise, the team believes that it will be important for POC to continue to make progress in the use of graduation and retention data for curricular change and student support.

Presidential transitions are key opportunities, and it is clear that there is high regard and respect for the new president. In particular, faculty spoke of the unique skills the new president brings to her work. The team believes that this bodes well for the institution as together administration and faculty address the opportunity to develop a new strategic plan that will guide the institution's work into the future. The team is particularly encouraged by the work of the faculty to reform the Faculty Senate and to reenergize faculty engagement in shared governance. With the support of the new president, the team is hopeful that this new partnership between senior leadership and faculty will prove transformative—particularly through the inclusive embrace of all stakeholders in the development of the next strategic plan.

Finally, the team acknowledges the unique and meaningful mission of POC. It is the team's hope that the college will continue to embrace its commitment to build a new future with the same courage and innovative spirit that led to its creation.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the WSCUC Standards. Final determination of compliance with each of the Standards rests with the Commission.

Commendations

1. The team commends the Board of Trustees for entering into a transformative partnership with TCSES, enabling the college to embrace a newly invigorated future (CFR 1.5).
2. The team commends the new president for her transformational leadership, recognized by all segments of the campus (CFR 3.6, 3.8).
3. The team commends the faculty for reforming the Faculty Senate and reenergizing faculty engagement in shared governance (CFR 3.10).
4. The team commends the college for its academic review programs, such as the meta-review and annual review of academic programs, and for operationalizing the flow of information from these reviews to strategy and budgeting (CFR 2.7).
5. The team commends the college administration and staff for the success in strengthening POC’s financial position, generating its positive operating results for the last three years, increasing its net assets, refining its budgeting processes, strategically focusing its expenditures, and growing its enrollment (CFR 1.7).
6. The team commends Pacific Oaks College for its meaningful connection between learning outcomes, student behavioral expectations, and the Quaker heritage—with particular focus on social justice, diversity and inclusion (CFR 1.2).

Recommendations

1. The team recommends that the college more clearly articulate, map, and assess WSCUC core competencies (CFR 2.2, 2.2a).
2. The team recommends that the college put systems in place to maintain a comprehensive system for assessment of student learning, both at the program and institutional level (CFR 2.6, 4.1, 4.3).
3. The team recommends that administration continue to include faculty voice and full participation in the shared governance of the college (CFR 3.7, 3.10, 4.5).
4. The team recommends that the college increase the number of professionally qualified faculty to deepen the college's diverse intellectual environment and care for the expanding needs of students. In addition, the college ought to clarify its computation of faculty FTE and faculty-student ratio to conform to standard industry practice (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 4.1).
5. The team recommends that continued progress be made in the use of graduation and retention data for curricular change and student support (CFR 2.10, 3.7, 4.1).
6. The team recommends that the Board of Trustees and college leadership continue to regularly monitor the TCSES relationship for its ongoing service level support and financial sustainability (CFR 1.5, 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9).
7. The team recommends that the college continue to strengthen the financial viability and staffing stability of the college given the high dependency upon enrollment growth and needed resources to properly serve students, faculty and staff (CFR 1.5, 1.7, 3.4, 3.5).
8. The team recommends that the development of the next strategic plan be broadly inclusive of all stakeholders and incorporates an assessment framework within the plan (CFR 3.7, 3.9, 4.6).

APPENDIX A: FEDERAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLISTS

There are four checklists that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal requirements affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist
- 3 – Student Complaints Checklist
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Checklist

Teams complete these four checklists and add them as appendices to the team report. They are included here in order for the institution to be prepared to provide the necessary information for the team. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

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.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii).

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor’s degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master’s degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where is the policy located? In the 2014/15 Student Catalog and Handbook, pp.147-148

	<p>Comments: A credit hour for a lecture or seminar course represents 15 hours of instructional activity (e.g., classroom instruction, engagement with web-based instructional materials) based upon a 50-minute hour toward achieving specified student learning outcomes. For distance education courses, the 15 hours of instructional activity may include synchronous or asynchronous lectures or webinars, 148 Interactive tutorials and online discussions. On-ground lecture or seminar classes may be scheduled for 15 or more hours per credit hour to include break times when class sessions are scheduled for longer than one 50-minute hour. A credit hour also assumes an additional 30 hours of homework, studying, and/or research.</p>
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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Pacific Oaks College has regular program reviews that assess the credit hour assigned to each class.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: All course schedules provide number of hours/times parameters that the class will meet. The information is posted on the website.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 6
	Type of courses reviewed: Online
	What degree level(s)? BA and MA
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	What kinds of courses?
(e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated). <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials).	How many programs were reviewed? 4
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Deg. Programs from each school
	What degree level(s)? BA and MA
	What discipline(s)? Hum. Dev., MFT, Special Education, Early Child. marriage and Family Therapy
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	

Review Completed by Christopher Sindt

Date: March 1, 2016

2- MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

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 Requirement	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
S	Comments: Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits the University from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments or the awarding of Title IV Higher Education Act program funds. Admissions counselors at Pacific Oaks' pay is not incentivized by recruitment of students. They are not offered commissions, bonus payment, merit salary adjustments or promotions based on number of students recruited.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The institution provides information of overall cost of the degrees on the website, catalog and admissions collateral: In can be found on the website at http://www.pacificoaks.edu/Admissions/Costs Financial Aid/Tuition and Fees and on p. 29 of the 2015/16 Academic Catalog and Student Handbook
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The School of Human Development does not list specific jobs your degree will qualify you to obtain but fields the degree will qualify the alumni to obtain employment. The School of Cultural and Family Psychology does not list specific jobs but the licensure the degree prepares you to apply for. We provide alumni profiles on our website and in a printed booklet and within the profiles is the employment of the alumni.

**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.

Review Completed By: Karen Davis

Date: March 2, 2016

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST

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.)

Review Completed By: Randal Wisbey

Date: March 2, 2016

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student</p> <p>Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? The policy is located on pp. 69-72 of the 2014/15 Academic Catalog and Student Handbook. The Catalog and Handbook is posted on the Pacific Oaks' College website for any student, employee or prospective student to view.</p> <p>Comments: The Student Grievance Policy may also be obtained in the annual Catalog and Handbook addendums as a repeat.</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Please describe briefly: The Student Grievance Policy is provided as an opportunity for students to bring forth claims of misapplication or misinterpretation of a policy, procedure or regulation of state and federal law. The Grievance Process is overseen by the Associate Vice President of Student Services or a designee. The process provides the opportunity for the student to have an informal and formal resolution process. The informal process is initiated by the student to the accused and is completely voluntary. If an informal process does not resolve the issue, the student has the opportunity to file a formal complaint with the AVP of Student Services. The AVP will then make a ruling in the matter, with the opportunity for the student to appeal the decision if desired. Appeal hearings are forward to a committee to review and resolve.</p> <p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Pacific Oaks makes every effort to adhere to all policies and procedures of the College. A student may request further review of the Provost and President's Office if resolution is not reached through the Student Services Department.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? The Student Complaint Records/Log is maintained under the auspice of the Associate Vice President of Student Services.</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Please describe briefly: The Student Complaint Log dates back to 2011 through current. Access is only provided to persons in this office who are a "need-to-know" College business authority. Access to these records is specifically controlled by the AVP of Student Services. Pacific Oaks' reviewing the incorporating an executive level annual review/audit of student complaints.</p> <p>Comments: The Student Grievance Policy can be found in the 2014-2015 Academic Catalog and Student Handbook on pp. 69-72.</p>

4 - TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST

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).	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Is the policy publicly available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? A summary of the transfer requirements is stated publicly on the Pacific Oaks Website under "Transfer Requirements." The section of the website addresses transfer requirements for the bachelor's Applicants or bachelor's Completion requirements. The posted summary refers to the full policy in the Catalog. The Transfer Credit Policy is stated in the <i>2015-2016 Academic Catalog and Student Handbook</i> on p. 17. The Catalog also includes information regarding Articulation Agreements and program specific requirements.</p> <p>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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO The Articulation Agreement statement and the list of General Education Requirements on Pacific Oaks' College Website list the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution.</p>
	<p>Comments: The Transfer Credit Policy can be found in the <i>2015-2016 Academic Catalog and Student Handbook</i> on p. 17. A summary of the transfer Credit Policy can be found on the Pacific Oaks College website at http://www.pacificoaks.edu/Admissions/Admissions_Requirements/Bachelors_Completion_Requirements/Transfer_Requirements</p>

*§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.

Review Completed By: Kay Llovio

Date: March 1, 2016

APPENDIX B: OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW

San Jose Branch Campus

Institution: Pacific Oaks College

Type of Visit: Off-Campus Location Review

Name of reviewer/s: Christopher Sindt

Date/s of review: February 21, 2016

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. 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

Pacific Oaks College – San Jose Branch Campus
NorCal Branch
1245 South Winchester Blvd., Suite 108
San Jose CA 95128

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).

This site was approved by the WASC Commission in January 2016 as a branch campus. According to the representatives on site, it consolidates several off campus locations into one branch campus hub. POC leases a large section of an office park/mall style building (shared with a bank and near a church) in a mixed use district near San Jose's Santana Row.

The site has a staff of 6.5 FTE, 1 full time faculty member and 14 part time faculty members teaching 1 or 2 courses per semester. They are engaged in searches for two additional full time faculty members to lead the new programming described below.

POC currently offers two programs at this site: a BA in human development and a MA in Human Development with an emphasis in early childhood education. POC plans in the near future to open cohorts delivered through its School of Education: credential programs in elementary education and special education, and an MA in education.

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

During the visit, I met with the following people.

- Marian Browning, Director of Northern California Instructional Sites
- Marcia Bankirer, San Jose Campus Dean
- A group of about 30 students enrolled in classes that day

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

I arrived at about 8:30 a.m. and was greeted by Ms. Bankirer. The students were assembled for a pre-class continental breakfast, and I asked to meet with them alone before their 9:00 a.m. classes started. We then assembled in a large classroom and met for about 25 minutes. The students were generally positive about POC, and appreciated the convenience and the quality of the instruction. It was clear that there has been a lot of transition in staff, location, and scheduling, and that has caused some frustrations to the students around planning their schedules. They indicated that they were very well supported in academic areas, such as IT and library, but felt generally disconnected from the main campus.

I met with Ms. Browning and Ms. Bankirer from 9:00 to 10:00 to review lines of inquiry around site, student services, curriculum, assessment and quality assurance. Ms. Bankirer had recently been hired in connection to the branch campus designation, and so Ms. Browning supplied most of the information.

There were four classes in session beginning at 9:00, and I observed each one for approximately 15 minutes, and left at 11:00 a.m. I observed full classes (ranging from 12-18 students) of engaged students and skilled instruction.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues).
<p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p>		
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1).</p>	<p>It generally seemed that the San Jose campus was strongly connected to the organization of POC in terms of inclusion of staff and faculty with mission-centric work, such as curriculum and support.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10).</p>	<p>Syllabi and other handouts were clearly branded with the identity of POC and the signage and interior decoration were consistent with POC identity.</p> <p>Students noted a strong connection to the alumni community of POC. Many were enrolled because alums in had recommended POC to them.</p> <p>Students complained that they feel disconnected from Pasadena, and that they are reminded of this through emails about things happening only at the Pasadena campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5).</p>	<p>The meeting space was very high quality: spacious, clean, comfortable with adaptable furniture and new technology.</p>	

<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7).</p>	<p>There are little student services provided at the site apart from administrative matters related to instruction. The students felt very well supported by centralized support for library and IT, and financial aid workshops.</p> <p>There periodic in-person visits by librarians and other support personnel.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty 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).</p>	<p>1 full time and 14 part time faculty teach the courses. The FT faculty member sits on College-wide curriculum committees and the department of Human Development. She attends meetings through video-assisted conferencing.</p> <p>Curriculum development and assessment of student learning are done centrally on the campus, and faculty from San Jose participate.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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).</p>	<p>All curricula are designed, approved and evaluated at the Pasadena campus, thus assuring consistency.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10).</p>	<p>The staff indicated that data on retention and graduation are collected and analyzed as central IR functions on the main campus.</p> <p>I asked to see disaggregated data for San Jose, and they indicated that it would be available at the AV.</p>	<p>Need data on retention and graduation disaggregated for this site.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> 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).</p>	<p>There is an overall assessment plan for POC and the San Jose site participates.</p> <p>I asked for disaggregated assessment data and they indicated it would be available at the AV.</p>	<p>Need assessment data disaggregated for this site.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> 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).</p>	<p>My sense was that the centralized nature of quality assurance was effective and provided a need quality assurance framework for the site.</p>	

Cerritos Instructional Site

Institution: **Pacific Oaks College**
Type of Visit: Accreditation Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Randal Wisbey
Date/s of review: Feb. 24, 2016

1. Site Name and Address

Cerritos Cohort
Sheraton Cerritos
12725 Center Court Drive S, Cerritos, CA 90703

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

A conference room in the Sheraton Cerritos serves as a classroom two nights a week. The B.A. in Human Development, Early Childhood Development has one cohort that meets at this location. Communication for Empowerment (HD341) is taught on Monday night and Play across the Life Span (HD311) is taught on Wednesday night. One adjunct faculty teaches each night a course is held there. No POC staff are regularly present at the site but a Student Service Coordinator will come by periodically to check on the space and student needs.

The room was set up with tables and chairs set in a U shape. There was a screen and projector set up, and a light supper was at the back of the room for the students.

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

Prior to the visit I reviewed the syllabus for both classes.

During the visit, I met with the following people:

- Dr. Donald Grant, Associate Dean, School of Human Development
- Terrynce Rucker, Student Services Coordinator-Off Campus
- Melissa Pinkham, Adjunct Faculty instructor for the course taught that night
- 10 of the 13 students enrolled in the course

Upon my arrival, I first met with adjunct faculty member Melissa Pinkham. We enjoyed a 20 minute private conversation. I found her to be an engaging and knowledgeable professor. She has taught courses both on-campus and off-campus.

I next spent 25 minutes talking with the students. 13 are enrolled in the course, and 10 were present during our meeting. While they had a few suggestions that they believed would improve the program, the overall response was one of gratitude for the program, for the convenient location, and for the opportunity to obtain a POC degree. This is the second semester (classes three and four) for this cohort. I reminded the students that their comments would be confidential and that they were invited to make further comment to the online secure email account.

I concluded my visit with a 30 minute conversation with Dr. Grant and Mr. Rucker.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues).
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6).</p>	<p>POC rents the space for the class on Monday and Wednesday evenings.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10).</p>	<p>There was a small sign noting the POC class outside the door to the meeting room, and the receptionist was familiar with the class and provided helpful directions.</p> <p>The primary connection to POC is through the relationships with the teacher and the support staff who occasionally visit the site.</p> <p>Though students are encouraged to stop by the main campus, students interviewed reported that they had little or no need to do so. Connectivity to the main campus is done electronically or the students can go to the main campus in Pasadena.</p> <p>POC send students a newsletter and emails to keep them connected to the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4).</p>	<p>The meeting space was appropriately appointed as a small classroom. It was noted by the students that there had been some challenges with technology in the past semester, but that there was now a projector and screen that was kept at the hotel.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5).</p>	<p>As noted by the teacher and the students, there are no student services regularly provided at the site.</p> <p>Library services are provided online. A beginning orientation takes place on campus.</p> <p>The Student Services Coordinator stops by the cohort approximately once a month. Students are welcome to go to campus if they have specific needs for student services.</p> <p>Students noted that their emails and telephone calls to the main</p>	<p>Students believe it would be beneficial to separate on-campus students and off-campus students during the initial orientation for new students that is held on the POC campus.</p>

	<p>campus are promptly responded to.</p> <p>The SOS team (admissions, student services, administrative faculty) work with Associate Dean Grant to ensure that cohorts have appropriate support.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3).</p>	<p>One adjunct faculty teaches the course on Monday night and one adjunct on Wed. night for the 2 courses taught at this site. The course syllabus is provided to the faculty.</p> <p>Adjunct faculty have little to no input into the curriculum development.</p>	<p>It was noted by the faculty member that opportunity for adjunct faculty to meet, discuss readings and class experiences, would be helpful.</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6). [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>According to Associate Dean Grant, the syllabi are designed by POC core faculty. Courses are comparable to those taught on campus.</p> <p>All ten syllabi are in the process of being redesigned and should be completed by this summer.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10).</p>	<p>According to Associate Dean Grant, POC's Office of Institutional Research tracks the data on retention and graduation rates.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4).</p>		
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7).</p>	<p>Both teacher and students noted the effectiveness of the cohort model. Students identified ways in which they encourage and support one another. Several noted that they were like a "family" and that this encouraged their overall learning experience.</p>	

Van Nuys Instructional Site

Institution: **Pacific Oaks College**
Type of Visit: Accreditation Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Karen Davis
Date/s of review: Feb. 22, 2016

1. Site Name and Address

Van Nuys Cohort
Holiday Inn
8244 Orion Ave., Van Nuys, CA 91406

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

The facility is rented space from the Holiday Inn Express in Van Nuys located 24 miles from POC. A small conference room on the 1st floor of the hotel is utilized for classroom space 2 nights a week. The B.A. in Human Development, Early Childhood Development has one cohort that meets at this location. This is the 1st term that the Holiday Inn has been used. One course is taught on Monday night and another course on Wed. night. No POC staff reside at this location. One adjunct faculty teaches each night a course is held there. No POC staff are regularly present at the site but a Student Service Coordinator will come by periodically to check on the space and student needs.

The hotel lobby has a small seating area, a small area for hotel patrons to have breakfast that students are allowed to use the microwave. Water and coffee are brought in by hotel staff for the students in the classroom. The conference room was very warm and the students stated that they have been complaining about the temperature in the room repeatedly.

There was no technology available in the room to facilitate the instruction of the class. For example, there was no projector, screen, or computer in the room. There were limited electrical outlets in the room. Students complained that they couldn't plug in their laptops in the class. The instructor could not use any PowerPoint, video or other electronic means for instruction. The instructor had to bring her own laptop but could not plug it in. There was no white board or easels for the instructor to write on either.

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

I met with the following people:

Dr. Veronica Estrada, Administrative Faculty and Cohort Coordinator, Human Development,
Terrence Rucker, Student Services Coordinator,
Norma Castellanos, Adjunct Faculty instructor for the course taught that night
10 students enrolled in the course

I first met with Dr. Estrada and Mr. Rucker who informed me that this was the 1st term that this site has been used. All the students taking courses at the site are part of the same cohort where all the courses will be taught at that site. The student support services are managed from the POC Pasadena campus. Students have online access to resources from the Pasadena campus.

There were no written materials to review since the space is only occupied by POC for classes 2 times per week. There are no documents stored at this site.

I interviewed Norma Castellanos, Adjunct faculty, privately and with the students in the class privately. I also informed them that WASC has a secure account for any of them to report any issues anonymously that they don't feel comfortable raising directly with me.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues).
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6).</p>	<p>POC uses this space to accommodate the cohort that mainly resides near this site.</p> <p>POC rents the space for the class times, 2 times per week in the evenings only.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10).</p>	<p>There is no visible presence of POC at this site. All connectivity to the main campus is done electronically or the students can go to the Pasadena campus 24 miles away.</p> <p>POC send students a newsletter and emails to keep them connected to the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4).</p>	<p>The site has adequate space for the classroom and gathering space in the hotel lobby for interaction before or after class. The temperature of the room was a complaint (too warm). It had limited electrical outlets and no electronic support such as projectors, computers, screens, etc. The hotel would sometimes allow students to use the copy machine and microwave.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5).</p>	<p>The site is not conducive to any ongoing student support services. An orientation is provided to the students at the beginning of the cohort and a student services coordinator is available remotely to contact for issues with the site. Other student support is available online or at the Pasadena campus 24 miles away. These include a writing resource and library. Faculty are available via phone, text, and email outside of class. Students stated responses were timely.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3).</p>	<p>One adjunct faculty teaches the course on Monday night and one adjunct on Wed. night for the 2 courses taught at this site. The course syllabus is provided to the faculty by the Dr. Grant, the dean. Faculty are instructed to teach from the syllabus provided and use the textbooks selected by POC. Little discretion is given to the faculty to design their course. The adjunct faculty do not have input into the curriculum development but are expected</p>	

	<p>to maintain the one provided to them. This is how they ensure the standardization of the curriculum taught at each location. Student satisfaction surveys are conducted each term. Adjunct faculty do not participate in the assessment process for the programs. Faculty evaluations are conducted at the end of each term.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6). [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>The faculty in the individual cohorts do not have any input into the design of the programs or courses taught at the site. Course syllabi are provided by the dean and the faculty must follow that template. This is used to standardize the course content at all sites.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10).</p>	<p>The cohort model used at the satellite sites is claimed to have a higher retention rate than the main campus where students are not part of a cohort structure. This site is new so there is no retention or graduation data available yet.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4).</p>	<p>POC claims to just beginning to gather assessment data by the cohorts. The assessment data is reviewed by overall program, not by site. POC is just beginning to look at the various site learning outcomes.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7).</p>	<p>The standardized course content, textbooks, syllabi are used to maintain quality of the courses being taught at remote locations. No evidence was available to determine if the off-campus sites quality varied from the main campus. Faculty evaluations are completed by the students at the end of each term.</p>	



North Hollywood Instructional Site

Institution: **Pacific Oaks College**
Type of Visit: Accreditation Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Karen Davis
Date/s of review: Feb. 22, 2016

1. Site Name and Address

North Hollywood Cohort
Onegeneration
17400 Victory Blvd, Van Nuys, CA 91406

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

The facility is owned and operated by a separate entity named “Onegeneration”. POC uses a conference room in the administrative part of the building for the classroom. There are no POC staff that reside at this location. This is only the 2nd term that courses have been held at this site. It is located 23 miles from the Pasadena POC campus. There is only one POC program at this site. It is one cohort of the B.A. in Human Development, Early Childhood Development. Two evening classes are held at the site, one course on Monday night and another course on Wed. night. The Onegeneration operations are closed during the time that POC courses are held, leaving the rest of the building vacant. Students have to wait for the faculty member to open the exterior door to get into the building and the exterior door remains locked during the class time. If students arrive late they must call someone in the class to come open the door since the conference room utilized is not near the exterior door.

There was no technology available in the room to facilitate the instruction of the class. For example, there was no projector, screen, or computer in the room. There were limited electrical outlets in the room. The instructor could not use any PowerPoint, video or other electronic means for instruction. The instructor had to bring her own laptop and showed video on her laptop to the class.

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

I met with the following people:
Dr. Veronica Estrada, Administrative Faculty and Cohort Coordinator, Human Development,
Terrence Rucker, Student Services Coordinator,
Krisna Escobar, Adjunct Faculty instructor for the course taught that night
8 students enrolled in the course

I first met with Dr. Estrada and Mr. Rucker who informed me that this was the 2nd term that this site has been used. All the students taking courses at the site are part of the same cohort where all the courses will be taught at that site. The student support services are managed from the POC Pasadena campus. Students have online access to resources from the Pasadena campus.

4. There were no written materials to review since the space is only occupied by POC for classes 2 times per week. There are no documents stored at this site.

I interviewed Krisna Escobar, Adjunct faculty, privately and with the students in the class privately. I also informed them that WASC has a secure account for any of them to report any issues anonymously that they don't feel comfortable raising directly with me.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues).
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6).</p>	<p>POC uses this space to accommodate the cohort that mainly resides near this site.</p> <p>POC uses the space for the class times, 2 times per week in the evenings only.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10).</p>	<p>There is no visible presence of POC at this site. All connectivity to the main campus is done electronically or the students can go to the Pasadena campus 23 miles away.</p> <p>POC send students a newsletter and emails to keep them connected to the main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4).</p>	<p>The site has adequate space for the classroom but had no other space available for the students. It had limited electrical outlets and no electronic support such as projectors, computers, screens, etc.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5).</p>	<p>The site is not conducive to any ongoing student support services. An orientation is provided to the students at the beginning of the cohort and a student services coordinator is available remotely to contact for issues with the site. Other student support is available online or at the Pasadena campus 23 miles away. These include a writing resource and library. Faculty are available via phone, text, and email outside of class. Students stated responses were timely.</p> <p>One student complained that her transcripts from another institution were lost at POC.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3).</p>	<p>One adjunct faculty teaches the course on Monday night and one adjunct on Wed. night for the 2 courses taught at this site. The course syllabus is provided to the faculty by the Dr. Grant, the dean. Faculty are instructed to teach from the syllabus provided and use the textbooks selected by POC. Little discretion is given to the faculty to design their course. The adjunct faculty do not have input into the curriculum development but are expected to maintain the one provided to them. This is how they ensure the standardization of the curriculum taught at</p>	

	each location. Student satisfaction surveys are conducted each term. Adjunct faculty do not participate in the assessment process for the programs. Faculty evaluations are conducted at the end of each term.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6). [Also submit credit hour report.]	The faculty in the individual cohorts do not have any input into the design of the programs or courses taught at the site. Course syllabi are provided by the dean and the faculty must follow that template. This is used to standardize the course content at all sites.	
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> 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).	The cohort model used at the satellite sites is claimed to have a higher retention rate than the main campus where students are not part of a cohort structure. This site is new so there is no retention or graduation data available yet.	
<i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4).	POC claims to just beginning to gather assessment data by the cohorts. The assessment data is reviewed by overall program, not by site. POC is just beginning to look at the various site learning outcomes.	
<i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7).	The standardized course content, textbooks, syllabi are used to maintain quality of the courses being taught at remote locations. No evidence was available to determine if the off-campus sites quality varied from the main campus. Faculty evaluations are completed by the students at the end of each term.	