

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To Pacific Union College

April 17-19, 2018

Team Roster

Stephen Morgan, Chair
President
University of the West

Stephanie Juillerat, Assistant Chair
Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Azusa Pacific University

Tammi Jackson
Vice President of Finance and Administration
Dominican University of California

Heather Brown
Associate Vice President
Institutional Research, Planning & Analytics
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Christy Stevens
Associate University Librarian
San Francisco State University

Maureen Maloney
Vice President, Staff Liaison
WASC
Senior College and University Commission

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

| | |
|---|---|
| A. Description of the Institution and Reaffirmation of Accreditation Process..... | 3 |
| B. Description of Team’s Review Process..... | 3 |
| C. Institutional Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence..... | 6 |

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

| | |
|--|----|
| Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions | 7 |
| Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees..... | 9 |
| Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies and Standards of Performance at Graduation..... | 12 |
| Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation..... | 16 |
| Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence..... | 19 |
| Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment..... | 22 |
| Component 8: NA | |
| Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators..... | 28 |
| Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement..... | 38 |

SECTION III – NA

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW..... 39

APPENDICES

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Federal Compliance Forms | |
| 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review..... | 40 |
| 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review..... | 42 |
| 3. Student Complaints Review..... | 43 |
| 4. Transfer Credit Policy Review..... | 44 |
| B. Off-Campus Locations..... | 45 |

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Reaffirmation of Accreditation Process

Pacific Union College (PUC) is a private, four-year, residential, liberal arts, Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) college offering seven baccalaureate degrees, one associate degree, and two master's degrees. Completing its 136th year this spring, PUC has a long history of providing Christ-centered education. In addition to its main campus in Angwin, PUC has two additional locations at Travis Air Force Base and in Napa. A member of the team visited the Napa site but discovered on the day of the tour that there were not any personnel present. This was both surprising and disappointing.

PUC has a long accreditation history, beginning in 1951. In addition to accreditation by WSCUC, PUC is accredited by six accrediting bodies. As a result of its last WSCUC accreditation visit in 2011, PUC received an accreditation period of seven years and was required to submit an Interim Report in March 2014. In response to the Interim Report, the WSCUC Interim Report Committee panel advised PUC to focus its efforts on 6 areas as part of its institutional report for reaffirmation (see Component 1 for the team's analysis of how well PUC addressed these areas).

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The review team (the team) engaged the process of review as designed and with significant collaboration and thoroughness. Beginning with an introductory conference call and development of a team worksheet, and followed by a comprehensive Offsite Review (OSR) in

November 2017, the team identified six lines of inquiry (LOI) to address the issues it thought prudent to pursue for the April 2018 Reaffirmation Visit. Those lines of inquiry are as follows:

LOI 1: Assessment of Student Learning - addressed in Components 3 and 4

- How does the mission (specifically institutional student learning outcomes, e.g., ISLOs) guide the meaning of the degrees?
- How does PUC use direct evidence to verify achievement of institutional student learning outcomes? In other words, how does PUC ensure that students exit with the desired values identified by ISLOs?
- General Education (GE) and Core Competency Outcomes - Along with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency profile, how will PUC continue to develop direct measures for assessing student learning, particularly information literacy, oral communication, and quantitative reasoning? What student artifacts are collected and evaluated?
- What are GE standards of performance in the associate's degree program?
- What are the student learning outcomes and performance standards for the master's programs?

LOI 2: Student Success, Retention, and Graduation - addressed in Component 5

- In what ways has the Student Success Council used strategies and data to impact student success? What do the latest retention data suggest in terms of the effectiveness of recent efforts?
- What strategies have been identified to help PUC achieve the retention goals set forth in the institutional report (p. 50)? How have these goals been shared with the campus, including with students?
- What are the plans for disaggregating retention data by academic program?
- Are there any efforts or plans to engage in some predictive analyses regarding retention (not only examining past data trends)?

LOI 3: Financial Sustainability - addressed in Component 7

- What is the budget process? Who is involved in determining the budget that is approved by the board of trustees?

- What is the plan for addressing the short-term fiscal challenges associated with declining enrollment? What is the status of each Strategic Initiative identified on p. 57 of the institutional report?
- How will PUC finance its long-term priorities and initiatives?
- What are the updates to the turn-around plan?
- What is the status of the conservation easement project?
- What new sources of revenue beside the land grant could be generated to diversify your portfolio?

LOI 4: Strategic Planning - addressed in Standard 4

- How does PUC leadership consider trends and innovations in higher education as part of the strategic planning process?
- Who was involved in the development of the strategic plan? What is the current status of the strategic plan? Has PUC established timelines and measurable outcomes for each element of the plan?
- What infrastructure is in place to implement, monitor progress, and evaluate the strategic plan?
- How is the strategic plan communicated to the PUC community?

LOI 5: Recruitment and Enrollment Management - addressed in Components 5 and 7

- What new enrollment management strategies, including those recommended by Credo, have been implemented; how is the effectiveness of these strategies being assessed; what additional strategies are planned for the future?
- What is the tuition discount strategy?

LOI 6: Effective Use of Data and Culture of Continuous Improvement - addressed in Component 6 and Standard 4

- Are programs required to engage in longitudinal reflections about curricular and student learning effectiveness? In other words, in addition to the submission of various annual program review components located in Canvas, is there a document/process where programs reflect comprehensively on 5-year trends?

- Who draws initial conclusions about a program's strengths and areas for growth referenced in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)? What is the process by which the administration responds to issues identified in the MOU?
- What plans are in place to examine department-specific graduation and retention rates as part of program review?
- How are external stakeholders (alumni, practitioners, employers) involved in assessment and evaluation, both at the program and institutional level?

The team thoroughly reviewed all documents submitted after the OSR and organized a set of interviews to acquire the information needed to write this report. All members diligently considered the written evidence provided by PUC and rendered judgment based on that evidence, supplemented by conversations with university constituents.

C. Institutional Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

As part of its preparation, the team read the Pacific Union College institutional report (institutional report or report) and its accompanying appendices. The team also reviewed subsequent materials that it requested from PUC. PUC was able to produce all requested materials in a responsive and timely manner.

The institutional report was clearly organized and addressed the institution's response to prior commission actions (Component 1) and Components 2-9. The narrative indicated that thoughtful consideration had been given to each Component, with supporting evidence to substantiate claims. The institution also identified areas for improvement and next steps in each section. Overall, the report reflected an authentic self-assessment of the institution's status at the time of its writing.

According to the narrative, and confirmed by subsequent conversation with the steering committee, there were broad levels of involvement in the identification of the issues to be addressed in the report. Specifically, board of trustees, faculty, staff, and student leaders were sent a questionnaire in 2015 asking them to provide a “self-review rating” and “importance to address” rating for each of the CFRs. Employees were also given opportunity to identify the most important issues raised under each Standard. The steering committee began the work of addressing those issues, many of which focused on administrative accountability and transparency. However, at the end of 2016, there was a change in presidential leadership which changed the nature of the inquiry. PUC decided to keep the work it had begun but to add updates from 2017. Based on conversation with the steering committee, the report was written mainly by one individual, who had since left the college.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

The institutional essays in the report included not only reflections on Components 2-9, but also responses to the most recent action letter received by PUC, which was the response of the Interim Report Committee panel. In that written response, the panel identified six areas which PUC needed to address as part of its institutional report. These included (excerpts from the letter below):

1. Strategic Planning - It was unclear to the panel how KPIs [key performance indicators] are being monitored and how results are being used to achieve institutional effectiveness. This linkage between planning, implementation, evaluation of those efforts, and data-informed quality improvement remains an expectation of the Commission. By the time of the comprehensive review, beginning in fall 2017, PUC should provide evidence of the

methods it uses to track progress with KPIs and the ways results are being used to make changes in the College. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 4.6, and 4.7)

2. Financial Sustainability - A critical factor for PUC is the ability to convert non-essential assets in order to build endowments, improve facilities, and support academic programs, which would include increasing compensation and benefits for faculty and staff. The panel learned that PUC has a potential new buyer for these assets and hopes to complete due diligence by November. If the college is successful with the conversion before the time of its next comprehensive review, it may wish to provide WSCUC staff with that information. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 4.6 and 4.7)
3. Enrollment Management and Retention and Graduation Rates - By the time of the institution's next comprehensive review PUC should provide evidence of student enrollment increases resulting from the college's marketing and prospective student recruitment efforts. (CFRs 1.4, 2.0, 2.6, 2.12-2.14 and 4.1)
4. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and Co-Curricular Units - By the time of the comprehensive review, PUC should provide evidence of how co-curricular activities are aligned with intended outcomes. In addition, at the time of the next comprehensive review, PUC should provide evidence that quality across co-curricular areas is even, that all departments use strategic planning to guide their work, and that results are linked with institutional planning and budget processes. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3-2.7, 2.11 and 4.1)
5. Institutional Research - At the time of PUC's next comprehensive review, the college should provide evidence of how findings from its study of the characteristics of at-risk and non-returning students have been used to intervene in and mitigate the attrition of these students. The college should also provide evidence of the on-going linkage between Institutional Research (IR) data, actions for improvement, and the assessment of those actions. (CFRs 4.2 and 4.7).
6. Governance and Leadership - The panel recommends that PUC maintain and advance its sensitivity to potential conflicts of interest in institutional leadership and governance. (CFRs 1.5, 3.6 and 3.9)

PUC's institutional report thoroughly addressed these issues, as well as other issues that had arisen since the Interim Report, most notably a significant change in presidential leadership and several cabinet-level vacancies. PUC's report was thorough and transparent in addressing the issues; however, it should be noted that their progress on several of the most critical areas was not significant. Specifically, at the time of the visit in April 2018, their progress on finances

and enrollment was seemingly no further along than they were in spring 2014. On a positive note, the team found that the college had made some gains in strategic planning, leadership, institutional research, and some of its assessment efforts, all of which will be discussed below.

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

At the time of the visit PUC had a coherent mission, defining itself as “a Seventh-day Adventist learning community offering an excellent Christ-centered education that prepares its students for productive lives of useful human service and uncompromising personal integrity.” The college also had a distinctive set of values that shape the meaning of its degrees and that were inscribed into its institutional student learning outcomes (ISLOs). PUC used the acronym WISDOM-- **W**holeness, **I**ntegrity, **S**ervice and stewardship, **D**iversity, **O**ur Adventist heritage, and **M**aintaining lifelong learning--to communicate and promote its ISLOs and the meaning of a PUC degree. PUC’s institutional report acknowledged that its ISLOs were “somewhat unconventional because they are focused on values” rather than knowledge and skills. The team noted that the ISLOs did not focus on the academic knowledge and skills that a graduate of liberal arts education should possess, but the ISLOs identified important values to PUC. (CFR 1.1) The team confirmed that academic knowledge and skills were articulated and assessed at the program and course levels (see also Component 4). (CFRs 2.2 and 2.3) Onsite meetings with faculty confirmed that they were familiar with the WISDOM acronym and the values it promoted. A meeting with more than 30 students, however, revealed that they were less familiar with WISDOM, though they could remember some of the values inscribed in the ISLOs after additional prompting from team members. At least one student indicated that some professors

started out their class periods with a brief narrative/reflection on one of the WISDOM values, and others confirmed that faculty discussed the ISLOs on “syllabus day.” (CFRs 1.2 and 2.4)

At the time of the visit PUC had two primary structures in place designed to both ensure and demonstrate that its graduates achieved its ISLOs: the Curriculum and Efficiency Committee (CECom), which had oversight of new and revised curriculum and academic program review, and the Assessment Committee, which was responsible for assessing student achievement of ISLOs. A meeting with CECom during the visit confirmed that the program review process required programs to align program learning outcomes with the ISLOs, where applicable. (CFR 2.7) Ultimately, however, it was the Assessment Committee’s responsibility to ensure that the ISLOs were assessed. Both the institutional report and members of the Assessment Committee acknowledged that assessing the values inscribed in the ISLOs was difficult, and as a result, they had relied primarily on indirect assessments of student learning. These included standardized assessment measures, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the University Spiritual Life Survey, as well as locally developed assessments, including the Graduate Exit Survey, which asked students in their senior year to rate their level of commitment to each of the ISLOs upon entering and upon exiting PUC, and the Graduate Exit Essay, which asked students to reflect on a single ISLO. Both exit assessments were conducted in the Assessment Seminar/Senior Assessment Seminar (GNST 201/401), a requirement of all graduating students in their final year. According to the Assessment Committee, a faculty researcher compiled the results of the committee’s content analysis and also performed additional qualitative analysis of emerging themes noted by the committee

members but not fully captured in the content analysis itself. The researcher then prepared a report for the Assessment Committee, and the committee in turn made recommendations for actions that might improve student learning of the ISLOs and/or the institution's assessment of them. The results were also reported to the faculty and staff. (CFRs 2.4 and 2.6)

At the time of the visit, the Assessment Committee had an upcoming opportunity to improve the Graduate Exit Survey. Specifically, because PUC had not had an effective means of collecting data from first year students, seniors had been asked to reflect upon both their current level of commitment to each of the ISLOs and their level of commitment when they first enrolled at PUC. The institution's newly-approved First Year Experience (FYE) course, which was to be required of all freshmen, provided an opportunity for PUC to collect baseline data from freshmen, thereby eliminating the potential pitfalls involved in relying on seniors' memories of their commitment levels four years in the past. (CFRs 2.6 and 4.3)

In addition to assessing the ways academic programs supported the ISLOs, the Assessment Committee also explored the contributions of co-curricular activities. To that end, the Vice President for Student Life, Enrollment, and Marketing had recently joined the Assessment Committee. The University Spiritual Life Survey provided one example of how assessment data related to spirituality, which is infused throughout WISDOM, and was used to make improvements to a relevant co-curricular activity. Student responses to the survey led the college to look at the worship requirement policy and how it contributed to spiritual growth. They found, for example, that students wanted their own worship experience, which led to the development of a student-run church. This change not only related to the Our Adventist heritage

ISLO, but also to “Wholeness,” providing students with the opportunity to make independent spiritual choices. (CFR 4.3)

In addition to assessing ISLOs, members of the Assessment Committee also took responsibility for communicating findings about student achievement of the ISLOs. Information was shared with a variety of different constituents in different venues, including department chairs, the faculty senate, the Directors of Campus Services (DOCs) group, the College Assembly (consisting of faculty and staff), the board, and board subcommittees. (CFR 2.4) The Vice President for Student Life, Enrollment, and Marketing assumed oversight of student life in July 2017, and since then, began making plans to more effectively communicate to students the results of student service-related surveys, as well as what the college was doing to respond to them, including those that related to the ISLOs. The team encouraged PUC to continue making progress in that direction. (CFR 1.2)

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

At the time of the visit, PUC offered an associate’s degree with 11 majors or emphases, seven baccalaureate degrees with 56 majors or emphases, and two master’s degrees, in teaching and education respectively. The college website published Curriculum Guidesheets for each degree program that outlined specific program requirements and learning outcomes. The institutional report indicated that institutional and general education learning outcomes were the same for both associate’s and bachelor’s degree students, but standards of performance were less rigorous for graduates of the associate degree programs, given their enrollment in fewer courses. Curriculum Guidesheets differentiated associate and bachelor level program learning outcomes

in terms of the level of mastery that should accompany the differing amounts of time devoted to and credits taken toward each degree. (CFRs 2.2 and 2.4) The master's degree programs also had learning outcomes that suggested that the graduate programs were more extensive in depth and breadth than their bachelor level counterparts. (CFR 2.2b) Going forward, PUC may find the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), and the [DQP Grid](#) in particular, useful as it continues to refine and improve its general education and program learning outcomes, more clearly distinguishing performance expectations at the different degree levels. (CFRs 2.4 and 4.3)

As indicated in Component 3, one of the primary lines of inquiry for the team was related to the assessment of the ISLOs. After reading PUC's institutional report, which described indirect assessment of ISLOs, the team needed to explore whether any direct assessment of students' achievement of ISLOs was taking place. A meeting with the assessment coordinator for core competencies, followed by a meeting with the Assessment Committee, confirmed that direct evidence was not being collected, but that they had plans to do so. The committee revealed that they had just recently begun to consider ways to utilize direct evidence and had started to draft new criteria for meeting ISLOs. This was an important development that would allow the Assessment Committee to more effectively assess the degree to which PUC students were actually achieving its ISLOs rather than simply measuring their self-reported commitment to them. During the visit, the Assessment Committee also reported that it was continuing to explore new ways to, as one committee member put it, "break down these wonderful sounding things [ISLOs] into concrete competencies" and to measure them directly, both in the classroom and in co-curricular activities. The team suggested that PUC expand initial efforts to develop and assess

direct evidence to verify that graduates exemplify the behavioral manifestations of the ISLOs. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6 and 4.3).

In addition to its inquiry around the assessment of ISLOs, the team also went into the visit with questions about the direct assessment of the general education outcomes and core competencies, particularly information literacy, oral communication, and quantitative reasoning. Documents provided after the OSR, in addition to productive onsite conversations, revealed that direct assessment of the core competencies was in its early stages at PUC but was underway. Although PUC had not engaged in a systematic effort to assess the core competencies prior to 2016, the college recognized the importance of doing so, and as a result, had appointed an Assessment Coordinator for Core Competencies (Assessment Coordinator). This coordinator served as an ex officio member on both the Academic Standards and General Education (ASGE) committee and the CECOM. (CFRs 2.2a and 4.3)

According to PUC, initial assessment efforts relied heavily on indirect methods (e.g., NSSE and the PUC graduate surveys), with the exception of one direct assessment instrument, the ETS Proficiency Profile, which was used to assess three of the core competencies. In 2016, PUC conducted an in-depth critical thinking assessment involving a faculty panel conducting a direct assessment of 144 student artifacts from a variety of capstone courses. The results were reviewed and utilized by faculty throughout the 2016-17 academic year. A subsequent core competencies report issued in 2017 showed significant improvement in the direct assessment of core competencies, including embedding a quantitative reasoning assessment in STAT 222 and an in-depth information literacy assessment of student artifacts from a variety of capstone

courses. The report also noted, and the Assessment Committee confirmed, that plans were in place to collect oral communication student artifacts in the form of video-recorded student presentations from multiple sections of ENGL 301 during spring 2018. Conversations with the assessment coordinator for core competencies during the visit revealed that the institution planned to continue to annually assess one core competency each summer by utilizing a group of faculty who reviewed and scored student products using a rubric. PUC offered a \$200 stipend to incentivize faculty to participate in the process, which had been successful to date. While these improvements in the assessment of core competencies were commendable, the team noted that the Assessment Coordinator also functioned as the Associate Academic Dean, and the Registrar. While common for PUC employees to “wear many hats,” it nevertheless raised questions about the sustainability of the core competency assessment effort. The team encouraged PUC to continue to prioritize this relatively new assessment initiative. (CFR 2.2a)

The general education (GE) outcomes, while aligned with the core competencies, were assessed using a different process. Each year, as part of a standardized form, the ASGE committee collected a written narrative from departments as to how they had assessed and what they had discovered related to a pre-identified GE outcome. Similar to CECOM, the ASGE committee generated commendations and recommendations back to the departments to ensure that assessment of GE outcomes were appropriate. (CFR 2.2a)

Given the college’s attempts to align the GE outcomes with the core competencies, the team wondered whether there could be a more streamlined approach whereby the same process of review and analysis was used for both sets of outcomes (GE and core competency). Given

PUC's small number of faculty, anything that can be done to create efficiency while maintaining quality would be wise.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Another line of inquiry that the team explored related to student success, retention, and graduation. According to members of the Student Success Council, PUC defined student success as timely achievement of stated program and ISLOs (WISDOM). At the time of the visit, PUC had implemented a number of strategies and programs to support student success. An extended orientation program (FUSION) involved peer mentoring, whereby sophomore students mentored freshmen and helped them acclimate to PUC. The program encouraged students to connect with peers through a variety of student life opportunities. Anecdotally, the Student Success Council members felt that these efforts had been helpful to mitigate homesickness and attrition, particularly during students' first weeks on campus. (CFR 2.11)

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) was the nexus for many student success programs (including academic mentoring, advising for undeclared students, tutoring, and disability support resources). Senior exit survey data showed that students regularly identified the TLC as a significant factor in their success. Acting on the recommendation of the Student Success Council, and in response to data showing lower success rates for Hispanic students, the TLC hired a new Hispanic male academic mentor in January 2017. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11 and 2.13)

In response to increasing needs for student mental health services, the Career and Counseling Center had substantially increased services, intentionally hiring mental health professionals who understood the community and drew from a diverse set of counseling skills

and techniques. Additional strategies to support success included: a Pioneering Success course and policies to support varsity athletes, a Success Strategies in Health Sciences course to support pre-nursing students, and a then-new Introduction to Human Biology course (required as a prerequisite for students with low incoming grade point average (GPA) or test scores to reduce the high course repeat patterns observed in Anatomy). (CFRs 2.10, 2.11 and 2.13)

Student success was also measured at PUC through traditional data points, such as graduation and retention rates. Within the institutional report, the college cited a then-average Unit Redemption Rate of 78% and average Absolute Graduation rate of 61%. According to the report, “comparative data provided by WSCUC demonstrates that PUC is congruent with (or occasionally above) the average for other WSCUC institutions in recent years” (page 52). (CFRs 1.2 and 4.1)

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) graduation rate data showed that most students who earned baccalaureate degrees from PUC did so within 5 years. The IPEDS 6-year graduation rate for baccalaureate degree-seeking students at PUC was 54% for the 2016 reporting year. Since 2008, this rate had ranged from 38% to 54%, exceeding 50% in 2014 as well as 2016. The 3-year graduation rate for students who began in the associate degree program was 39% for the 2016 reporting year. The official IPEDS graduation rate for all first-time, full-time freshmen (associates and baccalaureate combined) was 50% for the 2016 reporting year (Appendix 5E of the 2017 PUC Institutional Report). (CFRs 1.2 and 2.10)

Through a [key performance indicators webpage](#), PUC published information about IPEDS retention and graduation rates, time to degree, and measures of academic proficiency and

progress (ETS Proficiency Profile scores). (CFR 1.2) However, the retention and graduation rates were not presented within the context of the targets that the college had established.

According to its institutional report, and substantiated by document review and conversations with the Student Success Council and institutional researchers, the campus disaggregated retention and graduation rates by demographic, academic, and socio-economic factors. (CFR 2.10) As at many other institutions, retention and graduation rates were lower for students with lower entering high school GPAs, higher financial need, and traditionally underrepresented minority groups. As a residential, faith-based institution, PUC also examined student success data along other relevant dimensions. These analyses showed that students who came from out of state, and those who were not Seventh-day Adventists, were typically retained at lower rates than the general student body. The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP) analyzed data from the National Student Clearinghouse to identify where students subsequently enrolled when they left PUC before graduating. Informed by these studies, the campus knew that students who left typically transferred to other SDA institutions within the region (Loma Linda, La Sierra, and Walla Walla) or to public 2-year colleges. (CFRs 2.10 and 4.1)

As noted above, and in the institutional report, PUC had a number of widely-used best practices to support student success. However, the college had not had a cohesive first year experience. Guided by the academic dean, the faculty worked during spring 2017 to develop a proposal for a new First Year Experience (FYE) course. Led by faculty within the theology

department, the FYE course will include education about holistic living (i.e., mental, physical, spiritual health) and start in fall 2018.

As part of its strategic efforts to increase and manage enrollment, PUC hired the consulting firm Credo which recommended several additional strategies to improve student success. These included a modest increase in fall 2018 admissions eligibility requirements (from 2.3 to 2.5 high school GPA) and revisions to financial aid and scholarship strategies. Given that these changes were very recent at the time of the visit, the impact of these changes would not be observable until December 2018 or early 2019.

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

At the time of the visit, PUC was working intentionally to become an institution that both valued and utilized evidence for continuous improvement. One way the college used data for continuous improvement was the program review process. According to its institutional report, and substantiated by document review and conversations with the CECOM and the Campus Services Program Review Committee (CSPRCom), PUC had a well-defined and useful academic program review process (CFR 2.7) and an emerging process for reviewing co-curricular and campus services units. (CFR 2.11) Both academic and service units (co-curricular) utilized a 5-year review cycle, and units reflected longitudinally on trends in their units. Each unit wrote a self-study, followed by a committee review that made commendations and recommendations, which were then forwarded to the Senate (academic programs only) and the President's Cabinet (cabinet). (CFRs 2.7, 4.1 and 4.3) While similar in process, there were some notable differences at the time of the visit.

In academic program review, programs engaged in review and reported their findings in the learning management system, Canvas. According to conversation with CeCom, this had improved the efficiency and ease of the process. Certain institutional data was provided in the Canvas shell, and programs uploaded materials annually that became part of the review. The review utilized a standardized template and examined elements related to curricular quality and student learning. While programs examined enrollment trends in the majors/programs, given the institution's small size, the program review did not calculate program-specific retention or graduation rates. Programs utilized constituent feedback differentially. (CFR 4.5) When this discrepancy was explored with program faculty who had recently undergone review, the rationale provided was that most students weren't employed locally; therefore, connecting with alumni and employers was challenging. Accredited programs and programs associated with the health professions, teacher education, and the church acquired alumni and stakeholder feedback more readily and systematically. Others collected information more anecdotally. The team inquired about the use of an alumni survey, and the concept was received favorably; something PUC may wish to explore. (CFRs 2.7 and 4.1)

Once the program report was completed, materials were reviewed by CeCom, which submitted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that included their commendations and recommendations about the program, as well as recommendations to the administration, typically for initiatives that required funding. The review was approved by the senate and sent to the cabinet. (CFR 4.1)

While the academic program review process was described as thorough and useful, one element that still needed to improve at the time of the visit was the linkage between report findings and the allocation of budgetary funds. While MOUs were utilized, and the chair of CeCom presented budget requests to the cabinet, decisions about funding were made as part of the annual budgeting process and might or might not have incorporated recommendations from program review. Given the fiscal challenges facing the college, this was not an unexpected finding, and there was a spoken desire by the president to link the two more intentionally in the future. (CFRs 2.7, 3.4 and 4.1)

The co-curricular program review process had notable differences from academic program review. Although the process was in its third review cycle, the process lacked a standardized template, was not managed centrally in Canvas, nor did it have centralized or standardized data collection. In a manner similar to academic program review, the CSPRCom indicated that there was not a clear process for administrative response to recommendations that had budgetary implications. (CFRs 2.11 and 3.4) The conversations with staff indicated that although they felt the process could be valuable for improving quality, it was not consistently valued at higher levels of administration and often felt like added bureaucratic work. With small departments, the process of programmatic self-examination could feel like a personnel review, which brought risk to the process.

PUC would benefit from finding ways to improve the CSPR process such that it included the use of Canvas and measures of customer (especially student) satisfaction that were common across units, with data gathered by a single, neutral office (such as IRAP). It might also explore

the feasibility of implementing a shorter, more streamlined review cycle (e.g., every three years) to inform and guide programs that experience rapid changes (in scope, student needs, and resources). (CFRs 2.11 and 4.2)

For both types of program reviews, the team recommended better transparency of the decisions made from the review process, by communicating to staff, faculty, and students the changes made as a result of the review process, as well as reasons for why the changes could not be made. (CFRs 1.2 and 4.3)

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

In recent years, many small liberal art colleges, PUC among them, have endured the challenges faced with declining enrollment and financial challenges. Being tuition dependent, PUC had seen a steady decline in enrollment for the past three years and an accompanying net operating deficit for each of those years. As evidenced by Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 to FY 2018, economic full-time equivalent (EFTE) enrollment had declined from 1,377 to 1,115. The board approved the FY 2018 operating budget with a projected \$2.4M deficit. At the time of the visit, the college anticipated that it would need to take out an additional line of credit to cover the shortfall for FY 2018. In the past, the college had attempted to offset the shortfall of revenue with increased borrowing, resulting in \$36.6M in debt. With the full support of the Pacific Union Conference, the college was able to consolidate all of its debt with the conference, allowing for more flexible debt management. At the writing of this report, PUC was only servicing the debt on \$14.6M with lines of credit at \$502k annually. Nonetheless, the duration of this loan will take

76 years to retire and requires at least 60 EFTE (students) to cover the annual debt payments.

(CFR 3.4)

At the time of the visit, PUC indicated they had hired a contractor to prepare the FY 2019 budget, due to lack of staffing in the finance office, and had undergone a new budget development process. The new budget process was approved for implementation effective July 1, 2018 for FY 2020. The budget cycle calendar included month-by-month activity, summarized as follows:

1. In August, a review of the previous year's budget performance would be undertaken to confirm assumptions about the current year's budget.
2. In September, a review and recommended ratification of current year's budget would be conducted and if necessary, adjustments would be proposed at this time. Also in September, tuition rates would be set for next fiscal year.
3. By the fall board retreat, the board would vote to ratify the current year's budget as recommended by Administrative Council. The board vote covers tuition rates, confirms salary scales, and approves cost of living adjustments for the next fiscal year.
4. By November, scholarship programs would be finalized for the next fiscal year; all fees and rates would be voted on by the board for the next fiscal year, and faculty contracts would be drafted. Additionally, the finance committee of the board votes to approve the preliminary budget and finalizes faculty ranks for the next fiscal year.
5. By the May board meeting, any last minute amendments to the budget are voted on by the board. (CFRs 3.7 and 3.8)

While the cabinet and Finance Committee of the board was involved in determining the budget, there were several constituents who played vital roles in the process. Those included departments such as human resources (assess compensation), accounting (perform prior year analysis), enrollment, institutional research and records (determination of enrollment for new, transfer, and returning students), student finance and enrollment (determine net tuition revenue),

the academic administration and the rank and tenure committee (determine faculty promotions, additions, and replacements), Howell Mountain Enterprise (auxiliary income), Pacific Union Conference (allocation of subsidy), and department chairs and directors. (CFRs 3.4 and 4.6)

Since the arrival of the new president and the chief financial officer (CFO), Pacific Union College seemed committed to implementing a comprehensive turn-around plan. This plan consisted of three components:

- full-time employee reduction and rightsizing
- operational improvement
- new sources of revenue

Through planned and early retirements, involuntary separations, and attritions, the college was able to reduce its full-time employee count by 46 FTE. This reduction would produce an annual savings of \$2.8 million with a one-time cost of \$700,000 for support of early retirement incentives. Operational cost savings would be achieved by such actions as suspending wellness incentive payments, reducing health plan costs, outsourcing property management and campus security, ceasing to operate a preschool in St. Helena, and changing financial aid packaging.

Although the college had taken this significant step to reduce 46 FTE in the then-current fiscal year, PUC would continue to have a fiscal year deficit for FY 2018 and would have a projected cash flow shortfall by the summer 2018. The Pacific Union Conference intended to fund this line of credit. Realizing that this plan would take more time and resources, and in order to coordinate with the strategic plan, the college had adjusted the full implementation of this plan from three years to a full five years. (CFR 3.4)

During FY 2018, the college had taken the following steps in implementing the strategic initiatives to address its then-current financial challenges:

- Debt structuring – PUC had paid off the \$12M line of credit with Morgan Stanley Bank in January 2018, thereby releasing the collateral of the land. The Pacific Union Conference loaned PUC the \$12M to replace the Morgan Stanley Bank account and established a traditional payment plan for principal and interest. The college had \$36.6M in debt held by Pacific Union Conference.
- Audit adjustment – PUC had to perform a restatement of the 2014 audited financial statements related to the capitalization of land sale costs recorded in 2012-2013. The impact of this adjustment was \$6M to the financial statements.
- Tuition discounting / Student Finance – In fall 2017, PUC engaged Credo to perform a deep dive of the Student Financial Services department. The results reflected a need for significant improvement in customer service and numerous opportunities in efficiency and effectiveness. Based on these recommendations, PUC made changes in leadership in the department in January 2018 and began implementing many of the recommendations. In addition, Credo was engaged by the college to formulate a Strategic Packaging Mix, which would align enrollment, scholarship, and student finance strategies into one discounting matrix. PUC acknowledged that the financial aid packages were delayed in reaching students and may impact fall enrollment.
- Fundraising - The college had recently hired a new Vice President (VP) for Alumni/Development who was beginning to identify opportunities, reaching out and re-engaging alumni, and cultivating new donor relationships. The VP had identified 69 potential donors who had the capacity to give seven-figure gifts (from \$1M to \$10M one-time gifts) or who could be cultivated for planned gifts and had also created the “PUC Society,” a designation for those who contribute \$1,000 to the college. It was her goal to have 500 donors in the PUC Society within the next 18 months. These were ambitious goals given that the advancement office was starting from the ground up - requiring additional resources to start such endeavors.
- Operational improvements – Since PUC managed over 200 properties, the college administration decided to outsource the property management to Crown Property Management. While this move provided many benefits to the college, (e.g., all leases were updated with current legal language, better tracking of security deposits, better tracking of housing inventory), it also provided an additional cost of \$10k. PUC also outsourced campus security, which was cost neutral. A significant operational improvement was that the dorm facilities, custodial, and housing maintenance all reported to the Facilities Management Director. This reorganization created both a maintenance and janitorial pool and an on-call schedule. Management also decided that it

made the most economical and risk management decision to lease the St. Helena Preschool to an external operator. This reduced 9 FTE and netted a cost savings of over \$90k to PUC.

At the time of the visit, the engagement of Credo had made the most operational improvement on campus. Credo had been engaged in the enrollment ACE (Assess, Counsel, Empower), student finance service ACE, strategic packaging matrix, strategic planning, executive coaching, and the campus master plan. All of the Credo projects were underway at the time of the visit, but it will take some time to determine the impact.

Despite these steps to decrease debt and build revenue streams, enrollment continued to be the largest source of revenue for PUC. Being a faith-based institution, PUC had a student body that was majority-declared SDA. With national enrollment growth projected to drop approximately one percent (specifically in the college's market area), PUC needed to develop a combination of new market penetration, market development, and program development strategies to stimulate demand in this slow growth environment. In addition, Adventist higher education in North America had experienced a 1.6 percent drop since 2011. The college partnered with Royal to purchase names of SDA students, and Royal could not produce 25,000 SDA names. In addition, the college was saddled with a limited regional marketing pool/base, a financial aid package matrix that needed to be implemented (which entailed aligning enrollment, scholarship and student finance strategies into one discounting matrix), scarce marketing resources, and a need to decide whether to overcome or embrace the perceived reputation of PUC (e.g., spiritually too liberal). All of these factors made a significant impact on the enrollment and marketing strategies of PUC. The college's response to these challenges at the

time of the visit had been to independently purchase more student names of high school students in freshman, sophomore and junior years to broaden its recruitment pool; attend more college fairs; focus on conservative Christians and not solely SDA students; and improve the strategic packaging of financial aid. The team recommended that PUC develop and implement enrollment management strategies that attract and retain an appropriate number of students for long-term sustainability. (CFRs 3.4 and 3.7)

Going forward, capitalizing on the college's largest asset, over 1,800 acres of land, must be strategic. The college endured the outcome of attempting to sell approximately 100 acres of land, and after hearing the concerns of alumni and the community, subsequently withdrawing the offer. At the time of the visit, the college had entered into a partnership with the Land Trust of Napa County and CalFire to create a conservation easement that would protect 864 forested acres with the potential of providing \$7.1M in funds for the college in a combination of government grants and private gifts. PUC had not included these funds in their future planning, but fiscal stability would be impacted if the grant faltered. At the time of the visit, the advancement office was raising \$2M for the forest conservation endowment. If the project does not move forward, the college will still need to raise or institutionalize the \$2M for the maintenance and personnel of the forest (e.g., Forest Manager). (CFRs 3.1 and 3.4)

While exploring means of generating revenue from the college's land, PUC was also exploring other avenues for revenue generation. Management was working with its current dining service vendor, Bon Appetit, to capitalize on the new market deli and was going to explore investing in a pizza parlor. The college was looking to expand the revenue potential with

one of the retailers in the plaza, Ace Hardware. By changing product mix and the store layout/flow and increasing square-footage, marketing and promotions, Ace Hardware was hopeful those strategies would increase annual sales from \$650k to roughly \$1M. In addition, PUC continued to partner with Howell Mountain Enterprise (HME) on many endeavors, from having storage units in Angwin to utilizing empty buildings on campus. Many of these endeavors with HME were still in the exploration stage and return on investments were unknown at the time of the visit. PUC desired to revitalize the Angwin airport and find alternative uses for the agricultural land that was available (e.g., agricultural leases, Howell Mountain Farms). Again, many of these proposals were still in infancy, and impact on revenue was uncertain. (CFR 3.4)

Many of the proposed operational improvements and new sources of revenue strategies could result in significant financial stability for PUC; however, the college was still in the early stages of the turn-around plan to have any data to suggest that the plan would yield the desired long-term results. The team recommended that PUC build a financially sustainable budget model that will fund both short-term and long-term goals of the college. (CFR 3.4)

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

The team did a thorough review of the Standards at its OSR via the worksheet provided by PUC in its report. Many of the Standards have been addressed in this report as part of the Component sections; however, the team noted several items for consideration.

Standard 1 - Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Members of the team carefully reviewed the printed materials generated by the college, including the college catalogue and the website, and found the mission statement was clear. In

conversations across the campus with trustees, faculty, staff and students, there was a consistency in understanding and support of the college mission and purpose. Given the challenges PUC was facing at the time of the visit, the team found this ongoing commitment commendable. (CFR 1.1)

In reviewing the college's support of academic freedom, the team met with members of the recently-formed Academic Freedom Advisory Council. The team learned that the council was formed to review any issues of academic freedom and give advice to the administration and faculty when such issues arose. At the time of the visit, the council had encountered no significant issues of concern brought either by faculty or administration. When the team met with them, they had just received a request from the art department to assist the department in pursuing the department's request to utilize undraped models in the art program. The council planned to review the request and give counsel to both the department and the administration regarding the request. Conversations with faculty indicated they believed they had sufficient academic freedom at PUC. (CFR 1.3)

In reviewing the college's policies and practices, and in conversations with the staff, the team learned that there were processes in place for faculty review, including periodic post-tenure reviews, (CFR 3.2) but there was no systematic, regularly-scheduled evaluation process for the non-faculty staff of the college, including senior administration. A few departments conducted performance evaluations within the department, but those were limited and often did not include the supervisor of the department or division. Given the importance of feedback opportunities in terms of re-building morale and trust, as well as PUC's stated commitment to

building a culture of continuous improvement, the team recommended that the college implement a systematic and regularly-scheduled performance evaluation process for all non-faculty employees, including cabinet-level administrators. The team also suggested that the board conduct periodic performance reviews regarding the president's performance and engage in its own self-evaluation of board performance. (CFRs 1.7, 3.3 and 3.6)

During the visit, and in preparation for the visit, the team found Pacific Union College to be committed to honest and open communication with WSCUC. In all dealings with the team the college was candid and honest in providing information. That was confirmed during the visit when the team met with all of the major constituents in a variety of small, focused meetings. There was consistency and candor throughout the various groups. Written materials were validated during face-to-face meetings. (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.

Standard 2 - Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7)

The team found PUC's educational programs appropriate in content, rigor, and standards of performance for the baccalaureate, associate, and master's degrees offered. (CFR 2.1) The college outlined general education and major course requirements in a variety of places, including the college catalogue and [Curriculum Guidesheets](#). (CFR 2.2) Academic programs conformed to recognized disciplinary standards and were subject to peer review on a five-year cycle (see Component 6). (CFRs 2.1, 2.2 and 2.7) In addition to ISLOs, the university had also

developed program and course-level student learning outcomes that were published in a variety of places, including the college's [website](#), [Curriculum Guidesheets](#), and course syllabi. The CECOM reviewed syllabi and course and program learning outcomes to ensure that they were aligned with institutional guidelines and educational best practices. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5)

PUC had a number of structures in place designed to both ensure and demonstrate that its graduates achieved its institutional, program, and course learning outcomes, including CECOM, which administered the academic program review process; ASGE, which reviewed the GE program; the Assessment Committee, which was responsible for ensuring ISLOs were measured and reviewed; and the Student Success Council, charged with identifying barriers not only to retention and graduation but also to students' achievement of learning outcomes. Students also completed the Graduate Exit Survey, rating their level of commitment to each of the institution's ISLOs, and the Graduate Exit Essay, reflecting on one of the ISLOs (see Components 3 and 4). (CFR 2.6)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8 and 2.9)

PUC was explicit about its focus on undergraduate teaching and learning and the primary role that commitment played in the rank and tenure process. However, the institution also valued and promoted scholarship and creative activity and required the development of a professional development plan that included scholarship. The institution had structures in place to ensure appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, and student learning, including the Rank and Tenure Committee, which had oversight of the promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The self-evaluation and the portfolio required that

faculty demonstrate excellence in teaching and learning, as well as a commitment to students and the institutional mission. The Faculty Development, Research, and Honors committee (FDRH) promoted faculty scholarly activity through the faculty award program, as well as through special grants. It also documented, rewarded, and publicized the scholarship and creative activity of PUC faculty. The Faculty Handbook also outlined a sabbatical process designed to release faculty members from their teaching responsibilities for a specified time period in order to pursue research or other scholarly activity. (CFRs 2.8 and 2.9)

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10-2.14)

Both IRAP and the Student Success Council analyzed student retention and graduation rates, disaggregating data around a variety of categories (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, financial need, religion, etc.) in an effort to help more students complete their degrees in a timely fashion. (CFR 2.10) Assessment of co-curricular programs was in the early stages at PUC (see Component 6), but Student Services had documented co-curricular assessments taking place in various departments and was aware of the need to provide evidence of how co-curricular activities were aligned with specific ISLOs and program learning outcomes. (CFR 2.11)

According to its materials, PUC had advising programs in place designed to provide students with course registration advice, and it had conducted assessments to evaluate its advising practices. Some of these assessments had led to specific changes to improve the student experience, including the addition of professional advisors in Nursing and Health Sciences. (CFR 2.12) The institution also provided other student support services, including tutoring, services for students with disabilities, counseling, residential life services, athletics, and study abroad

programs. (CFR 2.13) Additionally, it had a [transfer of credit policy](#) posted on the website. (CFR 2.14)

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

PUC completed an Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) form that was included as an attachment to their institutional report. The college published Curriculum Guidesheets for all academic programs that were available for viewing online, and each of these sheets outlined the individual programs' learning outcomes. According to the IEEI, programs used a variety of forms of evidence to determine that graduates had achieved the stated learning outcomes, including standardized tests, senior/capstone projects, portfolios, lab performance, exit interviews, exit surveys, etc. While some departments had relied heavily on indirect forms of evidence, such as exit surveys and interviews, others had focused their efforts on direct evidence as well, working collaboratively as a department to examine student work artifacts with tools like rubrics that assessed specific learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6)

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

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

Given the Interim Report Committee panel's action item regarding board governance, the team met with members of the board. The team found the board to be highly engaged in the workings of PUC, but they also expressed an interest not to micromanage. (CFR 3.9) At the time of the visit, most board members served on more than one committee, and the team found the members to be conversant with the topics related to their committees. All of the board members

were engaged in the strategic planning process and familiar with the contents of the strategic plan. (CFR 4.3) At the time of the visit, the trustees had re-focused their attention on the matter of the utilization of the college's extensive land holdings. In 2016 the board had supported the sale of a portion of the land to generate additional financial resources for the college. In early 2017, faced with community input from both the college community and the community at-large, the board changed its direction and, at the time of the visit, expressed its commitment to conserve the land with hopes of financial support for the conservancy and the potential of leasing portions to generate new streams of revenue. (CFR 3.4)

At the time of the visit, the board had a number of vacancies and were utilizing a talent inventory to strategically select new board members with the array of characteristics deemed most needed to maximize the strength of the board as it moved forward. The team supported that strategy and suggested the board also implement a periodic self-evaluation of their performance. The team believed both would strengthen the board's ability to provide strong leadership as the college implemented its strategic plan. (CFRs 3.9, 1.5 and 1.7)

An area that arose as a result of the team visit that was not in the initial lines of inquiry related to the sufficiency of professional development for staff and faculty. Conversations with staff indicated a desire for more professional development and opportunities to advance, especially in light of the challenges with salaries not rising to the cost of living in the surrounding area. A conversation with the staff in the TLC indicated that while the center served students effectively, it had no charge nor capacity to offer any teaching-learning support to faculty. Follow-up conversations indicated that faculty development was "spotty" at best. As

mentioned earlier in the report, faculty were provided with minimal professional development funds and other forms of remuneration for getting published, but actual workshops, learning communities, or other forms of faculty development seemed to be lacking. The team recognized that PUC's small community and fiscal challenges may have created ambiguity around the need for such resourcing, but giving faculty the opportunity to learn and engage best practices in teaching would likely support recruitment and retention (of both students and faculty). Therefore, the team recommended that PUC demonstrate its commitment to its personnel and to continuous improvement by providing structured professional development programs for faculty and staff. (CFR 3.3)

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

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

Notable improvements had occurred since the last WSCUC visit, with respect to the resources and capacity to support quality assurance processes. IRAP had been formed, under the leadership of the same director. The institutional research function essentially existed as a distributed model, with significant contributions from colleagues within the academic dean's area. The director reported to the president, while another individual, reporting to the VP for Academic Administration, served as the Associate Director for IRAP, Associate Academic Dean, Assessment Coordinator for Core Competencies, and Registrar. The administrative assistant to the Associate Academic Dean also provided crucial research support by coordinating assessment, student surveys, and course evaluations. Collectively, the three ensured that PUC met all

mandated reporting requirements, monitored progress on key performance indicators, assessed ISLOs, and supported data-informed decision making for academic departments, campus services, and administrators. Occasionally, student interns had provided assistance on special projects, temporarily augmenting institutional research capacity. (CFRs 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4)

Although these individuals carried a rather daunting workload, PUC had provided opportunities for professional development to help them learn and apply the latest skills and knowledge. The director often attended the annual meetings of the California Association for Institutional Research (CAIR) and had received support to complete an online certificate program recognized by the Association for Institutional Research (AIR). The director and associate director had also attended relevant WSCUC conferences and workshops. (CFR 3.3)

During conversations with team members, the staff acknowledged that while the IR capacity at PUC had improved, other institutions were already leveraging benefits from investments in technology infrastructure, data warehouses, and software to provide data visualization and analytic tools. Ever-changing mandatory reporting requirements were taking more than half of the director's time. Increasing costs for some statistical software licenses had necessitated a shift to low cost tools, including Microsoft Excel. Deeply aware of the financial crisis facing the college, PUC researchers were reluctant to advocate for the most basic professional tools. The team suggested that PUC assess the existing resources available within the office, consider them against the need for actionable data, and seek viable enhancements as appropriate. (CFR 4.2)

As part of building a culture of continuous improvement, the team was interested in the strategic planning process and its evolution since the action letter from the Interim Report Committee panel. In its report, the college indicated that strategic planning had started under the leadership of the former president, and that the Credo organization had been retained to lead the strategic planning process. The planning process was slowed by changes in administration, but the strategic planning committee continued to meet and focused on creating a tentative vision statement with four subcommittees that were appointed to address four themes. (CFR 4.6)

The selection of a new president led to a decision to wait for his arrival in July 2017 to continue work on the new plan. During its visit, the team learned that the strategic planning process was reopened by the new president and significant progress had been made. That progress was confirmed at meetings across the campus and in a meeting with the board. The team confirmed that input was sought from faculty, staff, students, and trustees through a series of open meetings with the president. (CFRs 4.3 and 4.6)

At the time of the visit, the college had articulated the four pillars of the strategic plan which included: Our Students; Our People and Place; Our Story; Our Relationships. Each of the four pillars identified the key components of stakeholders, financial resources necessary for implementation, internal processes required for implementation, and the objectives of the recommended actions. The recommended actions included such key issues as increasing enrollment, increasing retention, increasing graduation rates, maintaining a balanced annual operating budget, and increasing the percentage of alumni donors for campus projects. The team confirmed that progress on the strategic plan was continuing and the final plan was scheduled to

begin implementation in the summer of 2018. (CFR 4.6) In a meeting with the board, the team found trustees conversant with the planning process and the elements of the plan, and the trustees expressed their support. The team commended PUC on its progress with development of the strategic plan and indicated that moving forward with the implementation of the strategic plan was an important step in moving the college to a trajectory that will enable long-term sustainability. (CFRs 4.6, 3.4 and 3.9)

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

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Through its institutional report, and in conversation with team members at the visit, PUC demonstrated that it was keenly aware of its challenges and had plans in place to address them, many of which are described in this report.

PUC's size, specificity in mission, and challenges with utilizing the land created a challenging scenario, but PUC's new leadership had brought a sense of optimism for the future. As the college looks to the future, key components to its sustainability will be the successful implementation of the strategic plan, particularly emphasizing strategies to build enrollment, retain students, balance its budget, and increase sources of revenue. At the time of the visit, the team found a college actively engaged in creating the strategic plan, implementing the turn-around plan, and pursuing new strategies to best utilize its sizeable land holdings. The team commended the college for its proactive approach. Continued pursuit of these strategies over the next five years will be essential to the long-term sustainability of the college. (CFR 3.4 and 4.6)

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After thorough review of PUC’s materials and substantive conversation with its constituents, the team offered the following commendations and recommendations:

Commendations

The team commended PUC for

1. its candor, transparency, and responsiveness to the challenging issues facing the institution.
2. its commitment to its mission and purpose.
3. a clear strategic planning process that invited multiple constituent voices and seeks to address the most pressing issues facing the institution.
4. its commitment to improving campus morale through improved lines of communication and by providing venues for multiple voices to be heard.
5. actively engaging the campus community and fostering a culture of collaborative decision-making.

Recommendations

The team made the following recommendations that PUC:

1. build a financially sustainable budget model that will fund both short term and long term goals of the college. (CFR 3.4)
2. develop and implement enrollment management strategies that attract and retain an appropriate number of students for long-term sustainability. (CFR 3.7)
3. expand initial efforts to develop and assess direct evidence to verify that graduates exemplify the behavioral manifestations of the institutional student learning outcomes (WISDOM). (CFR 2.4)
4. develop and implement an institution-wide, regularly-scheduled performance reviews for all staff and administrators. (CFR 3.2)
5. demonstrate its commitment to continuous improvement by providing structured professional development programs for faculty and staff. (CFR 3.3)

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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Where is the policy located? http://www.puc.edu/academics/academic-administration/academic-policies-procedures/credit-hour-policy |
| | 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: Each department is reviewed for compliance with the credit hour policy during the Program Review process every five years. Supplementary syllabus reviews may be conducted at any time at the discretion of the committee. |
| 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: Schedule Link: https://services.puc.edu/courselist/ |
| 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? 3 |
| | What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? both |
| | What degree level(s)? bachelor and masters |
| | What discipline(s)? Nursing, Education |
| | 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: |
| 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? 4 |
| | What kinds of courses? Student teaching, internship, research supervision, lab |
| | What degree level(s)? bachelor, masters |
| | What discipline(s)? Education, Business |
| | 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: |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? 12 |
| | What kinds of programs were reviewed? Associates, Undergraduate, post graduate |
| | What degree level(s)? AS, BA, BS, M.Ed |
| | What discipline(s)? Biology, Communication, Education, Physics and Engineering, Nursing |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: Catalog Link: http://www.puc.edu/academics/general-catalog . Associate degree guidelines: p.35 Baccalaureate degree guidelines: p. 36 Masters degree guidelines: p. 83, 85, 87 |

Review Completed By: Stephanie Juillerat

Date: April 17, 2018

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Material Reviewed | Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate. |
| **Federal regulations | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: Recruitment staff do not use a commissioned-based model. They have flat salaries. |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: http://www.puc.edu/academics/degrees-programs Each guidesheet provides a proposed schedule for its degree program. http://www.puc.edu/admissions/finance http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-finance/expenses-payments http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-finance/net-price-calculator |
| Careers and employment | Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO *see comment below) |
| | Comments: http://www.puc.edu/academics/degrees-programs Each guidesheet provides career information. PUC is just starting to gather this information. They have it in some areas such as Nursing and Visual Arts, but not in all departments. |

*§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: Tammi Jackson

Date: April 23, 2018

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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Information and guidelines for writing and submitting grievances are published in the Student Handbook. |
| | Comments: http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-life/general-information |
| Process(es) / procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | If so, please describe briefly: PUC has official procedures for individuals or groups to file grievances if they believe they have been or are being treated in an unjust or unethical manner, or who believe they have been discriminated against because of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, age, religious belief, sexual orientation, and disability. If informal attempts to settle the issue with faculty members or work supervisors are not sufficient, the formal grievance process can be followed. Students submit grievances to the appropriate teacher, work supervisor, or residence hall, who then submit them to the next higher administrator. Information on specific types of grievances and the guidelines for writing and submitting grievances, are published in the Student Handbook. |
| | If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | Comments: http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-finance/student-complaint-notice http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-finance/student-complaint-process http://www.puc.edu/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/157775/Grievance-policy.pdf |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | If so, where? Records are kept in the individual offices responsible for the type of complaint. For example, academic complaints are housed in the academic administration. http://www.puc.edu/campus-services/student-finance/student-complaint-process |
| | Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| | If so, please describe briefly: This is handled in various administrative areas, as appropriate. |
| | Comments: |

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Heather Brown

Date: April 18, 2018

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 publically available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? http://www.puc.edu/academics/records/transfer-credit http://www.puc.edu/academics/records/testing-credit |
| | 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: The Transfer Credit Policy for Pacific Union College is printed in the college catalogue accessible both as hard copy and on the college website. The criteria are clearly articulated. |

*§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: Stephen Morgan
Date: April 18, 2018

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Pacific Union College
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Tammi Jackson
Date/s of review: April 18, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address
Pacific Union College – Napa Campus
841 Latour Court, Suite C
Napa, CA 94558
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 Napa Campus opened in the Fall 2011 to provide a nursing program to enable licensed vocational nurses (LVN) to work full time while continuing their nursing education (RN and BSN). To ensure that these students have a full Pacific Union College experience at an off-campus site, the program offers a Bridge Course (orientation) that is held on the main campus (Angwin) for two days in mid-November and two days in early December. The program is 18 month in duration to obtain a RN and consist of three 17-week sessions extended over 18-month. Theory is taught during three core weeks; core weeks are four consecutive 8-hour days (normally on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday) evenly spaced throughout the 17-week session. There are 12-hour clinical labs are scheduled on non-core week Sundays during the session. The maximum class size is 18. The LVN-RN-BSN program is taught by full-time nursing faculty.

Acceptance into the LVN to RN program is competitive and based on a combination of academic achievements, admission test results, and personal qualifications. Completion of not less than 16 college quarter hours of nursing cognate and/or general education courses are required prior to orientation. Human Anatomy, Human Physiology and Microbiology are prerequisite to starting nursing classes. Transfer credit of 31 hours is granted from accredited vocational colleges for the first year of traditional AS in Nursing degree courses to applicants who possess a current LVN license or to military Medical Technicians who have passed the Assessment Technology Institute (ATI). LVN Comprehensive exam at a predetermined standardized level set by national norms. The LVN to RN AS in Nursing degree includes 41 hours of major course work taken through PUC. A total of 115 hours minimum are required for the degree (major courses, cognate courses and general education courses).

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

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

- Tour of off-campus location (Napa Campus)
- Met with Debra Wallace (Nursing Director)
- Examined/reviewed: Systematic Plan for Evaluation; Student Learning Outcomes; Program Outcomes Evaluation – NCLEX; minutes from Joint Faculty and Nursing Curriculum Retreat (June 2017); Schedule for Session I: LVN to RN Program (January 28 – May 30, 2018); Clinical Evaluation Tool (Session III Preceptorship – LVN to RN Program); BSN Exit Evaluation

| Lines of Inquiry | Observations and Findings | Follow-up Required (identify the issues) |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p> | <p>N/A</p> | |
| <p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p> | <p>The off-campus site serves licensed vocational nursing (LVN) students who wish to receive either an RN or BSN degree. The mission of the nursing program aligns with the mission of the college: human service, health, wellness and uncompromising integrity.</p> | |
| <p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p> | <p>The off-campus students attend orientation on campus and are assessed in Skills Lab. Off-campus students are aware of student services and resources (library) provided on-campus. These students tour the main campus. Once a session, Financial Services rep meets with each off-campus student to discuss student aid.</p> | |
| <p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p> | <p>There are two classrooms and clinical space for students. The Director of Nursing is present on campus (Napa) during sessions and has an office for meeting students and faculty. The Director offers additional office hours during the 'core' week as well as appointments for students.</p> | |
| <p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p> | <p>The students have access to the intranet while on campus (Napa). Students who request tutoring, Skype is available so that students have face-to-face time with tutors. During the exit interview, questions about student services is asked. On a scale of 0-4.0, the Napa campus scored 3.36 for 2015-2016.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p> | <p>The same Nursing faculty teach at both Angwin and Napa campuses. Faculty are full-time, while adjuncts are used for clinical. In exceptional cases does an adjunct teach a theory class (i.e. obstetrics). Since these are the same faculty for the main campus, they participate in curriculum development, attend faculty and departmental meetings.</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>The nursing faculty designs the programs and courses at the Napa campus. The program and courses are the same in content, outcomes and quality as those on the main campus.</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>For 2014-15, the nursing program at Angwin had 82.5% on-time graduation completion, while the Napa campus had a 94.4% on-time graduation completion rate. While attrition rates at Angwin was 13.8%, Napa campus had an attrition rate of 5.6%.</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>The institution assesses student learning at off-campus site the same as the main campus.</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>One measure of the institution's quality assurance processes is the performance on the NCLEX exam. The nursing program has an ELA that 80% or more of students taking the NCLEX in an academic year will pass on the first attempt. Pacific Union reported 83.6% NCLEX result for 2015-16 (with national average of 86.8%). Both the Board of Registered Nursing and ACEN requires nursing department to report overall NCLEX-RN pass rates. The BRN report pass rates per institution and not differentiated between the campuses.</p> | |