

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

William Jessup University

November 13-16, 2017

Team Roster

John Derry, chair  
President, Hope International University

Lisa Bortman, assistant chair  
Associate Provost, Pepperdine University

Elizabeth Morris, team member  
Associate Provost Institutional Effectiveness, California Baptist University

Brian Tomhave, team member  
Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Life Pacific College

Robert Humphreys, team member  
Chief Financial Officer, Humphreys College

WSCUC staff liaison: Maureen Maloney

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History .....	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process .....	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and rigor of the report and supporting evidence .....	5

### SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions .....	7
B. Component 2: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators .....	7
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees .....	14
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation .....	16
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation.....	17
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence .....	21
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment .....	23
H. Component 8: Optional Essay on Institution-Specific Themes .....	28
I. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement .....	28

### SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

### SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

A. Commendations .....	29
B. Recommendations.....	30

### APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review .....	32
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....	34
3. Student Complaints Review .....	35
4. Transfer Credit Review .....	36
B. Off-Campus Locations Review.....	37
C. Distance Education Review .....	40

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

### **A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History**

William Jessup University (WJU) is a non-profit private Christian liberal arts university located in Rocklin, California, with an additional off-campus site in San Jose. Founded in 1939 as San Jose Bible College, the university experienced 65 fulfilling years in San Jose before moving in June 2004 to its present location. The 125-acre property purchased in Rocklin included a striking, award winning office and warehouse facility for the Herman Miller Corporation, designed by world-renowned architect Frank Gehry. Extensive renovations have transformed the property into a highly functional university campus. When WJU started classes in Rocklin, it did so as the first private four-year university in the greater Sacramento area and the first evangelical Christian college between Fresno and Redding. WSCUC accreditation was achieved in 2002 as San Jose Christian College. (In honor of the founder, the name was changed to William Jessup University in 2003.) The next cycle of accreditation was completed under the former WSCUC system with a Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2007 and an Educational Effectiveness Review in 2009 that resulted in reaffirmation and the next visit scheduled for 2017. A Special Visit took place in October 2012 after which the Commission requested a Progress Report due March 1, 2014 to describe the process for addressing balloon loan payments and how those costs were to be covered.

The goal for all programs is expressed in the mission statement: “In partnership with the Church, the purpose of William Jessup University is to educate transformational leaders for the glory of God.”

WJU has experienced unprecedented growth and expansion over the past six years – enrollment has increased by 82.8% and 33 core and administrative faculty members have been

added to serve its expanded programs and growing operations. The university offers four master's degrees, 22 undergraduate majors, two associate degrees, and one certificate program; two programs are offered online. In the spring of 2017 the total headcount was 1325 students: 911 were traditional undergraduates, 204 were from the school of professional studies, and 210 were enrolled in the graduate school. Of those students 61% are female and 39% are male, 62% were Caucasian, 8% Latino, 6% African American, 5% Asian, 2% Islanders, 2% Native Americans, 9% Mixed, and 6% Undisclosed.

In the last five years the university has undergone a restructuring of the academic division by redefining deans/chairs roles, reorganizing faculty governance through councils and committees, expanding programmatic advisory boards, initiating a school of continuing and professional studies, and developing online capacities in design, production, delivery, courses, and degrees. Faculty development now includes regular scholarly lectures, pathways for promotion, reinstatement of tenure, development of the office of academic research, inauguration of the Jessup Press imprint, and faculty manual redesign and digitization. Student success is supported by a strengthened student life philosophy and capacity and through increased retention strategies (academies, student contracts, expanded tutoring, student support). The athletics program has moved to the Golden State Athletic Conference and is growing responsibly. Infrastructure growth includes the building of a new gymnasium, cafeteria, music building, offices, student residence halls, and most recently science labs.

## **B. Description of Team's Review Process**

The evaluation team reviewed the institutional report and supporting materials, Commission Action Letters, documents from a recent Special Visit, and the supplemental materials requested after the team's Offsite Review (OSR). The team was provided with a very

functional meeting room and found the institution's staff to be hospitable and responsive to requests for information. During the Accreditation Visit the team toured the campus, reviewed communications sent to the confidential e-mail account, and met with multiple constituencies to explore further the issues raised in the institutional report and the lines of inquiry identified during the Offsite Review. The lines of inquiry were:

1. **Financial Sustainability:** support for projected enrollment and fundraising goals that establish the university's confidence level in its ability to achieve these goals.
2. **Strategic Planning:** how the strategic planning process has matured over the past five years, and how it engages the campus community, is data driven, and is connected to the allocation of resources.
3. **Assessment Infrastructure:** the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of the assessment infrastructure in evaluating all areas including student learning in the discipline, core competencies and general education.
4. **Transformational Leadership:** how transformational leadership is being integrated into the curriculum and co-curriculum and how it is being assessed.
5. **Program Review:** the role of program review in ensuring the integrity and coherence of the curriculum.
6. **Student Success:** the ongoing efforts and strategies to promote student success including compilation and analysis of retention and completion data disaggregated to identify possible at-risk student populations.

### **C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report**

The institutional report submitted by William Jessup University for review by the team was well written. Requests for additional supporting documents were provided in advance of the visit. The campus community was broadly engaged in the self-study through conversations around the Criteria for Review (CFR) and by serving on committees that addressed specific topics. The report was approached as an action research project built upon the hypothesis that "WJU successfully prepares transformational leaders" and followed the format prescribed in the WSCUC Handbook. Five sub-themes were explored.

1. Jessup degrees are well-crafted to fulfill its mission with meaning, quality, and integrity.
2. Graduates are prepared for transformational leadership by the time of graduation.
3. Jessup empowers transformational leaders to engage in a lifelong pursuit of knowledge, spiritual formation, and service to their local and global communities.
4. The academic program review is a reflective process of inquiry to assess program quality, rigor, and sustainability.
5. Planning processes at the institution align resources and needs with the strategic objectives of the institution.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

### Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

Following a 2012 Special Visit to WJU, a Commission Action Letter dated March 11, 2013 identified two areas for continuing attention: achieving financial sustainability and managing institutional growth and enrollment. The Commission letter noted that “Because the issue of financial sustainability has been a continuing concern, it is important that substantial progress be indicated by the next comprehensive review.” In addition, the 2012 Special Visit recommended WJU ground its future aspirations in comprehensive, data-based decision-making processes (CFR 4.2, 4.3, 4.5).

These issues were addressed within the institutional report and with supporting materials provided to document the steps WJU has taken to make progress. They were also the subject of two of the lines of inquiry and are addressed further in the team report.

### Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The following observations are provided for reference.

#### *Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives*

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard.

One of WJU’s strengths is the integration of institutional values and mission in the curriculum and co-curricular programs (CFR 1.1, 2.1). Evidence considered included course syllabi and statements by students, faculty, and staff affirming this conclusion.

WJU has developed learning outcomes at the university, general education, program, and course levels. They are documented in the appropriate locations including the catalog, website, department handbooks, and course syllabi. A new set of institutional outcomes, known as

university learning goals, were adopted in 2012-13 following a meta-analysis conducted in the previous assessment cycle. The goals for WJU graduates are:

- Articulate the relevance of Jesus Christ, His teachings, and a biblical worldview to their personal and professional lives.
- Communicate effectively across cultures.
- Demonstrate critical, analytical, and creative thinking.
- Exhibit competence in their chosen disciplines.
- Engage in a lifelong pursuit of knowledge, character formation, and service to their local and global communities.

WJU regularly reports retention and graduation rates to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and in the Common Data Set as well as on the office of institutional research page on the university's intranet and the consumer information page at [jessup.edu](http://jessup.edu) (CFR 1.2).

An academic freedom statement and due process procedures are included in the *Faculty Manual* to safeguard the rights of faculty and students (CFR 1.3). Jessup's commitment to institutional integrity is expressed in the community covenant required of all employees and students and in the educational philosophy undergirding foundational studies.

The institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices (CFR 2.2a, 3.1). Statements of diversity can be found in the catalog, student handbook and faculty handbook. The university's commitment to increasing and fostering diversity and inclusion is also reflected in its current strategic plan. Strategic objective 3.2 supports this by proposing a chapter on diversity be added to the community covenant, making resources available to support student, faculty/staff-initiated

affinity groups, and including the use of best practices for recruiting underrepresented populations (CFR 1.4).

WJU is committed to a policy of safeguarding the rights and welfare of all human subjects in research as expressed in its official policies (CFR 1.6, 1.7).

The university engages on a regular basis in transparent communication with WSCUC through annual reports, substantive change proposals, and regular program implementation forms (CFR 1.8).

*Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions*

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

WJU's educational programs are appropriate in content, requirements, and level of achievement (CFR 2.1, 2.2). Upon review of the catalog and related documents it was found that programs were sequenced appropriately with prerequisites and standards to meet educational objectives (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6). WJU offers a 66-unit common core curriculum, known as foundational studies, that includes general education requirements (48 units), Bible courses (9-18 units), and electives (9 units). Majors range from 33-60 units (CFR 2.2a).

New graduate programs adopted the Degree Qualifications Profile to help define the level of rigor of graduate degrees as detailed in WJU's graduate studies policy (CFR 2.2b). Curriculum mapping exists and demonstrates academic and co-curricular programs alignment with the university learning goals.

Assessment methodologies found in annual reports and program reviews vary in quality. There does not appear to be formal mechanisms to help ensure assessment is leading to change or closing the loop (CFR 2.7). As reported in meetings with the faculty, program reviews do not

have consistent procedures for the evaluation or implementation of recommended changes (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.1). WJU has made progress in assessment of student learning in terms of the university learning goals, core competencies and general education assessment. However, annual assessment of program learning outcomes is still in the developmental stage.

During the visit, some faculty reported limited opportunity for sabbaticals that have been put on hold due to financial constraints (CFR 2.8, 2.9). Research leaves are granted through the Office of Academic Research.

Student support systems include a one-stop advising process, the university learning commons, that provides student academic assistance, tutoring, internship opportunities, and career counseling (CFR 2.5). Collaboration between student life and academic divisions was evident and considered by those interviewed as a strength at WJU (CFR 2.11). Currently the co-curricular programs have student learning outcomes but do not have a formal process for regular systematic assessment. Student life program areas have assessment plans following the same model as the academic programs, and expect to begin a more comprehensive examination of selected student learning outcomes. The associate provost for educational effectiveness coordinates campus assessment efforts for both academic and co-curricular programs (CFR 2.11). *The team recommends WJU develop an infrastructure for the ongoing assessment of co-curricular programs (CFR 2.3, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).*

WJU provides students with the relevant requirements of their academic programs (CFR 1.6, 2.12) including updated degree audits maintained in the student portal. Video tutorials for registration are found at [my.jessup.edu](http://my.jessup.edu). and each semester students receive an email from the registrar's office informing them of advising and registration dates and resources. However, during conversations with student representatives there was a strong consensus that advising

services are not consistent among faculty. The team suggests obtaining student input on strategies to improve advising and then ensure students are aware of what is included in advising support services and faculty are prepared to provide that level of assistance.

Data are collected, analyzed, and reported for selected sub-populations. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against aspirational schools as well as the rates of peer institutions. The team reviewed the Graduation Rate Dashboard, Student Satisfaction Inventory, National Survey of Student Engagement, Learning Commons report, and the Adult Student Priorities Survey (CFR 2.10).

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

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

Faculty hold degrees at least one level above that at which they are teaching. All new faculty are provided one course release time in teaching duties in the first year for a well-designed and valued faculty orientation and development program. Three-year peer reviews and professional support are provided to monitor and encourage faculty growth and development. Adjunct faculty actively participate in the development program and several have transitioned to full time teaching positions (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

As enrollment has increased, new faculty and administrative personnel have been added to the university. There is an excitement on campus that values the changes and expansion and an appreciation for the success, but the pace of change appears to have created a level of frustration with the lack of time and resources to focus on quality. WJU has found it difficult to find a balance between growth and support. Faculty and staff also expressed frustration with lack of communication and not being included in decisions about growth. They are very committed to

the university and their work but would like to know their voice is being heard and to be more engaged in developments and planning for the future. *The team recommends WJU establish transparent and inclusive approaches to decision-making and policy-development through a published and implemented shared governance model based on best practices in higher education (CFR 3.7, 3.10).*

The university is governed by a fifteen-member board of trustees characterized by a mixture of personal and professional backgrounds including business, education, law, accounting, and church/faith oriented experience (CFR 3.9). The trustees are organized into an appropriate structure with an executive committee and functional committees including academic affairs, finance and budgeting, trusteeship, and an audit committee. The team met with a representative group of trustees and was impressed with the knowledge, awareness, and engagement of these board members. All expressed an understanding of the university, its vision, mission, goals, programs, planning, and budgeting.

The trustees acknowledged the challenges facing WJU with respect to significant debt. Board members with expertise in banking and finance were able to discuss alternative methods of refinancing and reducing debt exposure and expressed confidence in the ability of the university to resolve this issue (CFR 3.6).

The team determined that the trustees met the expectations and intent of the WSCUC Governing Board Policy. Discussions with members of the university administration also revealed a high level of leadership expertise, experience, understanding, and dedication to the mission of the university. (CFR 3.8)

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

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

WJU has academic quality assurance processes and a program approval process that includes faculty, operations, and executive leadership. A five-year program review cycle exists for academic programs. There is limited evidence of processes to assure quality in non-academic areas (4.1).

WJU's institutional research capacity is sufficiently supported by the institutional research office with a staff of 1.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) and the educational effectiveness committee (CFR 4.2). The institutional research office maintains a calendar of surveys and assessments with data posted on the university's intranet. WJU benchmarks student success results with peer institutions and national norms. Additional disaggregated data on student success could be considered (CFR 4.3).

In its report, the institution notes four of the seven CFRs (4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7) within Standard 4 as "opportunities for growth" from a 2015 self-review and these have been the subject of ongoing efforts. The university leadership expressed a strong commitment to improvement, although there is concern among faculty and staff that the focus on growth is at the expense of improving quality. *The team recommends WJU assess the impact of rapid growth and change on the campus culture, personnel, and facilities and ensure appropriate levels of support are in place along with processes to effectively communicate with the campus community (CFR 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).* Faculty and administration demonstrate ongoing inquiry into the effectiveness of teaching and learning through assessment of general education and course level outcomes. WJU has invested time and resources in developing and evaluating university learning goals and outcomes, a practice that has been in place for over a decade and is a strength of the university's

assessment process. It includes participation from students and alumni through surveys and focus groups, external specialists, and employers who assess the effectiveness of interns' educational preparation (CFR 4.4, 4.5). Methodologies used for assessment of the university learning goals considers both direct and indirect evidence (CFR 4.1). Assessment of learning outcomes at the program level is still evolving.

Forms documenting compliance with federal requirements were reviewed by members of the team and are included in the appendices of the team report.

The review of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators confirmed assessment of university learning goals and the core competencies is taking place.

### Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

Referenced in the institutional report, and confirmed during meetings with the faculty, was a focused effort in the fall of 2016 to define meaning, quality, and integrity of degree (MQID). Faculty defined "meaning" for WJU as Christian worldview, rigorous academics, diligence and commitment for greater good, and integration of faith and learning (CFR 1.1, 1.2). The university's learning goals articulate a holistic education and are in alignment with the mission as outlined in curriculum matrices that connect the learning goals with program level outcomes (CFR 1.1, 1.2). On the MQID diagram, integrity was supported through the processes of assessment planning and new program development (CFR 2.2, 4.1). WJU's strength in establishing the MQID lies in the development of the five university learning goals and their alignment to the program learning outcomes. WJU has developed curriculum alignment maps that help to define the meaning of the degree and the rigor of the curriculum (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

New program proposals, reviewed by a four-member team, are required to demonstrate mission fit, market analysis, program outcomes, program assessment plan, fiscal and budget implications (CFR 3.7).

The process for program learning assessment is in an emerging stage. The team reviewed a document entitled Assessment Plan (developed and approved in 2013 by the faculty council, September 25, 2013) that details the expectations for program level assessment, but the plan has not been completely implemented. Faculty reported that assessment in the discipline has not been ongoing and is a priority for their next steps in the assessment process (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7).

The business program's 2017 assessment report was reviewed. It used a one-dimensional rubric to measure students work but wrote a thoughtful analysis to "close the loop" and offered specific recommendations. The music program assessment of program learning outcomes in the spring 2016 used direct assessment taken from students' work from courses and group presentations. The methodology did not include indirect data and the student sample was small making conclusions from the assessment difficult. The assessment tools were not available, and analysis appeared limited. The public policy program review in 2017 evaluated the participation of students in experiential learning environments, including class projects, mock interviews, field trips, internships, and research projects. These three annual assessment examples demonstrate initial and emerging data collection and use. The methodologies are limited in the ability to draw reliable and valid conclusions. The current assessment infrastructure does not fully ensure regular and consistent assessment of learning outcomes and standards of performance that will lead to curricular changes (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7). The educational effectiveness committee reported plans to begin a more comprehensive examination of assessment in the discipline.

WJU's assessment infrastructure does not use current assessment technology that provides mechanisms for validating rubrics, peer assessment and showcasing data results. Improved data management could make the assessment process more holistic and greater transparency and access could enhance clarity of expectations and consistency across programs. Involvement of students, alumni, and external constituencies has been used in program reviews, but it is not a standard part of the current methodologies used in the assessment process. The infrastructure to ensure academic rigor and standards of performance for program level assessment needs further development (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).

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

William Jessup University operates with a clear mission that is further defined in the five university learning goals. Achievement of these goals is primarily the responsibility of the faculty, as measured through an assessment plan administered by the educational effectiveness committee that reports to the academic council (CFR 2.4). The university learning goals were found to be aligned and consistent with the five WSCUC core competencies as well as creativity, civic engagement, breadth of knowledge, in-depth study, and the ability to work with others (CFR 2.2a).

Student learning is assessed through at least two embedded practices. First, the educational effectiveness committee assesses at least one university learning goal annually, ensuring all are assessed in a five-year cycle. Second, each degree program conducts an extensive program review every five years (CFR 2.7). Student learning assessment at the program level also takes place, but interviews confirmed that a system for reporting this type of data is limited. The quality of assessment at the program level also varied depending upon the experience of the faculty (CFR 2.4). Each division works within the respective area to assess

course and program outcomes and make decisions based on data that are reported annually and incorporated into the five-year program review. Every undergraduate major at Jessup requires a capstone experience. An educational quality task force met with lead faculty, program chairs, and assessment directors to create and perform a normed assessment of student achievement of selected core competencies (CFR 2.6). Analysis of corresponding data for each core competency showed WJU students were performing at or above expected levels in written communication, oral communication and information literacy. Data results from quantitative reasoning and critical thinking revealed achievement gaps that required attention. Faculty development for building critical thinking skills is planned the spring 2018 according to visit discussions. Recommendations for quantitative reasoning was expected to be determined by spring 2017, but evidence could not be found (CFR 4.3). Intentional academic and co-curricular opportunities are designed to promote transformational leadership development for all students, at all levels. This common goal is one of the strengths of the university (CFR 1.1, 1.2, .2.6). Identifying objective measures of achievement is challenging.

A new plan for compiling assessment results and implementing changes, accepted by the educational effectiveness committee, provost office, and faculty council in fall 2016, had not been implemented as of the visit. This plan includes an annual assessment fair that will improve communication of assessment results across the campus and reinstatement of annual program assessment reporting.

#### Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

WJU demonstrated commitment to student success through its formation of a student success task force in 2015 as part of the self-review. The group contextually defined student success using three key themes: retention and graduation, employability, and demonstration of

lived values. The lived values identified by WJU are developing transformational leaders, thriving spiritually, and engagement in community. The primary forms of evidence used to evaluate these values in students are surveys and tracking participation in selected activities (CFR 2.6, 4.3). The task force's collection and analysis of relevant data to document and improve student success appeared minimal. (CFR 2.10)

According to the 2014 National Survey of Student Engagement, 40% of seniors reported participation in formal leadership activities. Thriving spirituality is supported by faith integration in courses, biblical studies in the core curriculum, and required chapel and spiritual formation activities. WJU assesses this value through course evaluation responses where 79% of traditional undergraduate students and 88% of school of professional studies and master's level students reported growth in faith and practice. Opportunities for community engagement are provided by student life.

The student success task force concluded its work by identifying areas for further exploration including reasons for withdrawal and addressing retention by various student demographics. In summer 2017 the institution formed a retention task force to continue this effort. This task force included representation from institutional research, enrollment, registrar, academics, financial aid, athletics, campus safety, student life, and the learning commons. At the time of the interview there were no faculty on the task force. Members expressed a desire to include faculty and had questions over whether it is an ad hoc or standing committee, what authority it has, and its lines of reporting. They are beginning to work on the recommendations passed on by the student success task force prioritizing an investigation of reasons students are withdrawing by compiling responses to exit survey forms. In addition, the task force intends to identify relevant data to collect including disaggregation of student demographics such as first

generation, commuter versus residential, students of color, and Christian compared to non-Christian. It will also identify gateway courses, research peer comparisons and best practices, and what actions should be taken (CFR 2.10). Presently, there is minimal evidence through documentation or from interviews of review of disaggregated data on retention and completion rates (CFR 2.10, 4.2). The institution acknowledges that only graduation data has been disaggregated by demographic categories. *The team recommends WJU establish a standing committee, with faculty and other appropriate representation, to ensure a continued focus on student success and to develop a comprehensive retention plan based on institutional research data (CFR 2.10).*

Available data shows first year retention is relatively stable since 2007, with a slight decline in the last few years from the low 80% to the mid 70% range. The 6-year graduation rate averaged over the last five years is strong at 61.4%. For the 2010 first-time freshman cohort, male students were significantly lower (49%) than female students (72%). Graduation rates for athletes are on par with the rest of the student body. WJU is tracking graduation rates for first-time freshmen by ethnicity, but the small sizes of the ethnic cohorts do not provide useful data. Comparison with similar institutions drawn from IPEDS show WJU was near the median from 2011 to 2014 for retention and graduation rates. The absolute graduation rate for 2007 to 2014 from the Graduation Rate Dashboard is 63% and the Unit Redemption Rate is 74%.

The graduation rate for students in the school for professional studies is approximately 60%. Only one master's degree, the Master of Arts (MA) in teaching, has been in place long enough to have data and reports a 66% completion rate for credential recommendations and a 28% graduation rate which the institution attributes to many students satisfied with receiving

their credentials and not finishing the program. As the institution continues to add graduate programs, it should identify graduation targets for each one.

WJU reviews students' involvement in certain high-impact practices and administers a post-graduation survey to evaluate student success in terms of employability. The post-graduation survey results provide satisfactory evidence for success of graduates. Graduates demonstrate better results for full-time employment and graduate school than national averages, but lower entry level salaries and employment in jobs related to major or field of preference.

The institution established numerous student support initiatives in 2012 including the learning commons (CFR 2.11, 2.13) that is comprised of the writing center, disability support services, and career & life planning. The learning commons provides resources such as tutoring focused on courses identified as barriers to success, workshops, mentoring, and career counseling all in a shared space created in library for centralized services. The institution created academies for entering students deemed to be at-risk academically after realizing students accepted on academic probation had a 70% attrition rate. Students in the academies receive personal mentoring, individualized academic plans, and take a course focused on study skills and identifying personal strengths. Data show these academies have produced positive results and personnel continue to adjust the program to improve its effectiveness.

Additional programs include first-year and sophomore experiences and writing and math summer boot camps. Learning commons personnel report most students access some of its services during their time at WJU. Retention of first-time, transfer, and continuing students declined slightly from 2011 prior to these initiatives. WJU is evaluating the effectiveness of the programs based on student feedback, number of appointments, pass rates on equivalency exams,

and persistence rates to provide evidence of the effectiveness of these support services and retention initiatives.

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

A focus on creating a culture of quality improvement is evident through the program review reports and from interviews with faculty regarding assessment of student learning. Institutional data are used to analyze retention, professor/student ratios, cultural and gender divisions, and quality of instruction. The collection of data appears to have led the university to make program changes, engage faculty, and support student success services. Although these changes have been reported, there appears to be a lack of sharing these results with common stakeholders and a clear process for how these tools inform the institution's decision-making (CFR 4.1, 4.2).

WJU's program review process is designed to demonstrate a cohesive, integrated curriculum that supports both the program and university outcomes. The process places emphasis on linkages between the program and the community it serves and on the connections between the review and planning, decision-making, and resource allocation (CFR 2.7).

Program reviews included in the institutional report showed deep and thorough examination of most aspects of the degree. Program quality was analyzed through the lens of student learning, curriculum in relation to current professional standards, and faculty development. Reviews included benchmark comparisons, institutional research information, and assessment data collected within the last five years (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4). Program sustainability was considered by looking at the current demand and growth trends, faculty workload and institutional resources (CFR 4.5, 4.6). Funding for external review is also available. Standard expectations are provided, but each program has the latitude to review and

research what is most relevant and applicable to the particular line(s) of inquiry for the specific program. According to the academic program review template, the program reviews are presented to the provost and this was verified by the faculty. Results from program reviews were tied directly to the recommendations made. Interviews with the faculty revealed that the process was valuable and used to better inform decision-making. Curriculum was improved using industry standards, instruction of content was improved based on student input, and new programs were considered using external research (CFR 2.7).

Quality improvement was verified with faculty who had completed a program review in the last two years. Most of the recommendations seen in the program review reports have become part of a new process or are being considered with regards to budget. New programs have been created, professional accreditation processes have begun, and new faculty have been hired for identified needs.

Although the program review process appears to be supporting and informing decision-making for planning and improvement, the institutional report indicates that areas of improvement include reinforcing annual assessment efforts and providing annual feedback. This was verified on the visit through interviews with committees and faculty members. The first step to a process for annual assessment was seen in the required plan that each academic program has on file that includes the program learning outcomes and information for how and when each outcome is assessed (CFR 2.4, 4.4). Monitoring this plan will be the next step necessary to ensure quality improvement.

An educational quality task force conducted research on program learning goals, plans, and the process for using assessment results for program improvement. The team found that regular implementation of assessment plans had been hampered by curricular revision efforts or

new program design. Other anecdotal data was shared in response to how annual assessment results are used for program improvement and faculty again spoke to the lack of resources and administrative support available for the creation, implementation, and sustainability of regular assessment practices (CFR 2.4, 4.4, 4.5). WJU has invested substantial effort in assessing the university learning goals and program reviews. *The team recommends WJU continue to develop institutional assessment, which has not yet fully matured, by committing resources to manage and analyze data; by disaggregating data to track and improve student success; and by facilitating the connection between program review and strategic planning. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 4.2, 4.4 4.6)*

#### Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

Among the lines of inquiry for this visit were financial sustainability and enrollment management, two of the issues that were also considered during a 2012 Special Visit. In the years 2011, 2012, and 2013 the university experienced financial deficits but has had positive results each year since then. Budget projections indicate a deficit in 2018, and surpluses in the years 2019, 2020, and 2021. Assuming these results are realized, the five-year period 2017 to 2021 will show a cumulative surplus. Given the growth in enrollment WJU is experiencing and the corresponding necessary changes in expenses, fluctuation in surpluses and deficits would not be unusual. It is important to note that during the past 8 years, there has been an increase in cash as the deficits have been less than the non-cash expense charges in each year. This can be attributed to steady and sound financial management.

Of primary concern for both the reaffirmation of Accreditation Visit in 2009 and the Special Visit in 2012 was the continued financial sustainability of the university given the effects of the substantial debt taken on as the university relocated from San Jose to Rocklin in 2004.

Since this move, the university has experienced first an enrollment decline and then an impressive growth in enrollment to the current level.

The rapid growth in enrollment and accompanying increase in faculty, staff, physical facilities, and program offerings has put stress on resources and finances. As of the Fiscal Year 2017 audit, the university has accumulated a significant debt of approximately \$74 million, including a sizeable loan with a balloon payment due July 1, 2019, a construction loan, and a line of credit each also due in 2019, lease obligations due in 2020, and a note with the local municipality for street improvements.

The university currently incurs a significant cost in debt service each year. Of interest to the team at the time of the visit were three large loans described above that will need to be refinanced in 2019. Good progress has been made in improving revenues from tuition as well as fundraising. The tuition discount rate as a percentage of all revenue has remained at 36% for each of the past two years. In the interest of being able to continue to make the debt payments, and eventually refinance these into fully amortized loans or other financing, it is important that the university have a full and realistic understanding of its ability to continue to achieve enrollment growth, as has been shown over the past several years to be impressive. At the time of the visit, WJU projects a positive view of the next five years in both financial results and enrollment growth. In light of the close ties the university has with its supportive community of churches and other faith-based organizations, and its impressive ability to raise funds over the past several years, WJU can make a strong case for these projections.

Conversations with the trustees, president, and chief financial officer reveal a strategy of growth in the traditional undergraduate, adult degree completion, graduate, and international student programs with higher financial margins. The intention is to produce increasing financial

surpluses which can be used to reduce debt principal. The university is executing a plan to refinance this debt into a fixed rate long-term structure.

Carrying such a high level of debt presents risks that are of concern to the team. Over the past several years the surpluses realized by the university have been well below the non-cash expenses. Therefore, if enrollment targets are not met or there is a sudden decline in giving, significant deficits could result. The president, chief financial officer and members of the board executive committee are aware of this but are enthusiastic in their expression of confidence that the university will continue to be successful in increasing enrollment, revenues, and margins.

Ultimate enrollment goals as discussed in the strategic plan are 1159 traditional, 695 graduate, and 204 school of professional studies. These are ambitious aspirations but do not seem to be unrealistic given the university's specific mission and its place in the Central Valley as the only faith-based, comprehensive independent institution. Nevertheless, there remains the possibility that enrollment or fundraising goals could fall short as has occurred in the recent past. Further, continuing to carry such high levels of debt could affect the ability of the university to secure refinancing or future financing at reasonable rates. It would be prudent for WJU to consider alternatives in the event of unexpected developments or unanticipated challenges.

Currently, the major primary loan is interest-only making it especially vulnerable to changes in rates that are almost certain to begin increasing and could be markedly higher by the time it is necessary to refinance the existing debt. Without a large reduction in principal, debt service will increase when amortized with a higher interest rate and this will have budget implications. The institution will be especially interested in securing longer term, low rate financing to the extent possible. *The team recommends WJU aggressively pursue arrangements to refinance existing debt into a fully amortized loan and to incorporate into the annual budget*

*operating surpluses dedicated to reduction of principal. Financial planning will also need to include a contingency plan in the event there is a major shortfall in enrollment and/or fundraising (CFR 3.4).*

The institution is also encouraged to consider seriously its stated plans of reducing debt either through capital giving or potential monetization of existing real estate assets. The permanent endowment is currently \$2,817,968 and growth should also be a consideration in future fundraising strategies.

The university has been successful in maintaining a capital giving program. Over the past 6 years, the university has established a very effective development department headed by a capable and energetic director. The office has grown in staffing and has adopted strategies in keeping with successful college and university practices. At the time of the visit, the president informed the team that this director will be leaving at the end of this year. While it is unfortunate to lose this key leader at this time, the structure he has put in place is solid and will endure the time between his leaving and the acquisition of a new director. The president made it clear that this will be his top priority in the next few months.

While operating results have been modest over the past three years, it is noted that additions to cash have been positive and increasing due to enrollment growth. Unrestricted net assets have trended upward from \$14,823,055 in 2011, to \$18,608,652 in 2017.

The strategic planning process involves multiple constituencies, but appears from interviews to be more vision-driven than data-driven (CFR 4.6). The institution is aware of potential higher education changes and considers them in planning, particularly the possibility of state and federal legislation withdrawing funding from faith-based institutions as was strongly referenced in the institutional report (CFR 4.7).

The university recently developed and published a strategic plan structured around four key priorities: equip transformational leaders for kingdom impact; encourage innovative scholarship; foster a diverse community that honors Christian principles; secure a financially secure future (CFR 3.4, 4.6). Discussions with the various constituencies of the university reveal an acceptable level of knowledge and participation in the planning process. The goals and implementation strategies outlined are understood and accepted as appropriate for the university given this time in its history and future opportunities. However, the team determined the level of data usage in planning was spotty and uneven at this point. WJU is encouraged to continue to formalize policies and procedures to more firmly imbed the acquisition and use of data as metrics to develop and measure progress in achievement of the strategic initiatives.

One shortcoming of the plan is the tie between the planning goals and the supporting budget. There is a place on the plan for costs associated with the various goals and strategies but with one or two exceptions, there are no stated budget impacts. Because many of the goals carry significant financial commitment it would be important for the resulting impact on the annual budget to be more clearly presented (CFR 4.6). Several department heads indicated they experienced the budget impact of planning goals affecting their respective budgets. This is a positive start to making the connection between planning and budget. The institution is encouraged to continue to develop and formalize this next step. *The team recommends WJU enhance the strategic planning process to include broader systemic input from stakeholders, greater reliance on data and research, and an effective means of communicating progress to the campus community (CFR 4.5, 4.6).*

The university is commended for its acquisition of the fortune 500 class budgeting and forecasting software to help provide timelier, accurate, and sophisticated financial results that

will be very useful in managing an increasingly complex and large budget and operations (CFR 3.5).

#### Component 8: Institution Specific Themes

No additional themes were addressed by the institution or the visiting team.

#### Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The self-review process for William Jessup University provided insight to institutional strengths and opportunities for growth. It affirmed a solid assessment and review process to track and improve student learning. A focused research project demonstrated that graduates are prepared to become transformational leaders through well-designed degrees and practical co-curricular leadership experiences. The university has made good progress toward establishing a functional system for policy development and planning that engages the campus community.

With respect to areas that will require further attention and development the following concerns were identified in the self-review.

- Secure Additional Resources Committed to Educational Effectiveness Structures And Procedures.
- Equip Transformative Leaders for Kingdom Impact
- Encourage Innovative Scholarship
- Cultivate a Culture that Respects the Value of People
- Secure a Financially Sustainable Future

### **SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS**

There were no additional issues addressed by the university in the self-review or by the WSCUC Team during the Accreditation Visit.

## **SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Over the past two years, the William Jessup University campus community has actively engaged in the WSCUC review process and sentiments expressed by those involved indicated the self-review was a valuable and informative experience.

Since the relocation of the university's main campus from San Jose to Rocklin, California, major changes have occurred including new academic and athletic programs, enrollment growth, campus facilities expansion, and increases in faculty and staff. During the visit it became quite clear a major ongoing challenge is managing that change.

It is within this context that the following commendations and recommendations were identified by the team.

### *Commendations*

1. WJU full-time and part-time faculty are commended for their commitment to providing quality education as affirmed by students who expressed overwhelming gratitude for their dedication and service.
2. It was evident throughout the institutional report and confirmed during the visit that WJU stakeholders have a strong sense of mission and ownership in developing students as transformational leaders for the glory of God.
3. The team commends WJU for significant enrollment growth during a period of exceptional higher education challenges and for executing a campus facilities master plan that is attractive, functional, and an innovative use of space.
4. The team commends WJU for developing well-defined university learning goals and for assessing them effectively to inform quality improvement.

5. The WJU student life team is commended for their dedication and commitment to creating a caring environment in which individual students receive the support, encouragement, and guidance necessary to develop academically, relationally and spiritually as transformational leaders.

### *Recommendations*

1. The team recommends WJU develop an infrastructure for the ongoing assessment of co-curricular programs (CFR 2.3, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).
2. The team recommends WJU establish transparent and inclusive approaches to decision-making and policy-development through a published and implemented shared governance model based on best practices in higher education (CFR 3.7, 3.10).
3. The team recommends WJU assess the impact of rapid growth and change on the campus culture, personnel, and facilities and ensure appropriate levels of support are in place along with processes to effectively communicate with the campus community (CFR 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).
4. The team recommends WJU establish a standing committee, with faculty and other appropriate representation, to ensure a continued focus on student success and to develop a comprehensive retention plan based on institutional research data (CFR 2.10).
5. The team recommends WJU continue to develop institutional assessment, which has not yet fully matured, by committing resources to manage and analyze data; by disaggregating data to track and improve student success; and by facilitating the connection between program review and strategic planning. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 4.2, 4.4 4.6)

6. The team recommends WJU aggressively pursue arrangements to refinance existing debt into a fully amortized loan and to incorporate into the annual budget operating surpluses dedicated to reduction of principal. Financial planning will also need to include a contingency plan in the event there is a major shortfall in enrollment and/or fundraising (CFR 3.4).
7. The team recommends WJU enhance the strategic planning process to include broader systemic input from stakeholders, greater reliance on data and research, and an effective means of communicating progress to the campus community (CFR 4.5, 4.6).
8. The team recommends that WJU develop an effective way to track and monitor student complaints over time (Student Complaints Review Form - Records).

## Appendix A Federal Compliance Forms

### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? Faculty Manual AO 5.2.1 Credit Hours Faculty shared drive, course development materials
	Comments: Published in course syllabi
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: through new course approval process and program review
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Jessup has a fifteen week semester, comprised of 14 weeks of instruction plus finals; classes are based on a 55-minute hour in order to meet the policy based on 50-minute hours x 15 weeks.
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? <b>Undergraduate online:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to Philosophy <a href="http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-phil271-01">http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-phil271-01</a></li> <li>• Foundations of Education <a href="http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-tedu302-01">http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-tedu302-01</a></li> </ul> <b>Graduate online:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Testament Foundations <a href="http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-bibl500-01">http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-bibl500-01</a></li> <li>• Transformational Leadership <a href="http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-ldrs513-01">http://onestop.jessup.edu/17-sp-s1-ldrs513-01</a></li> </ul> <b>Undergraduate hybrid</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FA-16 BUS245 Financial Accounting</li> <li>• ENGL350 Children's Literature</li> </ul>
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS X BA/BS X MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Philosophy, Education, Bible, Leadership, Business, English
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical,	How many syllabi were reviewed? MUS296 University Choir & Orchestra 1 unit, 4 hrs/week; CART376 Acting III- Shakespeare 3 units, 4hrs per week plus 6-12 outside; CHEM111 Lab 2 units, 6 hours; MAT Student Teaching
	What kinds of courses? Labs
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS X BA/BS X MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Music, Theatre, Science, Education, Business

independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Performing arts classes meet for more than the prescribed hours. Student Teaching demand hours apart from state-mandated classroom hours meets policy. Faculty will conduct credit hour compliance audit in spring semester 2018.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? All
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? All
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? All
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: website: <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/academics/">http://www.jessup.edu/academics/</a> 2016-17 catalog

Review Completed By: Elizabeth Morris  
Date: November 16, 2017

## 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/TitleXDisclosure.pdf">http://www.jessup.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/TitleXDisclosure.pdf</a></p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:  Length time of degree: <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/undergrad/admissions/">http://www.jessup.edu/undergrad/admissions/</a> <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/sps/">http://www.jessup.edu/sps/</a> and graduate program pages at <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/academics/">http://www.jessup.edu/academics/</a>  Overall cost of degree:  general page: <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/">http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/</a> <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/undergraduate/#tab_undergrad-tuition-fees-future">http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/undergraduate/#tab_undergrad-tuition-fees-future</a> <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/school-of-professional-studies/#tab_sps-tuition-fees-current">http://www.jessup.edu/financial-aid/school-of-professional-studies/#tab_sps-tuition-fees-current</a>  graduate program pages at <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/academics/">http://www.jessup.edu/academics/</a></p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:  See individual program pages for kinds of jobs for which graduates are prepared <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/learning-commons/career-life-planning">http://www.jessup.edu/learning-commons/career-life-planning</a> <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/learning-commons/career-life-planning/useful-links/">http://www.jessup.edu/learning-commons/career-life-planning/useful-links/</a></p>

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Robert Humphreys  
Date: November 16, 2017

### 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?  website Consumer Information Page: <a href="http://my.jessup.edu/studentlife/home-page/student-complaint-process-notice/">http://my.jessup.edu/studentlife/home-page/student-complaint-process-notice/</a> intranet Student Handbook link to website link <a href="http://my.jessup.edu/studenthandbook/">http://my.jessup.edu/studenthandbook/</a>
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Students may contact either the Dean of Students or the Office of the Provost, who will direct them to the appropriate process.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: WJU encourages minor differences be resolved through an informal process. In situations where a more formal process may be necessary, the grievance process is intended to settle disputes through mediation and reasoned discussion. This process is not intended to supplant the student conduct process or the administrative rules of the university, particularly in situations of sexual misconduct, discrimination, or disability services.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Registrar's Office
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO If so, please describe briefly:
	Comments: WJU intends to move to a google form that will enable the university to digitally record pertinent details of the complaint.

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Lisa Bortman

Date: November 17, 2017

#### 4 - TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publicly available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where?  The Transfer Credit Policy is posted on the institutional website: <a href="http://www.jessup.edu/registration-and-advising/articulation-agreements/">http://www.jessup.edu/registration-and-advising/articulation-agreements/</a> and in the 2017/18 College Catalog on p. 124.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:  WJU follows the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers guidelines for transfer of credit.  Criteria include: “All courses taken at schools with regional or ABHE accreditation, meet UC or CSU transferable credit requirements, do not repeat Jessup credits, and are a “C-“ or better will be accepted in transfer during the first semester of enrollment. Units will be accordingly distributed to proper requirements. Decisions about course comparability may be referred to the appropriate department chairs.’

\*§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 WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Brian Tomhave  
Date: November 14, 2017

## **Appendix B Off-Campus Locations Review**

Name of reviewer: Dr. John Derry, Chair

Date of review: October 26, 2017

1. Site visited:

William Jessup University San Jose Branch Campus  
1190 Saratoga Ave. Suite 210  
San Jose, CA 95129

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)

The WJU campus in San Jose has been in operation since the university relocated to Rocklin, CA in 2002. It has evolved from an education center to a fully functioning campus. The facilities are well-located in a corporate office complex with adequate parking and accessibility and include a student lounge, reception area, offices, classrooms, and general-purpose meeting rooms. Video conferencing technology is incorporated that enables interaction with the main campus for meetings or instructional purposes.

Approximately three years ago the university made a strategic decision to expand the academic offerings and level of support staff. Current programs include a for-credit certificate in addiction counseling, undergraduate degree completion in business administration, Christian leadership, organizational leadership, and psychology, and masters level degrees in education, teaching, and business administration.

The campus is served by an appropriate number of support personnel who communicate regularly with the main campus and have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities.

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

The campus was visited by Dr. John Derry, chair of the evaluation team, on October 26, 2017. Prior to the site visit, he reviewed documents provided by WJU and prepared a series of questions and topics for discussion. The results of the visit were shared with the team at the time of the Accreditation Visit to the WJU main campus on November 13-16, 2017.

All requested documents were provided in digital and print format and included a description of programs, examples of course evaluations, student success data, faculty qualifications, etc. with print copies of the material available in San Jose and at the Accreditation Visit in Rocklin.

Meetings took place with the site director, representative faculty, representative students, and administrative staff. Topics covered in the discussions addressed the level of student and faculty support, policies and procedures, quality assurance practices, strategic planning, and challenges. The participants were very engaged in the conversation and were enthusiastic in their assessment of the value of the WJU branch campus programs.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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?	This was the first site visit by WSCUC to this location and there were no previous recommendations.	None required.
<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)	There is a strong conviction on the importance of WJU having a strategic presence in Silicon Valley because of the institutional mission opportunity and enrollment potential. Having a qualified upper level administrator who oversees this site and reports directly to the provost has been critical to the success of the campus. Changes are integrated in the short and long term strategic plans.	None required.
<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)	Affiliation of the campus with WJU is clearly evident through signage, marketing materials, and publications available in the reception and student lounge areas. The students interviewed were aware of the association with the main campus in Rocklin. The nature of the program is such that students are on campus primarily for instruction only and have minimal time and capacity for further involvement in the life of WJU outside of the classroom.	None required
<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)	The well-maintained classroom accommodations for students reflect sensitivity to professional standards and the computer lab and study lounge serves working adults who may need study space away from family distractions. Qualified staff are on hand during all times that classes are in session to assist as necessary.	None required.
<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)	Full time personnel on site provide assistance with enrollment, academic advising, support services, and respond to student accounts questions. Communication with the main campus frequently takes place. Student course evaluations and comments by students indicate a high level of satisfaction with these aspects of the campus.	None required.

<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>Courses are taught primarily by forty-three adjunct and one full time faculty members, and by three full time administrators with some teaching responsibilities. Faculty participate in a well-designed orientation and ongoing faculty development program that ensures they are appropriately engaged with the university and have opportunity for input on curriculum and educational effectiveness.</p>	<p>None required.</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>Programs and courses offered at the off-campus site are the same programs that are available on the main campus as part of the School of Professional Studies.</p>	<p>None required.</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>Data for programs established at the off-campus site are comparable to the results of those within the School of Professional Studies.</p>	<p>None required.</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>All processes for the assessment of student outcomes at the off-campus site are the same as the main campus within the School of Professional Studies</p>	<p>None required.</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>The processes to evaluate educational effectiveness at the off-campus site are the same as those implemented at the main campus with the School of Professional Studies.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

## **Appendix C**

### **Distance Education Review**

Name of reviewer: Brian Tomhave

Date of review: November 15-16, 2017

#### **Programs and courses reviewed:**

B.S in Criminal Justice

M.A. in Leadership

WJU currently offers 2 fully online programs: a Master of Arts in Leadership (MAL) begun in January 2016, and a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Criminal Justice (BSCJ) begun in September 2016. In addition, WSCUC approved an online BS in Business Administration, which will begin in either Summer or Fall 2018. WJU also offers online courses as part of its traditional program by the different schools/divisions as deemed necessary by the deans, provost and registrar.

From its beginning in Summer 2013 to Fall 2017, Jessup Online enrollments have increased from 104 to 804, and the number of courses offered each semester has grown from 15 to 54. As of fall 2017, Jessup Online has developed 91 undergraduate and 32 graduate courses.

The BSCJ program had 3 students (3 FTE) in fall 2016 and 10 students (7 FTE) in fall 2017.

The MAL program had 31 students (23 FTE) in fall 2016 and 42 students (30 FTE) in fall 2017.

The institution is planning on adding four new online programs by fall 2018.

#### **Nature of the review:**

Reviewed the WJU Catalog, institutional website, Jessup online course design guide

Interviewed the online advisory task force; dean of online instruction

<b>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</b>	<b>Observations and Findings</b>	<b>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</b>
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>WJU’s online program offerings align with the institutional mission. The philosophy which drives Jessup Online is one of thorough institutional integration. Consequently, courses and programs are “owned” by the academic divisions within which they are appropriately housed.</p> <p>New online programs are conceived through a collaborative effort of the deans and the provost’s office, and then go through the university’s academic program development process, which includes approval by the Academic Council.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>The fully online students in the MA Leadership and BS Criminal Justice programs are integrated into the life and culture of the institution in several ways. All online courses include new-student orientation, introduction forums with ice breaker questions and prayer request forums. Class sizes are kept to about 20 students, allowing faculty to have a high level of interaction and relationship with students. In addition, distance students have access to live-streaming and previous chapel service videos, and have available fully online access to student services such as library materials, writing center tutoring, advising, and career services.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>The institution uses the Moodle learning management system (LMS) hosted by MoodleRooms in a clustered, load balanced, redundant environment. They guarantee 99.9% uptime and less than two-second average server response time. MoodleRooms is password protected against hackers, virus scanned to isolate and delete any corrupt files, authentication, and roles-based access, to control access and delegate administration. MoodleRooms follows a release, upgrade and maintenance schedule that fits with the academic calendar:</p> <p>Every course places a great deal of emphasis on community-building through high levels of faculty/student and student/student interaction. This is accomplished through discussion forums and online office hours for faculty. All Jessup Online courses have a link for 24-hour Information Technology (IT) support from an outside vendor. Support is also available during regular business hours through the WJU IT department.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>Students have access to advising, library resources, IT support, writing center tutoring, the success center, and career services – all provided either online or through phone appointments. Student use and satisfaction with both IT/moodle support and library resources is tracked through student evaluations which show satisfactory and improving levels of satisfaction with information resources, technical support, and the help desk.</p>	

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>Online courses are taught by a mixture of adjunct (approximately 70%) and full-time (approximately 30%) faculty. Approximately 40% of courses in the BSCJ program and 15% in the MAL program are taught by full-time faculty. All online faculty are considered to be a part of the department/division in which they are teaching. The deans of these divisions and schools include online adjunct faculty members in their divisional/departmental faculty support and development processes and activities.</p> <p>All online faculty go through a comprehensive training program covering LMS usage and navigation, online learning theory, online pedagogy, and best practices in the online learning environment. New online faculty are personally mentored and shadowed by the dean of online instruction throughout their entire first course. Faculty have direct access to the dean of online instruction and to the Jessup Online instructional designers if they have any questions or problems. Typical response time is from a few minutes to a few hours. The dean of online instruction provides weekly opportunities for all current online faculty to engage with each other as a community to discuss relevant faculty development topics regarding online learning and pedagogy.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>Jessup Online courses are designed using a tandem, collaborative approach between faculty SMEs (Subject Matter Experts) and instructional designers. Courses have consistent and standardized syllabi, as well as consistent design and navigation within MoodleRooms – across all disciplines and all programs. Faculty are provided an Online Course Design Guide.</p> <p>New online programs are conceived through a collaborative effort of the deans and the provost’s Office, and then go through the university academic program development process, which includes approval by the Academic Council.</p> <p>All Jessup Online courses have the same learning objectives, credit hour expectations, and quality of instruction as the traditional on-campus courses. Program/courses at the university are not approved according to modality, but according to academic rigor.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>The institution produced some data on online course completion rates with comparisons to on ground courses. The data shows improved completion rates each term from fall 2013 to spring 2015 at 91% compared to 97% for on ground courses. Personnel attribute this improvement to better advising of traditional students on the rigor and expectations of online courses.</p> <p>No data exists on retention or completion at the program level, partly due to neither program being two years old yet. The institution will need to develop procedures for tracking program completion as it creates additional offerings.</p>	

<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>The course design process ensures that each course contains measurable learning objectives. Further, every course has an assessment map that assures that each course objective is properly assessed.</p> <p>The faculty have not yet conducted assessment of student learning at the program level within the two online programs.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>WJU has contracts with Blackboard/MoodleRooms and AELearn to provide the infrastructure and some technical support for our learning management system. The arrangements comport with the policy on <i>Agreement with Unaccredited Entities</i>. WJU is currently in discussion with an online program management company to provide recruitment, enrollment, and coaching services.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>Courses and programs are assessed by the relevant academic division chair or dean as they are developed. Every course is designed to meet the standards of the quality matters rubric. Courses are monitored while in progress to ensure that the faculty (particularly new faculty) are maintaining social, teaching, and cognitive presence according to the community of inquiry model. Every course has a formative assessment instrument in week 4 (of 7) to give faculty an opportunity to check learning and make midstream adjustments if necessary. Student evaluations at the conclusion of each course provide summative assessment, giving diverse feedback on curriculum, faculty, technology, online support resources, and the online experience. Faculty evaluations are required after each course, giving suggestions for course improvement as well as providing an opportunity for self-reflection to improve personal pedagogy. Fully established courses are evaluated and undergo significant revision or upgrade on a rotating, three-year cycle.</p> <p>At the end of each year the dean of online instruction conducts a self-study using the Online Learning Consortium's Scorecard to assess where Jessup Online stands and to make suggestions for improvement in the overall program during the following academic year.</p>	