

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To CETYS University

March 15 - 17, 2017

Team Roster

Timothy P. White - Chair
Chancellor, The California State University

Judie Wexler - Assistant Chair
Provost and Interim President, California Institute of Integral Studies

Robert Allison - Team Member
VP for Business and Finance, Retired, Vanguard University of Southern California

Susan Opp - Team Member
Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, California State University Maritime
Academy

Jennifer Summit - Team Member
Interim Provost, San Francisco State University

Richard Osborn - WSCUC Institution Liaison
Vice President, WSCUC

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of the Institution and Reaccreditation Process	
B. Description of Team's Review Process	
C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	
SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	6
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees	
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment	
SECTION III - FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	24
APPENDICES	26
A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Program Length	
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	
3. Student Complaints Review	
4. Transfer Policy Review	

SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

Description of the Institution

CETYS University was founded in 1961 in Mexicali, Mexico. The university was established to provide quality higher education within the Baja California region so that young people would not need to leave the region to seek higher education. It was expanded in 1972 when the Tijuana Campus was established and then again in 1975 when the Ensenada Campus was established. CETYS today serves nearly 5,000 students at its three campuses, offering 16 undergraduate and 6 graduate programs (Institutional Report, page 3). In the time since the Institutional Report as submitted, CETYS has added a new graduate program, a Master of Arts in Neuropsychology.

With 2009 students, the College of Business is the largest at CETYS, closely followed by the College of Engineering with 1883 students. The College of Social Sciences and Humanities is the smallest with 904 students. The campus in Tijuana is the largest with 2,164 students, followed by Mexicali with 2,037 students. With only 595 students, the Ensenada campus is the smallest. The university employs 101 full-time faculty (WSCUC CETYS Supplement January 2017, p. 12). In 2010 approximately 17% of the full time faculty had terminal degrees. Responding to a previous WSCUC recommendation, CETYS has focused attention on hiring more faculty with terminal degrees and on supporting existing faculty to complete further education. By 2015, nearly 50% of the faculty had terminal degrees; by 2017, the percentage had increased to 64% with the stated goal as having 70% with terminal degrees by 2020 (Institutional Report, p. 6).

CETYS stresses the importance of educating and developing the whole person, identifying “formation of character” as one crucial element for personal fulfillment and society’s highest functioning. The mission statement specifies that the university aims to “contribute to the education of persons with the intellectual capacity necessary to participate in an important way in the economic, social and cultural improvement of the country. CETYS University seeks, as a result, to make indestructible the values that have traditionally been considered as basic so man[/woman] can live in society in a peaceful way, and satisfy the needs that his capacity allows him” (website).

CETYS education is built on a model incorporating four pedagogical principles and six distinctive elements. The pedagogy stresses: learn how to learn; learn how to do; learn how to coexist; and learn how to be and be good. The distinctive elements include: entrepreneurship and innovation; linkage; sustainability; internationalization; social responsibility; and culture of information (website).

The university encourages faculty to incorporate opportunities for teamwork and linkage to the community and/or industry into assignments at all levels of education. This goal is reflected in the expectations for capstone projects. Over two terms students work on researching real projects, developing and presenting solutions to the wider

community. The capstones and other team projects express both the pedagogical principles and many of the distinctive elements that drive the campus's mission. At the visit, all campus constituencies spoke eloquently of the connections between CETYS and Baja California and of the intentionality of the university in educating students to be responsible citizens (described by the Chair of the Board as people with a sense of belonging to a community and working to contribute to that community).

The university *writ large* is a matrix organization, with each of the three campuses headed by a campus dean or director who reports to the president. Reporting to each campus leader is a Dean of Academic Affairs; Dean of Advancement; Dean of Business and Finance; Dean of Enrollment Management; and Dean of Student Affairs. Each campus has responsibility for academic programs and student support at that campus and is connected to the university through reporting lines to the university vice presidents (Academic Affairs, Operations, and Finance) and the deans of each college. Each of the three schools on the campuses is headed by a dean who reports to the college Dean of Engineering, Business, or Social Science and Humanities. Faculty on each campus are organized into schools and connect back to the university through their respective colleges.

Accreditation History

CETYS applied for Candidacy with WSCUC in May 2005. The university was granted Candidacy in June 2008. At that time CETYS was offering Bachelor's degrees, Master's degrees, and a Doctor of Administration degree. Prior to receiving Candidacy the university decided to suspend enrollment in the doctoral degree; WSCUC required that any new doctoral degree be approved by the Commission prior to initiation.

In February 2012 CETYS was granted Initial Accreditation.

In the intervening years CETYS has submitted three Substantive Change applications:

- The Bachelor of Business Management was granted Interim Approval in June 2012 and Final Approval in August 2012.
- An application was submitted for an EdD in Education and Values and Educational Management in May 2016. It was approved in January 2017.
- The Master of Arts in Neuropsychology was granted Interim Approval in June 2016 and Final Approval in July 2016.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The OSR/AV team reviewed the CETYS report and supporting documents prior to the Off-Site Review in April 2016 and again prior to the Accreditation Visit in March 2017. Each member completed an independent assessment of the documentation for the OSR using the worksheet provided by WSCUC. The feedback was compiled by the Assistant Chair for use during the team phone conference on March 25, 2016. The OSR was held in Alameda on April 14-15, 2016. The team discussed and further examined CETYS documentation, identified Lines of Inquiry, and communicated this information to the CETYS team via video conference call on April 15, 2016 and in writing. CETYS

provided the additional requested information, which was discussed by the team via conference call on February 23, 2017. Team members worked on assigned sections of the team report that were later consolidated into one document.

The AV took place March 14-17, 2017. The team conducted interviews with individuals and key groups. The Team reviewed additional documentation and documents relevant to federal requirements onsite. All team members were present at the Mexicali campus; three team members went to Tijuana and two to Ensenada.

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

It is clear that CETYS University has accomplished a great deal in a short period of time. The Institutional Report provides a clear and compelling view of the university mission and confirms that educational programming and student programs are tied to the mission. The commitment to the students and the well-being of the Baja California Region are well articulated. During the AV all constituencies stressed the linkage between the university and its region. The Board has explored the needs of the Baja business communities and translated its observations into action--as it did, for example, in seeking to develop entrepreneurs as well as managers. During the AV, the leadership noted that survey data indicated that employers in the region were quite satisfied with the preparation of CETYS graduates (96%), as did internship feedback and the employment data for new graduates. Given the importance of such regional connections, CETYS would benefit from more systematic efforts to collect and analyze data on the impact of the university on the region.

The Institutional Report (p. 10) indicates that CETYS began preparing for the report when the university achieved initial accreditation four years previously. Twenty people in addition to the Deans of the three College and the Vice President for Academic Affairs made up the team that prepared the Report.

CETYS provided a well-organized but descriptive review of the university that addressed concrete activities, processes, and structures with little analysis. The considerable supporting documentation was also primarily descriptive in nature. It was difficult from the Report and the supporting documentation to know how the information gathered fed into institutional decision making or the development of strategic initiatives. However, discussions at the AV made it clear that the university leadership is reflective and analytical in its decision making.

Discussion of the Review under the WSCUC Standards was left out of the Report, but the accompanying worksheet enabled the team to understand how the university viewed itself and its strengths and weaknesses in connection to the Standards.

The OSR Team identified several areas of inquiry organized around each of the Components that were pursued during the AV. The additional materials that were requested were supplied by the university.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The current visit is the first since CETYS received Initial Accreditation in 2012.

The WSCUC Commission's letter of March 6, 2012 commended the university for its commitment to continuous improvement and excellence, its financial stability, its careful strategic planning, its commitment to a culture of evidence, and the significant improvements to the libraries on all three campuses. It identified four areas for further attention: implementing program review; enhancing faculty qualifications; developing faculty governance; and collecting and using institutional data.

The May 5, 2014 Interim Report Committee letter noted that CETYS had made major progress in all four areas and asked that the university present more explicit documentation for each area for the site visit team. According to the Institutional Report (p. 7), recommendations from WSCUC visits have been reviewed and discussed by the Board, President and leadership team, and the faculty. Actions taken in each area were not presented in the first chapter of the institutional report, although some were embedded in other parts of the Report.

Implementing program review. As noted by the Interim Report Committee, the team too is impressed that the university was able to conduct reviews of all programs, including external reviews, during an 18 month period. There is now a calendar of academic program reviews, specifying that two be conducted each year. While program review is clearly being taken seriously by the faculty and administration, the Report did not specify how the university was building upon the first round of program review or what had been learned from the initial reviews. Discussions during the AV revealed some concrete examples of programmatic changes that had been made as a result of the program review process (e.g., the International Business program changing the curriculum as a result of the analysis of the national exam results and the recommendations of the external reviewer).

Enhancing faculty qualifications. At the time of the Interim Report, CETYS had increased the percentage of fulltime faculty with doctorates from 17% in 2010 to 41% by December 2013. Since then the percentage has increased to 64% at present. The goal is 70% by 2020 (Institutional Report, p. 6). This is an impressive achievement. The team joins the Committee in commending the provision to provide benefits and faculty development opportunities to adjuncts and so to enhance their connection to the university.

Developing Faculty Governance. As the Interim Report Committee indicates, faculty governance is not common practice in Mexican universities. At the urging of WSCUC, the Academic Advisory Council was organized in 2011. The fulltime faculty at each campus elects representatives who meet monthly with open sessions scheduled once each term. Faculty are involved in assessment activities on an ongoing basis. A new faculty evaluation process is being created that would benefit from more faculty involvement in the final design and implementation, something that has reportedly been promised as the new system is implemented.

Collecting and using institutional data. The university was encouraged to study implementing a centralized system for institutional research. This continues to be a need.

Since the last visit, the university has requested approval to add a doctoral degree in Education. This degree will become part of the College of Social Sciences and Humanities.

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

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes. For nearly 40 years, CETYS has a formally approved mission statement that has defined the purpose and character of the institution. While the strategic plan, “Vision 2020” provides a road map for the immediate future, the institutional mission has steadfastly provided context for institutional efforts. (CFR 1.1)

CETYS has a well-defined set of educational objectives and clearly describes the expectations of degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Institutional Report states, “Every college has a set of outcomes (competencies/skills) the student should learn at the end of their studies. Depending on the college, there are between 12 and 15 required courses. They are transferable between majors in the same college.” Likewise, each undergraduate major and master’s degree program has a set of expectations that are clearly stated. The institution tracks outcomes of students and compares their results to other comparable institutions. (CFR 1.2)

Integrity and Transparency. CETYS has a published statement on academic freedom that describes its policy, stating that academic freedom is essential for conducting research and in the teaching and learning process, and to protect the rights of students and faculty members. The policy also states that all activities of faculty, researchers, and academic administrators are subject to the principles, ideas, and aspirations of the CETYS. (CFR 1.3)

Cultural diversity is one of the institution’s General Institutional Competencies (CIG in Spanish). However, diversity, as defined by WSCUC standards, is not as closely attended to in Mexico as in the US, as, “...the prevailing notion is that regardless of ethnic origin everybody is a Mexican.” As a result, the usual diversity policy that one sees in the US is not in existence, nor are graduation and retention rates disaggregated for different racial/ethnic groups. The notion of cultural diversity appears to be more closely related to international cultural diversity. Even though this issue is one of the general institutional competencies the team saw little evidence of a common understanding among the community as to what it means. The team recommends that the institution give more thought to defining what cultural diversity means for CETYS and to begin thinking about emerging bio-demographic factors that may impact student success. This will likely entail changes to data collection, storage, and analysis. (CFR 1.4, 4.2)

CETYS operates with an independent Board of Trustees and is not controlled by outside entities, except to the extent regulators provide oversight and control of all educational institutions through policies by accreditors, and laws and regulations from national, state, and local entities. The purpose of the institution is clearly educational in nature, and the institution has an independent, non-sectarian governing board, with only education as its central mission. (CFR 1.5)

The entrance and graduation requirements for all degree programs are clearly described in public documents, including the university catalog and the institutional web-site. Costs of programs of instruction are also easily found, both in university publications and on the institutional web-site. However, actual completion data, by program, retention, and graduation data were not readily available on the public institutional web site. It is suggested that the information provided to prospective students be expanded to include this information. (CFR 1.6)

The institution has created policies for operations that are readily available on their external and internal web-site for faculty and staff to see. Policies are available for business operations, for faculty and staff evaluations, and for student appeals. An example of these policies is the CETYS Periodic Academic Program Review Policy, adopted in 2008. This policy guides all program reviews. The institution conducts regular audits and conducts training for board members and administrators. (CFR 1.7) The institution conducts itself with transparency and honesty with the WSCUC commission. (CFR 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard 1. The university has a clear understanding of its educational mission and is true to it. The institution operates with transparency and integrity, as evidenced by an academic freedom policy, annual financial audits, an independent board of trustees, serious program reviews, and honest and open communication with WSCUC.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning. CETYS has a well-articulated education plan for its undergraduate and graduate programs, linked to the university mission. (CFR 2.1, 2.2) The engineering and business programs are accredited by ABET and ACBSP. All programs have been subjected to a complete round of internal program review and consideration by an external reviewer. In general, CETYS undergraduates do better than the national averages on the national graduation exams. As the Institutional Report (p. 25) notes, however, International Business and Mechatronics Engineering are exceptions to this. In addition, the mean exam scores for Cybernetics Engineering and for the College of Engineering as a whole are below the national means. The faculty are reviewing the national exams to align the CETYS curriculum with them, as they deem appropriate. A strength of CETYS' education and student life programs is the extent to which they prepare students for work and citizenship; these linkages are embedded throughout the curriculum and co-curriculum. (CFR 2.2a) The programs include the

core competencies, though their assessment is still in progress (quantitative reasoning has not yet been satisfactorily assessed).

The PLOs for graduate programs are appropriately more advanced in expectations than are those for undergraduate programs. They create strong cultural support for professional practice. Projects are encouraged that connect academic work at the university with the needs of area industry and communities. (CFR 2.2b)

Student learning outcomes are clearly articulated at all levels. Assessment activities are well described and defined at the course level. Program assessment has largely succeeded in refining rubrics and setting other assessment measures. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5) Program review has been completed for all programs. The next round of review will benefit from current work to improve assessment measures. Retention and graduation rates are consistent with those of benchmark institutions but further analysis of these rates will be helpful in improving outcomes. (CFR 2.6, 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity. Since its founding, CETYS has largely focused on teaching. In creating centers of excellence it has sought to foster faculty scholarship. The new faculty evaluation process currently in design should clarify faculty expectations regarding scholarship (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

Student Learning and Success. CETYS provides data on student graduation and retention, noting that its 64% graduation rate over six years is better than that of its chosen peer institutions. Disaggregated data are not provided nor is an analysis of student retention and graduation. (2.10)

One of CETYS's significant strengths is the extent to which student support is well-connected to the mission and goals. Curricular and co-curricular programs are in strong alignment with each other. (CFR 2.11) An assessment has been completed of the Library but not of other student services. CETYS provides academic and psychological support services for students. (CFR 2.13)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard. The university enacts its educational mission and philosophy thoughtfully and effectively. Not only has CETYS instituted thorough assessment processes and protocols, these functions have effectively permeated the academic programs.

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

Faculty and Staff. The institution employs sufficient numbers of faculty and staff to fulfill its educational mission. Since achieving initial accreditation CETYS has set goals for increasing the number of full-time faculty, and improving the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. As already noted, the institution has improved the number of

faculty with terminal degrees dramatically, in a relatively short time. This has been accomplished by supporting faculty in obtaining doctoral degrees and through improved recruiting. Prior to setting this goal most new faculty members were recruited by word of mouth. With the establishment of this goal, searches have taken on a more national and international flavor. (CFR 3.1)

CETYS supports faculty development in a variety of ways, including its significant commitment to assisting existing faculty to attain terminal degrees. At the time of the visit, 26 current faculty members were being supported in their pursuit of a doctoral degree. Once this group finishes their course of studies the level of doctoral degrees in the faculty will reach approximately 76%.

The institution has created a faculty development department, CDMA, “Centro de Desarrollo and Mejoramiento Academico (CDMA),” (The Center for Academic Development and Improvement). This center has four functions: faculty development; educational innovation; faculty evaluation; and learning assessment. (CFR 3.3) Resources are available for attendance at conferences. The CDMA also offers a wide range of professional development courses for faculty, creating them according to articulated university needs and from surveys of the faculty. As an example, the CDMA recently offered a skill development workshop for teaching working adults. This was needed as the institution has primarily provided educational programs for full-time students; however, recently programs, especially the graduate programs, have targeted working adults. During 2016, CDMA served over 456 faculty, in 33 professional development workshops. The CDMA also provides training courses that result in certifications, for part-time faculty. In 2016, just over 200 part-time faculty attended. (CFR 3.3)

At the conclusion of each semester faculty are evaluated by their students. The evaluations are reviewed by deans who provide feed-back when scores are less than satisfactory. In addition, faculty are evaluated more formally every three years. The human resources department coordinates faculty evaluations, which contain three elements: peer review, student assessment, and academic administrator review. There are approximately 10 levels of faculty ranks, each with different pay levels. For promotion from one level to the next higher level, professors must create a portfolio demonstrating why they should be promoted and undergo the periodic evaluation. A new faculty evaluation process and scale is under development, driven in part by the improving academic credentials and expectations of the faculty. The scale is based on 100 points, with 50 available for teaching effectiveness and degree level; 30 points available for research and linkages to employer communities, and 20 points for university service. Faculty were not clear about the nature of the scales or how the process was to be followed. The team recommends that the periodic evaluation process be fully implemented with faculty involvement and be carefully monitored. (CFR 3.2)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources. The university has a long history of financial solvency as demonstrated in CETYS audited financial statements for the three years ending December 31, 2015. The draft statements for 2016 also demonstrate another financially positive year, with an increase to net assets.

The statements do not conform to United States GAAP, but rather to the Mexican financial standards, in which capital depreciation is not required to be recorded. Many new buildings have recently or are currently being constructed; without a recognition, or set aside of this future cost, deferred maintenance in a few years could become a serious problem. The visiting team recommends that the university consider how the very real costs of depreciating assets should be handled. (CFR 3.4)

The visiting team noted that capital spending during the past few years has been immense, approximately, \$14,000,000 USD in 2014 alone. The state of the university's buildings is impressive, with smart, well maintained buildings and landscaping evident. Four new buildings are planned in Mexicali, and 2 new buildings have recently opened at the Tijuana campus. More than \$25,000,000 USD is planned in capital construction in the new few years. (CFR 3.5)

CETYS is committed to improving its information technology infrastructure as well. Faculty are supplied with personal computers for their use, and all classrooms have internet access, with almost all having media projectors for use in teaching. Since 2010 internet speed has increased remarkably at all three campuses. Library facilities also have improved, as have the collections. Since 2010 the number of library books has increased from approximately 208,000 to approximately 475,000 and electronic data bases from 11 to 32. The institution has a process for ensuring the correct collections are provided for the programs that are offered. Each semester the library system communicates with faculty to determine if new or different materials are needed. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes. The institution is led by a full-time President/CEO, a full-time chief academic officer, a full-time chief financial officer and a full-time chief operations officer. The decision-making structures are a "matrix" organizational model, with central administration, i.e., deans of the three colleges, and the provost, mostly responsible for planning, quality control, and consistency through the three campuses. The dean of each campus reports directly to the president, but is more focused on the execution of centralized plans, policies, expectations developed at the system level. The team noted that the institution had difficulty in explaining how the organization model worked, but also noted that none of the participants indicated that the model was problematic. The organization is well-staffed with experienced faculty and staff that are passionate about the mission, and have been an integral part of the impressive changes that have occurred at CETYS during the past five years. The team commends the university in its selection, development and retention of long-term and very capable senior and administrative staff and faculty in all areas. (CFR 3.6)

The governing board consists of 47 individuals that meets at least three times per year and has committees for planning, academic affairs, finance and student life, alumni, and fund-raising. The board has engaged AGB to assist itself in improving its functioning. The desire expressed by the board members that the team met with was

that “we are attempting to move from an engaged board to a consequential board.” Work is underway now that will undoubtedly strengthen the board effectiveness. The AGB honored CETYS at its April 2017 meeting by bestowing the John W. Nason award on the institution. This award honors boards that are exceptional in demonstrating innovations and exemplary leadership. The visiting team commends the institution for developing a consequential board of trustees. Its strength certainly contributes to the institutions sustainability in a changing higher education environment.

Effective faculty governance has matured during the past five years. The CCA, Academic Advisory Council, was formed in 2010. Faculty members are elected by faculty to serve on the advisory council in two year terms. The CCA has four committees, “commissions,” Curricula and Co-Curricula, Faculty Development, Policies and Procedures, and Student Life. Through the efforts of the CCA, the faculty has gained greater voice in the operations of the institution. Faculty participate in program development, program reviews, and in curricula revisions. (CFR 3.10)

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard 3. The institution has sufficient faculty and staff, with sufficient skills to operate the institution, has operated in a financially sustainable manner for years, and has decision-making apparatuses that are understood by members of the CETYS community. The President and chief financial officer are both full-time, and the board is independent. The faculty governance system is maturing and continued effort in this area is warranted.

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

Quality Assurance Processes. CETYS tracks and evaluates graduation and retention data on a routine basis. Data are disaggregated by program, college, and location. These data are routinely analyzed to determine trends and take actions for improvement. The collection of student achievement data, through program reviews is well-development and routinely collected. Institutional results, graduation and retention data, are compared to comparable institutions both in the US and Mexico. Because of national level exit exams, data are also compared nationally, and for those few programs where results are lower than the national average, plans are created and then acted upon to improve results. (CRF 4.1)

CETYS has continued to develop its institutional research capacity during the past few years. The “Institutional Data System” is comprised of: the CETYS University Information System (SICU), the Portal of Academic Information (PIA), the Registry of Research Projects, and the student electronic portfolio. The largest and most widely used of the systems is the SICU. This system is used for aggregation and disaggregation of information at different levels, such as: system, campus, college, school, program, and students. It stores and provides information about faculty, students and curricula. The system is increasingly used by faculty, and modifications continue to be made as staff and faculty work more closely together to identify areas of information need. Additional training in the use of and disaggregation of data should be considered,

especially about emerging demographic and social trends. The team found that the institution is rich in information, allowing it to track its stated goals in a detailed manner. However, the visiting team recommends that the existing data system be expanded to include dashboard metrics that allows disaggregation of data along bio-demographic parameters as CETYS prepares for demographic change in the decades ahead. (CFR 4.2, 4.6)

Institutional Learning and Improvement. During 2013-2015 every academic program conducted the first round of program reviews. These reviews then resulted in new curricula, developed during 2013-2015, with renewed learning outcomes and the incorporation of Distinctive CETYS Education Elements (EDECs). The program reviews have resulted in changes. For example, the external program reviewer for the Master of Science in Engineering recommended that an advisory council be created for engineering to ensure alignment with industry needs and cutting edge academics and to expand the opportunities for graduates. This recommendation was acted upon, and now an advisory council for engineering is functioning. (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

The Vision 2020 strategic plan had broad stakeholder involvement and was approved by the Board of Trustees, in 2010. The relatively large board has played a key role between the external constituencies and the programs and planning of the university. The plan identified broad areas for improvement; many of these goals have already been achieved, or nearly achieved. Among important examples are enrollment growth, with the 2020 targets having mostly been met, and the increased number of faculty with doctoral degrees. The institution is likely to achieve the 70% target of faculty with doctoral degrees, given the number of faculty nearing completion of their own academic programs. The strategic plan included estimates of costs, which is considered a best practice. Plan accomplishments are briefed to the board at least twice each year. In addition, all levels of the organization track their goals on a periodic basis. The institution should be commended for their efforts in this area. CETYS has recently established advisory councils for each College to ensure that its programs remain relevant. Each council is co-chaired by a member from industry, business, or society and a recognized academic leader. In this way, the institution has sought to ensure that both perspectives are represented in the advice provided. (CFR 4.6)

The original Vision 2020 goals have been modified somewhat since the plan inception, as significant changes that have occurred, for example, the 2010 earthquake, which heavily impacted the goals for physical infrastructure and fundraising for the Mexicali campus. The institution produces an annual formal report to the board of trustees and external communities regarding the strategic plan with informal updates provided more frequently. The university also maintains an internal system of reporting for staff and faculty, formally at least twice each year, and informally, more often. The community was very aware of the institutional goals, as well as the extent of goal accomplishment. (CFR 4.6)

From a resource allocation and planning perspective, the most significant risk that the team observed was the size of the Ensenada campus. Small campuses usually have a higher cost per student, based upon fixed costs, than do larger campuses. The visiting

team therefore recommends that CETYS work to improve clarity on the academic and business plan for the Ensenada campus to strengthen operations to sustain high quality and not drain resources disproportionately. (CFR 3.4, 4.6, 4.7)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard 4. The improving data collection and analysis for institutional improvement is commendable, as are the strategic planning efforts.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees [CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4]

CETYS emphasizes in its mission statement the development of "moral capacity and intellectual preparation" in graduates, as well as "improving economic, social, and cultural aspects of the nation." This emphasis on development of the whole person and on contribution to the Baja California region are institutional values that are clearly reflected in the faculty, staff, students and alumni. The members of the Board stressed the development of citizenship in students, defined as a sense of belonging to and commitment to improving local and regional communities. Students and alumni clearly and emphatically articulated the meaning and impact of an education from CETYS as preparing students for meaningful employment as entrepreneurs and leaders, but moreover as an educational experience that resulted in life-altering perspectives and opportunities. CETYS University is viewed as "family" by alumni who enthusiastically discuss their trajectories of learning and personal development based in their CETYS education.

The specific requirements necessary to obtain an undergraduate degree are clearly delineated, both in terms of curricular as well as co-curricular elements. Undergraduate students are expected to have learned about the world around them through a rigorous program of courses essentially equivalent to general education, as well as through completing community service hours that are mandated in Mexico. CETYS also emphasizes international experiences for their students, whether through study abroad or by bringing "international" to the students through international faculty brought to campus.

In addition to satisfying the CETYS degree requirements, undergraduate students are required to demonstrate proficiency in their major on the National General Exam for Undergraduate Program Graduation (EGEL). To ensure validity of the CETYS programs, the learning outcomes of programs and classes are aligned to those of the EGEL for each degree program. The majority of CETYS students score at or above the Mexican national mean on the EGEL, but in programs where students have scored toward the low end of the means, faculty have worked to add or remove program content, revise course scheduling, or adopt new practices to improve student performance. Thus, through these degree requirements and exams, CETYS ensures that students graduating with baccalaureate degrees have entry-level skills in their field of study, and the professional competence to go to graduate school, if desired.

While in their written report, CETYS made only passing reference to any deeper meaning to their degrees, during the institutional visit it was readily apparent that members of the Board, faculty, staff and students are all well aware of the meaning – and the quality – of a CETYS degree. Passion, leadership, service, and caring for humanity were commonly cited, as were the institutional learning outcomes of entrepreneurship, internationalization, and information literacy. When asked, even undergraduate students were readily able to provide personal narratives for these learning outcomes.

The graduate programs of CETYS also have well defined degree requirements that include courses considered fundamental, specialized, and elective for each program. All graduate programs require that students successfully complete a capstone project that is reviewed by faculty using rubrics, thus ensuring that the integrity and quality of graduate programs is upheld. It was clear that graduate level learning outcomes and expectations differed from undergraduate through the rigorous capstone projects required at the graduate level.

Prospective CETYS undergraduate students must meet admission requirements which include high school GPA and the Spanish equivalent of SAT scores (College Board: Prueba de Aptitud Académica or PAA), which helps to ensure program quality as well. Prospective students with PAA scores below a certain level are admitted conditionally and receive a semester of follow-up by the Student Development Center (CEDE) and oversight by the program chair. While only about 10% of prospective students are admitted with the indicated marginal scores, CETYS is commended for their commitment to ensure success of all students. Students are also expected to achieve TOEFL scores to demonstrate proficiency in English to prepare them for service beyond Mexico. Similarly, the quality of graduate degrees is maintained by adhering to admission standards for applicants based on scores on a standardized test (called PAEP) which is similar to the GRE. In addition, CETYS requires an interview with the program chair, and evaluates undergraduate college GPA in making admission decisions.

Finally, CETYS reported that more than 85% of students have jobs upon graduation, with over 90% having jobs within one year of graduation. In terms of return on investment, this is a very clear further indicator of program quality.

Academic integrity was addressed in the institutional report in a discussion of the honor code of the institution and through an emphasis on individual responsibility toward others. CETYS clearly defined what academic dishonesty is and what penalties exist for violations. While not mentioned in this portion of the institutional report, it is also very clear that CETYS ensures the integrity of its academic programs through program reviews conducted of all programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (see Component 6).

While this interpretation of academic integrity differs from that commonly articulated by WSCUC, there were clear indications of the rigorous communication strategies and extensive meeting structures that are employed throughout the three

campuses to maintain consistency and integrity of the degrees. The faculty are commended for their work in this regard.

While co-curricular programs were indicated as being important to the overall learning experiences of students at CETYS, assessment of the learning that occurs in these co-curricular programs is still under development. CETYS is encouraged to investigate the level and types of student learning that are taking place within the co-curricular programs with an eye toward areas that might need improvement. In some instances, it appeared that the underpinnings for assessment were already in place. For example, for many years, CETYS has held three half-day student college experience retreats which occur at the beginning, middle and end of undergraduate degree programs. The goal of these retreats is for students to contemplate and reflect on their college experiences and on their goals and aspirations as they have progressed through their programs. These retreats may hold powerful information that captures student development and growth, as well as the quality and importance of the degrees earned. CETYS is encouraged to explore the potential of this and other rich activities that are already occurring for their potential to provide evidence of the learning that occurs in co-curricular activities.

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

CETYS has worked hard to institutionalize its assessment of student learning by improving data collection, establishing assessment academies for faculty, and actively involving students in the assessment process. According to Exhibit 22, "New Curricula model 2015," "all academic programs and classes have student learning outcomes that are assessed with rubrics, and the student learning outcomes are compared with those obtained from external national measures. . . in addition, the results of assessment are used by the academies to support the recommendation of curricular modifications." Our visit confirmed that both faculty and students are familiar with rubrics and find them a valuable means of clarifying course expectations and making evaluation criteria transparent and accessible. Strong, common rubrics have also helped to align the curriculum—a critical function at CETYS, where curricular consistency across the campuses and disciplines supports the institution's "one university" mission as well as student degree progress. These team findings demonstrate what the process of achieving WSCUC accreditation has accomplished through the concerted effort of many years.

A key to the success of CETYS' assessment enterprise has been the establishment of "Assessment Academies" throughout the system and across the disciplines. With support from the Office of Assessment, each undergraduate and graduate program maintains a faculty academy that meets frequently throughout the year to review assessment data and develop and evaluate assessment mechanisms. Academies have designed rubrics for programs and specific assignments as well as for core competencies that cut across the programs. This effort has involved some trial and error. For example, they have attempted to apply standardized instruments to individual core competencies (such as Information Literacy) but have found them to be

inadequate to their purposes, and, are now taking a different approach. They have also attempted to develop a common rubric encompassing all core competencies but have found that to be incomplete (leaving Quantitative Reasoning insufficiently covered). But these efforts – even, and perhaps especially, when they expose weaknesses – are commendable for the spirit of engaged inquiry that they bring to CETYS’ work of assessment. The engagement of faculty in assessment data and evidence was identified in CETYS’ 2016 Institutional Report, expressed as a goal of establishing “better communication amongst faculty and better utilization of assessment results to improve curricula needs” (p. 27). As our meeting with the Center for Academic Development confirmed, CETYS aspires to make assessment an academic, not an administrative exercise. The clear engagement of faculty on and across all three campuses--and their ongoing efforts to improve the accuracy of their assessment mechanisms – suggests that this goal is now being met.

CETYS’ assessment of student outcomes extends beyond the use of rubrics to regular surveys of employers, student internship supervisors, and graduating students and alumni about their own experience and professional preparation. Such surveys address the broad range of skills and habits of mind that CETYS identifies in its ILOs – including the values of entrepreneurial culture and innovation, internationalization, sustainability, service and social responsibility. Our meetings with alumni confirmed that graduates are familiar with these ILOs. Furthermore, the thoughtfulness with which they discussed the ILOs’ meaning and application in their own lives indicated a much deeper relation to CETYS’s core values and learning goals than the report was able to convey.

Not only do the Academies develop and evaluate assessment mechanisms, they communicate assessment results and monitor evidence that results have been applied (to close the loop). The curriculum is subject to continuous assessment and improvement at both the course and program level: for example, when “Bachelor psychology students scored below the expected program learning outcome of understanding research methodology” the report notes, “faculty enhanced the content of the Research Methods class to facilitate student learning during 2015.” Our visit uncovered multiple examples of similar efforts to apply assessment results to improve student learning. Often the effectiveness of an institution’s assessment efforts shows less in its treatment of high-performing students than in its response to students for whom assessment reveals a need for greater support. CETYS’ programs show a commendable transparency in their efforts to identify struggling students; for example, The Baccalaureate in International Business (LNI) identified a need to support students’ foundational skills in economics and mathematics that the Academies should help to address.

Given the nature of the university’s learning goals, we suggest that the Academies develop qualitative and reflective means of assessing them, to complement the quantitative data that is already being captured. For example, the institution might gather and make better use of the student artifacts produced in three half-day college experience retreats for freshmen, juniors, and seniors “to reflect on their college experience, and their goals and aspirations as they have progressed.” Systematically

collecting and comparing student reflections across a timespan of several years could offer valuable insights into student development over the course of the degree; these could in turn help the institution assess the application of some of its more abstract learning outcomes and understand how best to support and strengthen them.

Similarly, students' capstone projects might also be systematically collected and assessed to better understand and evince students' achievement on multiple levels. The capstones reflect an impressive culmination of student learning; in Engineering, for example, projects arise from actual industry challenges, which students discern and develop out of their experience in internships or classes. We found the students who presented their capstone projects in showcases on all three campuses to be uniformly articulate about their learning and appreciative of the opportunity to apply their academic learning in hands-on projects. The capstone projects synthesize learning outcomes across multiple disciplines and skills, involving subject-matter expertise as well as quantitative reasoning, oral and written communication, critical thinking, and information literacy. Secondary, but no less important, skills involved teamwork and collaboration with classmates and, in a number of cases that the team viewed, with partners and counterparts in industry. There is commendable alignment among students' courses, internship experience, and the capstone effort. Collecting and comparing capstone projects from a number of students, courses, and programs could offer valuable and nuanced evidence of student learning that would in turn deepen and enrich CETYS' developing understanding of assessment and its value.

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

[CFRs 1.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10-14, 4.1-4]

Over the past 10 years, CETYS has moved from a view of student success that relied almost solely on course completion rates, performance of co-curricular requirements, and pass rates on the national exit exam, to a model that considers the integration of a number of more nuanced aspects of higher education. For example, student learning outcomes for all programs have been developed and assessed to ensure that student learning is at the center of considerations of student success. The assessment of student learning continues to mature as improvements to the learning experiences are incorporated. In addition, a new set of social leadership programs (for example, FORTES and IMPACTO) have recently been developed and efforts are underway to foster healthy lifestyles in campus life and increase the emphasis on athletics. International experiences are another component gaining emphasis within CETYS, through study abroad and guest international faculty. CETYS is commended for the development of these rich and rewarding student initiatives and is encouraged to develop student learning outcomes and assessment vehicles for both curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities.

Student life, as defined by CETYS as the development of a student's moral capacity and their ability to make a difference in their community, is another aspect of student success. At CETYS, for undergraduate students this has been seen traditionally as the primary responsibility of the humanities faculty, although additional dimensions have been added in recent years. Undergraduate students complete about ten courses

that are considered to constitute human values. These include communication skills, information literacy, arts and culture, society, ethics, sustainability and global literacy. In addition to these courses, CETYS seeks to facilitate the diffusion of culture through co-curricular activities including student clubs, and to promote healthy lifestyles through sports and healthy activities. Together, these are seen as the integral university formation, which in many regards is similar to General Education in the U.S. and serves to complement and expand the learning that occurs in the majors.

In order to improve students' skills with technology, CETYS has been piloting a program that seeks to have students take at least 10% of their curriculum via online courses. CETYS is commended for this endeavor and is encouraged to continue to evaluate student completion rates and learning outcomes in these online courses as they are rolled out to more students.

Both the WSCUC Graduation Rate Dashboard and CETYS own analyses indicate that the 6-year graduation rate of undergraduates is approximately 64%, which compares favorably with the comparison institutions identified by CETYS. Nevertheless, CETYS has indicated their goal is to increase to a 70% 6-year graduation rate. A number of initiatives are directed toward this goal, including early intervention and tutorial programs for students who might be experiencing academic difficulties. In addition, a team of psychology faculty, program coordinators, and school deans are available to intervene where needed to address student issues, including poor study habits, poor time management, or psychological difficulties. As CETYS continues to see more students with special education needs, they are encouraged to consistently monitor student progress via indicators of success at the program and campus level.

First year retention rates are consistently high in each college (80-85%), yet the first year is identified as having the highest attrition rate for undergraduates. Although CETYS graduation rates do not differ statistically among campuses and majors, the Ensenada campus has a consistently (though statistically insignificant) lower graduation rate than the other campuses. In particular, in 2012 and 2013, the 6-year graduation rates in Engineering in Ensenada were 10 to 20 percentage points lower than in other years; the graduation rate dramatically recovered in 2014. While much of this variability was attributed to the effects of small sample sizes following the economic downturn, the campus also implemented programs to improve student success, including mandatory advising for students in academic difficulty and an early alert system. CETYS is commended for this responsiveness and commitment to ensuring the success of all students.

Women are not equally represented among the three colleges at CETYS; the College of Engineering is about 27% women while the College of Social Sciences and Humanities is about 71% female, and the College of Business is about 60% female. These differences are not in and of themselves troubling as they mirror similar differences in gender distributions in many institutions of higher education across the U.S. However, the data provided indicate that female student 6-year graduation rates are about 10 percentage points lower than male rates. CETYS is encouraged to examine

the causes for this disparity and to investigate potential mechanisms for reducing this gap in success rates based on gender.

In general, the section of the institutional report on student success lacked in-depth consideration of the larger picture of student success. While considerable data were provided, these data would have been strengthened by disaggregation and explanation so that the dimensions of what CETYS considers as success for students was clear. In addition, separate student success or graduation rate analyses for graduate students were not provided. CETYS is encouraged to develop better institutional data systems and training for faculty and staff in using data to better understand the changing demographics of the students, the success rates of different student groups, and the trajectories of the campuses and the system over time.

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

CETYS' work on program review, assessment, and the use of data and evidence has been formidable: its rapid expansion of program review efforts reflects the deep institutional commitment to the value of student learning grounded in data and continuous assessment that we saw in the Assessment Academies. The results, as documented in the university's own records as well as testified by faculty and staff we interviewed on our visit, are indeed impressive.

The WASC Interim report letter (May 2014) commends CETYS because "the commitment to effective assessment continues to show growth and maturity. Data collection and its usage in decision-making have been made stronger over the last two years." Where the Commission action letter from March 6, 2012, identified the need to implement program review and strengthen the collection and use of institutional data, the May 2014 letter found much to commend in both. Reflecting on the institution's success in completing sixteen program reviews in eighteen months, the panel found "great growth" in "the institution's focus on measuring Institutional, Program, and Student Learning Outcomes on a systematic basis." An opportunity for further improvement was identified in "a greater and more explicit focus on written documentation of changes made as a result of program review and assessment" and "a focus on how the program review process ties back to the strategic plan and how budget decisions will be made more formally in the future based on the reviews" (recorded through "the development of a manual with templates on how this might be accomplished in all academic areas"). On the collection and use of institutional data, the interim report (May 2014) remarked the limitations of the institution's distributed model of data collection, encouraging "the institution to study the possible benefits of a more centralized and unified system for institutional research that might result in greater cohesiveness," asking further for "a more specific description of how the institutional research function is structured, staffed, and carried out."

Since the earlier report, the institutional practice of assessment has been strengthened. SICU (University System of Information) aggregates and disaggregates data at system, campus, college, school, program, and student levels (including

evaluations, student success data, retention information, learning assessment details). Each college maintains a Program Assessment Coordinator, and the Office of Academic Development has been reorganized into an institution-wide office that comprises three distinct but interconnected units: assessment, curriculum development and program review, and faculty development. This is a commendable effort to aggregate and synthesize assessment efforts.

As a result of these efforts, program review has become a deeply collaborative experience – and indeed, as one faculty member remarked, a “democratic” one-- involving stakeholders both across the university and from outside. Following assessment instruments developed in the CETYS Academies, the formal program review process begins by surveying alumni and their employers to determine strengths and weaknesses of student preparation. Programs then gather and analyze all assessment data to review the consistency of program outcomes. Graduate programs follow similar process, but they include portfolios for students as well. Program review is aligned with accreditation efforts for individual programs (such as Engineering with ABET). Faculty with whom we spoke felt that the use of external as well as internal data has resulted in more objective evaluation of the programs, allowing them to become more responsive to feedback. Some remarked as well that the process has benefited the university’s academic reputation. Our interviews confirmed that program review has become a point of pride and a recognized investment in programs’ quality.

Most important of all, program review is driving improvements to curriculum. On the course level, faculty who teach the same class have been able to use review data to guide them in reviewing syllabi and aligning expectations with program goals. And on the program level, faculty across schools and colleges have generated changes in response to program review: Business added content in accounting to enhance student preparation, while Engineering noted that students needed greater support for capstones and added new pre-requisites.

We were impressed by the seriousness and thoroughness of CETYS’ efforts to institutionalize program review. Faculty and assessment staff with whom we spoke attributed their success to concerted efforts to broaden communication within and across the campuses, engage faculty in the analysis of student learning at the program level, and apply the review findings to programs’ improvement. There is ample evidence of this thoroughness in the records that CETYS provided us in response to our request; clearly, the institution has made a commitment to a strong system of data collection and record keeping, which will enable to lessons of program review to be widely shared and applied. As its culture of assessment and program review matures, it will benefit from opportunities to develop a more self-reflective and synthetic approach to student learning at all levels. CETYS manifests a powerful and widespread culture of student learning, as our interviews with everyone from board members and administrators to faculty, student, and staff confirmed. As noted above, its assessment efforts are thorough, energetic, and data-driven. The institution’s enviable challenge in the years ahead will be to develop and deepen its assessment mechanisms in ways that allow them to capture – and indeed, to catch up with – the richness of the student learning that is clearly taking place.

Perhaps the most valuable evidence of success is the students and alumni themselves, who spoke of their own learning in terms that clearly echoed the learning outcomes that represent the university's highest aspirations. When asked, students told us repeatedly that CETYS had taught them to align their interests with appropriate majors, to apply themselves to the acquisition of foundational skills, and to master their disciplines through integrated and applied knowledge. Beyond these essential program learning outcomes, students also testified to a range of broader learning outcomes: through CETYS, they told us, they learned emotional intelligence, interpersonal sensitivity and trust, international awareness, and ethical commitment to their communities and to the broader society. These are students whom any institution would be deeply proud to call its graduates, and they are clearly CETYS' most important outcome of all.

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

The university has operated for many years within its means, incurring no losses from operations. Financial discipline within the institution is evident, and is a result of board and executive management leadership in this area. The current chief financial officer has been at the institution for over 20 years and has played a key role in creating an environment where financial discipline is expected and demonstrated. Fund raising has been effective and likely will continue to be effective in the future. The board itself has set minimum expectations for giving, an element of board member evaluation when a member's term is nearing its termination date. Contributing to the financial sustainability of the organization is the type of extensive planning that is conducted. As noted in the discussion of Standard 4, the institution's planning is commendable. The board of trustees has taken a strong lead in encouraging planning and has been generous with both member's time and resources. The population in the state of Baja California has continued to increase providing a good recruiting base for the university. CETYS is very conservative in the use of debt, and had none until the past few years. Now, it is mostly limited to debt for infrastructure type projects that have pledges that will pay down the debt when the pledges are fulfilled. For example, building construction can now begin when the building fund campaign has received 60% in cash and the remainder in pledges from known donors who clearly have the capacity to perform on their pledges. (CFR 3.4, 4.7)

The visiting team engaged the senior management of CETYS regarding apparent risks to financial sustainability. They indicated that this was a concern and have continually sought ways to mitigate risk. For example, even given interim loans to finance pledges they will only take down debt with fixed percentages. Building contracts are exclusively written with Mexican pesos as the financial medium, so that changes in exchange rates will not increase the costs of buildings while in the process of construction. They build a large contingency into their operation budgets, approximately 18% for 2016 and 2017, and have made changes to their expenditure patterns when warranted. In addition, CETYS has created a significant amount of operational reserve funds that can be used to cushion any unanticipated shortfalls, or

changes in the environment. As of December 31, 2016, cash on hand was approximately \$16,000,000 USD, with long term debt at approximately \$7,000,000, which has more than sufficient pledges to cover.

Because the institution has taken on long-term debt that is more than covered by pledges, has a healthy amount of cash on hand, a track record of sustained enrollment growth, prudent financial management, a robust recruiting market place and conservative financial management, the team believes that the institutions is financially sustainable. (CFR 3.4, 4.7)

As the president and the board has thought about the future, they have concluded that enrollment growth, for the sake of enrollment growth, is not the direction they want to take. They have chosen a course of action where quality is more important than quantity, and will take enrollment growth, if it comes, because of the quality vision. In looking to the future, the institution has adopted an enrollment goal of 10% of undergraduate courses to be on-line, but that is to further assist their undergraduate students to fully embrace technology and to learn to collaborate with colleagues and faculty in an on-line environment. In addition, the institution has included in its 2020 campaign a goal of establishing an endowment to help mitigate unanticipated changes in the external environment. (CFR 4.7)

While the visiting team believes that the institution meets the expectations of all four WSCUC standards, final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CETYS University engaged in a comprehensive and consequential review process that articulated both accomplishments and challenges for the future. The university was responsive to prior WASC recommendations and expectations in both spirit and letter. The AV revealed a university with vision and experienced, capable and committed leadership, faculty, and staff, and engaged students and board.

Commendations

In addition to the commendations noted in the preceding narrative on components and standards, we commend:

- **Mission.** The CETYS mission has been actualized and continues to be voiced with passion and excitement. Institutional values as expressed in the mission are being transmitted to employees and students, beyond the academic content of the various disciplines and degrees. These values are articulated as goals and hopes by the board and president and are understood and respected by students and alumni. The university is committed to quality over size.
- **Leadership.** CETYS benefits from a consequential, engaged and influential Board of Trustees. The senior leadership is experienced and capable, with well-developed academic, administrative, and financial structures in place that support the one-university, matrix model design. Intentional and consequential communication and sharing occurs among campuses in both academic and non-academic matters.
- **Faculty.** The faculty are passionate and skilled with genuine commitment to student learning. The deployment of faculty is innovative, with the use of industry experienced faculty in upper division undergraduate courses and fulltime faculty teaching the lower division. This facilitates the application of knowledge to society's economic, environmental and social issues.
- **Planning.** Strategic and other forms of planning are effective and ongoing. This planning has enabled the alignment seen in the AV between academic and non-academic parts of the university and among the curriculum, internships and capstone projects
- **Linkages.** The creation of authentic linkages with business/industry and community needs serves the public good and positively influences the quality of private and public higher education in Mexico and beyond. The internationalization of the learning environment in traditional (study abroad) and innovative (bring the world to campuses) ways is similarly influential.
- **Students.** Engaged, capable and eager students.

Recommendations:

1. Provide consistent training to all faculty and relevant staff to utilize student achievement data, including relevant co-curricular information, to further strengthen the learning environment. Consider establishing and utilizing a data

system, including dashboard metrics that allows disaggregation of data along bio-demographic parameters as CETYS prepares for demographic change in the decades ahead. Align data-driven decisions with CETYS mission, vision and goals. Measure what you value, not value what you measure.

2. Engage faculty and monitor the efficacy of the emerging new system for faculty evaluation, compensation and promotion, particularly as the faculty academic credentials and duties continue to change and increase.
3. CETYS needs to define diversity, including cultural diversity, in a fashion that is meaningful to the university given the populations being served today and going forward, with metrics to monitor desired progress.
4. Further develop assessment of core competencies, especially for quantitative reasoning.
5. Plan for future maintenance and replacement costs of capital assets because depreciation is not required to be factored in financial statements, yet will in the future be a real cost
6. Improve clarity on the academic and business plan to strengthen Ensenada operations to sustain high quality and not drain resources disproportionately. The issue today isn't quality, but rather small size and the attendant higher cost per student based upon fixed costs and its future consequence. Reach scalability that maintains quality.

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 1. Program Length
 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 3. Student Complaint Review
 4. Transfer Policy Review

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLISTS

1 - 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.

Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? http://tinyurl.com/q5xxv83 (transfer information) http://tinyurl.com/zlzcclxr Mexican Education Department that oversees credit and transfer - Establishes the minimum of credit-hours of class per academic level (University, 2400 as a minimum. The institution's major are 2880 hours of in class time)
	Comments:
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: There is a master calendar for Program Review, and work done by department faculty (academies) that oversee the work of a set of courses. The number of credits a major must have as a minimum is stipulated by Law 289, the institution surpasses the minimum stipulated.
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: A sample of scheduling for Ensenada, Tijuana and Mexicali is provided.
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?
	Type of courses reviewed: <input type="checkbox"/> online <input type="checkbox"/> hybrid
	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 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 (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	What kinds of courses?
	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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: This type of activity does not grant credit at the institution, only the pre-determined courses that meet on site, four hours per week, for sixteen weeks.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other	How many programs were reviewed?
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?

program materials)	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)?
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

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.

<p>**Federal Requirements</p>	<p>Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>Degree completion and cost</p>	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? http://tinyurl.com/zrcea3y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? http://tinyurl.com/zeepxew <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>Careers and employment</p>	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? Examples by major (one form each college): Marketing http://tinyurl.com/js6luhs Mechanical http://tinyurl.com/h6xj8nc Psychology http://tinyurl.com/jntw428 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? It has an ex-alumni department to help alumni find jobs http://tinyurl.com/jr6aqvu <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

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

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW 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.

Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? On the website http://tinyurl.com/zzwjqfl and http://tinyurl.com/zl3eswy
	Comments: This policy operates a process where a third party receives in an anonymous manner any and all complaints, and does the follow up with the key person
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Please describe briefly: If the complaint is regarding grading; on the students rules and regulations booklet there is an article that details the procedure to follow. Any student may file a grade complaint, and the program chair, along with the Dean of Academic Affairs within three days will have convened a committee to investigate and hand down a resolution to the student and with a copy to the Registrar's office
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: If the complaint is different from grading, it is addressed by the program chair, which may take it up to the Dean of Academic Affairs, and if need be, it may be taken up by a committee convened by the Provost, and the Deans of Colleges.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? At the Registrar's office on the file for each individual student if it's a grade complaint. Otherwise it is kept by the office that oversees complaints.
	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: Grade complaints need be resolved within three days. Recurring complaints will convene a special committee
	Comments:

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.

Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? On the web page and on the Registrar’s office http://tinyurl.com/q5xxv83
	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
<p>Comments:</p> <p>There’s a policy for students incoming from the out of High School or transferring from College outside of Mexico (US and other countries) There’s a policy for students changing major once enrolled at CETYS. There has been work done to develop articulation agreements between Two year institutions and CETYS (e.g. Exhibit Imperial Valley Campus IVC Articulation)</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.