

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

of

Brandman University
Irvine, California

September 30 – October 2, 2013

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Janet L. Holmgren [Chair]
President Emerita, Mills College
Senior Vice President for Strategic Advancement, UniversityNow

Tomoko T. Takahashi [Assistant Chair]
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Soka University of America

Christine Geith
Assistant Provost and Executive Director, MSUglobal
Michigan State University

Stephanie Juillerat
Associate Provost, Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
Azusa Pacific University

Charles Nies
Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
University of California, Merced

Maureen A. Maloney
Vice President, WASC

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC 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 WASC website.

Table of Contents

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	1
A. Description of Institution and Visit	1
B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report.....	3
• Alignment with the Institutional Proposal (IP)	3
• Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report.....	4
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review.....	5
SECTION II: EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS	15
A. Theme One: Attaining Student Success.....	15
1. Scholarship & Creativity in Teaching and Learning	15
2. Program Learning Outcomes & Stakeholders	15
3. General Education Revision	21
4. Effective Advising	23
5. Assessment-Based Decision-Making	24
6. Student Success	29
B. Theme Two: Building an Effective Learning Community through Communication	30
1. Institutional Reflection, Planning and Continuous Improvement	30
2. Communication, Training, and Development	31
C. Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs	32
1. Governance as It Relates to Educational Effectiveness	32
2. Doctor of Education (EdD) in Organizational Leadership.....	33
3. Marketing and Recruitment Practice Review and Student Complaints Review	34
SECTION III: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	35
Appendix A: Off-Campus Site Summary (Roseville).....	40
Appendix B: Off-Campus Site Summary (Ontario).....	43
Appendix C: Off-Campus Site Summary (Palm Desert)	46
Appendix D: Off-Campus Site Summary (Walnut Creek).....	49
Appendix E: Off-Campus Site Summary (Modesto).....	52
Appendix F: Off-Campus Site Summary (San Diego).....	55
Appendix G: Credit Hour Policy Review Report	58
Appendix H: Marketing and Recruitment Practice Review Report.....	59
Appendix I: Student Complaints Review Report	60

SECTION I OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

Brandman University is a private, nonprofit, co-educational institution of higher education offering undergraduate and graduate degrees, credential, and certificate programs, online and blended/hybrid through 26 campuses throughout the states of California and Washington, with its main campus in Irvine, CA. A member of the Chapman University System, Brandman distinguishes itself by focusing on the non-traditional, adult student, while upholding its unique mission “to provide students with a dynamic education based on excellence and flexibility that creates lasting value and relevance for evolving careers.”

Brandman is a Hispanic-serving institution, with 27% of its undergraduates identifying as Hispanic/Latino (2011 IPEDS), as well as a military-friendly institution, with six campuses located on military bases and military students constituting 13.38% of total fall 2011 student enrollments being military students. The typical Brandman undergraduate is between 35 and 39 years of age.

Brandman currently offers one associate degree, 13 bachelor’s degrees, 12 master’s degrees, and two doctoral degrees. These 28 degree programs are offered in arts and sciences, business, education, and health. The university serves a total headcount of 3,523 undergraduate students (2,559 FTE) and 3,125 graduate students (2,524 FTE), according to the fall 2012 data.¹

According to the fall 2012 data, Brandman’s faculty consists of 70 full-time and 554 part-time,

¹ There has been an overall enrollment decrease of approximately 30% since fall 2010, while there has been a notable increase in undergraduate enrollment, resulting in a 50/50 balance between undergraduate and graduate enrollments — a shift from a graduate-heavy enrollment trend. As reported in the CPR team report, according to the fall 2010 IPEDS data, the institution served a total headcount of 2,897 undergraduate students (2,199 FTE), 254 non-degree students (116 FTE), and 6,849 graduate students (5,060 FTE).

totaling 254 FTE faculty members. These data indicate that the university has an overall student-faculty ratio of 20:1.

Brandman University originally began with the first adult program established by Chapman University at El Toro Marine Air Station in 1958. Initially known as the “Residence Education Center Program” and later named “Chapman University College,” the program served Marine Air Station military personnel. Over time additional campuses were established on other installations, and more programs were added in order to meet the educational needs of military personnel as well as those of non-military adult learners. In 2006, Chapman University College began the process of becoming a separate entity of Chapman University, and WASC approved the structural change that it become a separately accreditable unit and operationally distinct from the Orange campus of Chapman University, effective June 1, 2008. In September 2009, with a significant naming gift, the institution’s name was changed to “Brandman University.”

Since it became Brandman University, the institution has added several more programs. In January 2010, it began offering new fully online and blended undergraduate and graduate degrees in business, and a blended graduate degree in public administration. In August 2010, the university started its first doctoral program, Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP), and in January 2011, it initiated a Bachelor of Science in Nursing program. In July 2011, WASC approved Brandman’s second doctoral program, Doctor of Education (EdD) in Organizational Leadership, which was initiated in August 2012 as planned. In December 2011, WASC also approved Brandman’s proposal to enter into a new joint venture with Ameritas Educational Services for the formation of “Ameritas College,” a four-year college program to serve Spanish-speaking students. After launching the program in August 2012, the institution revised its plan based on the insights gained from the first cohort of students enrolled. Consequently, effective fall 2013, Ameritas College has transformed into a shorter (one-year, 30-credit) dual-language English-

immersion program, named “Ameritas Hispanic Pathways,” in which students receive bilingual instruction to be able to transition into regular Brandman classes to obtain an Associate of Arts (AA) degree. In March 2013, WASC approved the expedited proposal for the Bachelor of Arts in Social Work (online) to be offered in fall 2013.

Brandman University is seeking Reaffirmation of Accreditation. Toward this end, it produced the required Institutional Proposal (accepted in May 2010) and subsequently submitted the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report in preparation for the CPR site visit, which took place March 21–23, 2012. In July 2013, the institution submitted the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) report in preparation for the EER site visit, which took place September 30 – October 2, 2013. The EER visit was conducted at the main campus in Irvine, CA. The EER team also visited a total of six off-campus sites (out of the 26 sites that Brandman currently operates) prior to and during the EER visit — see Appendices A–F for off-campus site reviews.

B. The Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

- Alignment with the Institutional Proposal (IP)

The EER report submitted in preparation for the fall 2013 visit was found to be well aligned with the goals proposed in the Institutional Proposal (IP). The visiting team also found the report well prepared and organized, clearly written, and easily readable.

Brandman has chosen a theme-based approach for its reviews with the following two themes as the intended outcomes of the IP: (1) attaining student success; and (2) building an effective learning community through communication. The two themes identified and addressed are relevant, and the research questions are of importance to the newly structured institution with its unique program mix, delivery model, distributed campus system, and adult-learner student population.

• Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

Overall, the EER report adequately portrays the condition of the institution and the assessment process it has undertaken for the EER, demonstrating a diverse spectrum of substantive engagement with the key issues for a direct impact on improvement in faculty, student, course, program, and university outcomes. The information provided by the institution prior to and during the EER visit and the observations obtained on site helped the visiting team understand the progress the institution has made since the CPR.

Similar to the CPR visit, the EER team was welcomed by a cooperative and enthusiastic community, and the review was conducted with rigor and openness. Representatives of the campus leadership and community interacted and communicated with the visiting team in a candid manner (CFR 1.9). The administrators, faculty, staff, students, and alumni whom the team met demonstrated a sincere commitment to the mission and goals of the university (CFRs 1.1, 1.2). Since Brandman is still a relatively new institution with a diversified portfolio of traditional, blended, online, and offsite educational delivery, the EER team focused its attention on the development of curriculum improvement as well as student and faculty engagement in all venues, while conducting onsite reviews and interviews geared toward the verification of actual engagement (CFRs 4.1, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8).

The team commends the Brandman University community for its engagement in the accreditation process and the amount of time and effort it has invested in the process. The team would also like to express its appreciation to the Brandman community for the openness with which they responded to questions and the provision of additional materials as requested as well as for their effort in making the site visit well organized and hospitable.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

Four areas were specified by WASC in its action letter dated July 3, 2012: (1) faculty workload and engagement; (2) consolidating growth; (3) developing student services; and (4) preparing for the EER. These areas (except for [4], which is the main focus of the EER report itself) are addressed in great detail with specific attention to each of the recommendations in the institution's EER report section entitled "WASC Action Letter Emphasis Areas for Continued Attention and Development" (pages 8–21), which also addresses "Credit Hour Policy" and "Student Authentication" as additional recommendations provided by the CPR team. With a clear set of strategic plans to address the recommendations, Brandman has made notable progress since the CPR, as reflected in its EER report. The team commends Brandman University for having been responsive to the recommendations of the CPR.

During the EER visit, the team followed up on the written report with in-person validation from the various constituencies impacted — faculty, staff, students, and alumni — as to the effectiveness of the institution's efforts in all areas.

(1) Faculty Workload, Engagement & Development

The CPR team recommended that the university leadership and faculty collaborate to review the workload for full-time faculty and associate deans, given the significant number of faculty-driven initiatives Brandman was taking on (CFRs 3.1, 3.3, 3.4). The team also recommended that the institution look for ways of valuing and honoring the work of adjuncts (CFRs 3.2, 3.3).

In response, Brandman investigated its FTE student-to-faculty ratios and the faculty workload, while collecting data on satisfaction levels with the same. In its analysis of student-to-faculty ratios, Brandman — currently operating 26 off-campus sites — reports university-wide ratios, rather than disaggregating by site. This global analysis provides a favorable analysis, indi-

cating that Brandman is well below the average of its peer institutions. Although logistically difficult, a site-specific analysis of student-to-faculty ratios would be enlightening and should be considered as part of its future analytics (CFRs 3.1, 4.4).

Brandman reports high levels of satisfaction from a faculty survey with teaching loads and support. Additionally, the institution's engagement in a comprehensive analysis of workload resulted in positive changes. Based on the institution's EER report, full-time faculty formerly taught 24 credit hours and engaged in advising, service, and administrative work that required at least 16 office hours across four days each week. Brandman modified its expectations for faculty workload to include 18-24 credit hours of teaching, student and adjunct mentoring, and service to the community. Reassigned time has been given for course and program development, mentoring, and special projects. The faculty and academic leaders interviewed during the EER visit confirmed the use of reassigned time for accreditation, assessment, mentoring, and special projects, which they viewed as a positive development (CFR 3.3).

Additionally, faculty reported that the new advising model reduced the time required for scheduling courses with students. Faculty noted the increased support from instructional designers, which reduces time on task for course-shell management. However, faculty still reported concerns with workload and innovation fatigue. Specifically, in face-to-face meetings, faculty claimed that they still had significant responsibilities for adjunct development, course oversight, annual assessment, and other initiatives that take time: i.e., references to "innovation fatigue" remain common among the faculty — see "(2) Consolidating Growth" below (pages 8–9). While faculty appreciated the opportunity to fully engage with the academic and curricular components of the institution, the university may still be moving at a pace that is not sustainable (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

In addition to re-allocation of faculty time, associate deans' workloads were evaluated. In conversations at the time of the visit, deans indicated that they were able to secure more associate-dean positions, as well as allocate dedicated release for supervisory roles (CFRs 3.1, 3.3).

While expectations for faculty productivity are high, Brandman continues to excel in the area of educational development and resourcing (CFR 3.4). The Center for Instructional Innovation (CII) has adopted a new employment model where instructional designers are full-time staff members with 60% of their time assigned to schools, rather than faculty with dual status. Based on conversation with CII staff, the team found that this model translates into better support for programs. Conversations with full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and faculty at off-campus sites all confirmed the availability of support and training opportunities out of the CII. Faculty who are new to Brandman receive significant orienting to online instruction through mandatory training and orientation (CFR 3.4). The CII utilizes anecdotal feedback systems and levels of faculty activity to determine its effectiveness at resourcing faculty. The visiting team recommends that the CII engage in a process of review to determine whether the methods of faculty training and resourcing result in a more effective educational experience for students (CFR 4.4).

Brandman has also made positive advances in its specific resourcing and development of adjunct faculty (CFR 3.4). The institution reports the availability of faculty development funds up to \$600 for adjunct faculty who meet six criteria. When this funding option was explored during the visit, the team discovered that the monies had yet to be distributed because of some logistical issues. There is excitement and hope for this new level of support, but the target has not yet been achieved.

In terms of adjunct faculty engagement in curriculum design and assessment, conversations with adjunct faculty provided strong verification that adjuncts have a close connection to full-time faculty acting as course custodians, who also serve as mentors (CFRs 3.2, 3.4). Ad-

juncts at the main campus, as well as those at off-campus sites, reported that they felt empowered to provide feedback on the courses they teach and reported, to varying degrees, that they are invited into conversations about assessment data and program review (CFR 4.7). Despite the institution's assertion that "a significant number of adjunct faculty are engaged in assessment activities at Brandman" (page 13, 2013 Brandman EER report), however, conversations with adjunct faculty at off-campus sites indicated that the majority of them were engaged only in the utilization of rubrics to assess signature assignments. Results from the adjunct faculty survey suggest that online adjuncts feel more connected to assessment activities than adjuncts teaching in a blended environment. Interviews during the visit confirmed these survey results. Additionally, the team found that adjuncts teaching at an off-campus site where a full-time faculty member is present felt more connected and included in the curricular processes (CFR 4.7). In onsite conversations with faculty about assessment and program review, the full-time faculty reported that they make significant efforts to include their adjuncts, but because the adjuncts engage on a voluntary basis, there are varying levels of participation.

Because of the significant role that adjunct faculty members play in enacting educational quality, they should be supported in their responsibility to engage in reflection and analysis at multiple levels in the institution. The visiting team recommends that Brandman continue to find ways to systematize the engagement of adjunct faculty in decision-making about program and institutional effectiveness (CFRs 3.2, 4.7, 4.8).

(2) Consolidating Growth

Recognizing that Brandman underwent a period of intense growth and re-invention since its separation from Chapman University, the CPR team detected the beginning of "innovation fatigue." It thus expected that the university's gains be consolidated and embedded into its infrastructure (CFR 4.1, 4.2).

In response, Brandman states in its EER report that although the university continues to be responsive to the ever-changing environment of higher education with new initiatives designed to respond to significant threats and opportunities (e.g., competency-based education), the pace of change has slowed down with the recently completed transformation of the institution's infrastructure and processes, reduction of the program development pipeline, and reduction of the backlog of blended and online courses scheduled for development or revision. During the EER visit, the team found that references to "innovation fatigue" still remain common among the faculty. As noted above (page 6), while faculty appreciated the opportunity to fully engage with the academic and curricular components of the institution, the university may still be moving at a pace that presents a challenge for sustaining academic engagement and quality (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

While commending Brandman's innovativeness and responsiveness to the needs of adult learners, the EER team recommends that the pace of growth, particularly in newly developed programs, be balanced with the ability to measure effectiveness and quality. Institutional financial sustainability requires careful attention to long range planning, enhanced marketing, and focused attention to educational quality. This is particularly true for programs that are too new to have students who have completed their academic degrees. Because Brandman expects to grow significantly online through competency based learning, it is particularly important that the university continue to monitor the educational and financial viability of its multiple off-campus programs, only six of which were visited by the team (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

(3) Developing Student Support Services

The CPR team recommended an assessment of need in the area of student support services — e.g., professional development activities, student organizations that promote their career development, and the development of stronger learning communities among students (CFR 1.5, 2.11, 2.13, 4.6).

In response, within the last year (since the spring 2012 CPR), Brandman has launched career services, student organizations, and an alumni advisory board. While the career services activities are the most developed, all are still early in their development but present great opportunities for ongoing measurement of student success (CFRs 2.11, 2.13). All three programs have either implemented or have explored online software that helps track student and alumni activities. Paying attention to the compatibility of these programs with the campus student information system will allow for data collection and more evidence of student success (CFR 4.6). Additionally, the opportunity to create these services as truly co-curricular, linking these out-of-class opportunities with the applied focus of the institution's educational efforts, competency-based learning, and the vast network represented by community partners, and adjunct faculty will only enhance the potential of these programs.

Brandman's development of the One Stop Student Services for students around admission, financial aid, and enrollment has proven effective in supporting students. While the back of the house processes are centralized at the main campus, the on-ground delivery of services at the off-campus sites allows students to build a relationship with support staff, which advances the institution's commitment to quality student experiences marked by sound customer-service practices. The cross training of the staff members to respond to the wide array of student questions prevents the student from being passed around from staff to staff while also ensuring continuity in messaging. The staff feel empowered to respond to student questions and problem-solve with the student on the ground without creating the sense of student issues being lost or being blamed on central operations. Feedback and data collected from students confirm that the service has met student needs and expectations.

The team found the addition of disability services to the student advising to be important. The opportunity for Brandman to manage their own responses to disability accommodations will

help its student population better achieve success, not to mention compliance with state and federal laws. It is only a year old, but the opportunity to track students and create an aggregate report on their accomplishments will help the institution communicate its responsiveness to student needs. With the focused recruitment of military veterans, current national data trends show that many students from this population arrive in the classroom with the need for disability accommodations. The development of this service needs to synchronize with the institution's recruitment efforts for this student population. The awareness, training, and support that disability services can provide for the faculty will increase their effectiveness in helping students succeed in this online and blended environment, especially when few have the knowledge on how to respond to learning disabilities, autism spectrum disorders, or mental health diagnoses.

(4) Credit Hour Policy

The CPR team recommended that Brandman work to fully implement responsibility and a process of review, revision and time tracking if necessary that provides evidence that courses comply with the Brandman credit hour policy (CFRs 2.3, 3.5).

Brandman University offers a total of 28 degree programs (excluding credential, certificates, and individual emphasis areas within a degree program). Of the 28, three of the degree programs require internships, practicum, and/or clinical experiences. Twenty-two of the degree programs are offered fully online. The university offers a total of 552 graduate and undergraduate courses (excluding student teaching, internships, practicum, and clinical courses): 81% of these are currently offered both in an online and in a blended format; 4% are blended only; and 15% are online only.

The visiting team reviewed the "Brandman University Policy on Credit Hour" (adopted January 2012) and found it consistent with the WASC credit hour policy. For example, for a blended three-credit semester course over an eight-week semester, Brandman requires three

hours of scheduled face-to-face meetings and 2.5 hours of online engagement each week. An online three-credit semester course requires 5.25 hours of engagement each week.

During the EER visit, class schedules for two of Brandman's campus sites were reviewed. The team found that on-ground meeting days and times for offerings in a blended format complied with the WASC credit hour policy. Twelve syllabi were also reviewed — three in each of the four types of courses that do not meet for the standard amount of in-class seat time (blended, clinical, student teaching/fieldwork, internship/practicum). They included eight graduate courses and four undergraduate courses across seven disciplines. All those reviewed were found to be compliant with the WASC credit hour policy — see Appendix G for credit hour review.

Several other items indicate that processes are in place to assure compliance with the WASC credit hour policy. For example, the “Contract for Part-time Faculty Appointment, Full-time Overload, and Administrator Part-time Teaching” stipulates the expected hours of engagement for blended and online courses. The expected hours of engagement and independent work are also evident as a standard phrase in the “Student Registration Landing Page” for both online and blended courses.

For course design, the “iDEAL Credit Hour Accountability Form” lists the hours a student is expected to spend each week on synchronous communication, asynchronous communication, and independent work. One of the schools uses an “Assurance of Learning Form,” which provides a description of activities each week and estimated engagement time for each, such as discussion board, wiki, commenting on classmates' presentations, class lecture, textbook readings, and viewing supplementary online resources. Brandman has instituted the “IQ Tool” for instructional designers and faculty course owners, which includes instructional time elements. According to the Director for the Center for Instructional Innovation, IQ Tools are completed for approximately 60% of the courses.

Brandman does not have a formal review of intended time in course activities and actual time spent by students in these activities. Program assessment reports (every two years) and program review (every six years) inquire about academic rigor but they do not ask about time. The “Course Feedback Survey Tool for Faculty” does ask a number of questions about the percentage of time students spend in various activities such as writing, presentations, and discussions. The course “Student Opinion Survey,” however, does not ask students any questions related to the time spent on various course activities.

To ensure compliance with federal policy, the team recommends that Brandman close the loop with their credit hour policy and consider instituting a periodic audit to ensure course time estimates in the course design process, recorded in instruments such as the IQ Tool, be regularly compared with actual student time spent engaged with the course. The results of the audit should then be used to inform course improvements. Faculty and instructional designers report that this process occurs as a natural part of their continuous improvement dialog, but it is not a formal, periodic process as part of program review.

(5) Student Authentication

The CPR team recommended that Brandman provide evidence of compliance with the federal requirement that student identity is assured (CFR 1.7).

Brandman currently has 22 of its 28 degree programs online, as well as 96% of its lecture courses. The university is instituting procedures consistent with the widely-recognized best practices for academic integrity published in “Best Practice Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity in Online Education” (Version 2.0, June 2009 by UTTC, WCET, and ITC). These include the “Brandman Academic Integrity Policy,” the hiring of a new quality assurance position in the Center for Instructional Innovation, and tests of a number of software solutions to assure student identity.

Brandman's approach promotes a culture of academic integrity as well as policing using the three authentication approaches stipulated in current federal guidelines: (1) secure credentialing/login and password; (2) proctoring; and (3) technology authentication systems. The university has experimented with different software solutions and is currently piloting Remote Proctor Now in two courses with plans to roll this solution out to all courses in spring 2014. In addition, students in the Schools of Education and Nursing & Health Professions are required to take high-stake exams and demonstrate competency in key areas through simulations and presentations during face-to-face immersions sessions.

To ensure compliance with federal policy, the team recommends that Brandman imbed student authentication interventions as an explicit component in the course design process and that data on the effectiveness of the interventions be part of formal, periodic course and program review processes.

SECTION II

EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Theme One: Attaining Student Success

1. Scholarship & Creativity in Teaching and Learning

Brandman continues to be pioneers in the innovation of teaching and learning. As identified in the Brandman University Scholarship Statement, “[t]he primary demonstration of scholarship at Brandman University is teaching informed by an application-focused manner that affords the integration of best practices with the newest theories and ideals within each discipline.” As such, scholarship continues to be explored primarily within the context of teaching, although traditional scholarship is valued in the faculty promotion process (CFR 2.8).

As part of its continuing commitment to scholarship, faculty development funds for full-time faculty have been increased to \$1,200 per faculty, with the potential to receive \$2,000 if presenting at a conference. Additionally, scholarly collaboration between full-time and adjunct faculty is fostered by providing up to \$600 for adjunct professional development monies — see discussion above (page 7). This model seems to fit within the mission and vision of Brandman, and faculty are resourced appropriately to be innovative educators (CFRs 2.8, 3.4).

2. Program Learning Outcomes & Stakeholders

Development of Course and Program Learning Outcomes: Brandman has continued its commitment to the development of high-quality programs and courses that have clear, integrated, and aligned outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.7). In materials provided by the institution, as well as in conversations with multiple groups, the team found substantial evidence that Brandman engages in a thoughtful, cohesive, and well-designed process of curriculum design and subsequent analysis of student learning (CFR 4.7).

One of Brandman’s major initiatives on course development and delivery was to convert all curricula into a blended and/or fully online environment. The visiting team engaged in multiple conversations with students, faculty, and administrators to explore the rationale for this initiative as well as the communication process utilized to acclimate students and faculty to a new delivery system. Conversations confirmed that the decision to move to blended learning was grounded in research and best practice and was generally viewed positively by students, faculty, and administration. As would be expected, however, the initial stages of conversion were reported as “rocky,” with students and faculty experiencing difficulty with technologies and new pedagogical strategies. Conversations with students, faculty, and administrators during the visit confirmed that blended courses are enjoyable and produce high-quality learning, although issues of academic freedom and flexibility to innovate remain unresolved (CFR 1.4) — see discussion below.

As part of the commitment to high-quality courses that ensure student learning, all courses at Brandman have common “shells” that are utilized by faculty. The use of a common shell has produced both advantages and disadvantages for educational effectiveness. During the visit, students and some adjuncts indicated that instructors are constrained by the adoption of a standardized shell. Some students indicated that instructors report not having the flexibility to change elements of a course, thereby producing a negative assessment from students. Conversations with adjunct faculty during the visit confirmed some element of confusion as to what can be changed and what must remain in a consistent format. Full-time core faculty also indicated that explorations should be made into what elements of academic freedom can exist within the framework of a common shell (CFR 1.4).

An additional element of student learning that has emerged from the move to blended courses is the use of common signature assignments. Core faculty on curriculum teams have de-

veloped signature assignments with rubrics that are embedded in courses and utilized by all faculty who teach the course. The instructor of record assesses the student work with the rubric. Data are collected, disaggregated by site, and disseminated back to core faculty to assess student progress on learning outcomes (CFR 2.10). Conversations with students and adjuncts confirmed that both groups had a good understanding of the role of signature assignments in the overall learning of the student. Feedback from students indicated that signature assignments are “authentic” and valuable.

The team commends Brandman for the development of signature assignments with rubrics that measure student learning and for the level of faculty involvement in the development and continued improvement of these assessments (CFRs 2.3, 2.4).

An issue that Brandman has identified as an important next step in the assessment of student learning is the calibration of assessment rubrics (CFR 4.4). Some programs and schools are moving in the direction of calibration, but the team recommends that Brandman ensure that assessment rubrics in all programs are calibrated through the establishment of inter-rater reliability, so that confidence may be ensured when individual faculty submit assessment data. Conversely, faculty may consider using a model where a sample of student work is reviewed by multiple faculty members to render accurate judgments about student learning and curricular effectiveness.

Student Expectations, Engagement, and Learning: The visiting team found student engagement in the learning process to be significant and genuine (CFRs 2.4, 2.5). Students seemed to be actively engaged and invested in their learning and to take seriously the responsibility of providing feedback about the quality of education they are receiving (CFR 2.5). Conversations with students at all sites indicated a strong commitment by staff members, faculty advisors, and course instructors to respond to student needs that arise (CFR 2.12). “Student Opinion Survey” data also indicate high levels of satisfaction in multiple areas that impact the quality of learning

(CFR 2.13). The ability to disaggregate data by site is helpful in identifying unique student needs that may arise. Competition for “high student ratings” across sites may contribute to esprit de corps; however, the possibility of coercion or undue pressure to achieve high survey results may create an unnecessary level of stress in an environment where a commitment to student excellence is evident.

Brandman continues to embody best practices in building a culture of assessment with its students (CFRs 2.10, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6). One note of caution from conversations with students is the potential for “survey fatigue.” Students are grateful for opportunities to provide feedback, but the carousel of surveys can be perceived as burdensome. An area for future consideration is the lengthy course evaluation tool that is administered in every class across every term. While faculty effectiveness data are most likely necessary due to the one-year contract system, evaluations of the course shell and course content may be assessed differently and less regularly.

Program Assessment: Brandman continues to be exemplary in their collection of assessment data (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4). As stated above, the use of standardized signature assignments with rubrics enables the university to collect and disaggregate data for decision-making related to the achievement of program learning outcomes (CFR 4.3). Program assessment reports are produced by the Assessment Office and read biannually by the full-time and adjunct faculty in the program. After review of the program assessment data, faculty produce an action plan to address issues that will positively impact student learning (CFRs 3.11, 4.6). Conversations with faculty and academic administration during the visit confirmed the value of this process to maintain educational quality. While some program representatives indicated that the cycle is ambitious and more time to reflect on the data would be desired, other programs with professional accreditation found value in the assessment cycle.

When the visiting team explored adjunct faculty involvement with the program assessment process, responses were mixed. At off-campus sites, adjunct faculty reported that they were not routinely involved in the review of assessment data — also see discussion above (page 6); however, conversations with full-time faculty and adjunct faculty at the main campus in Irvine indicated that adjuncts were routinely involved. As is often the case with a distributed system, differential levels of involvement will arise, and concerted efforts to include adjunct faculty and faculty at off-campus sites is advised.

Program Review: The program review process at Brandman occurs on a six-year cycle and is a more comprehensive review of the program's overall effectiveness. Four programs underwent program review in the time period between the CPR and EER visits. Through a review of the program review reports as well as discussions with faculty who engaged in the program review process, the visiting team found a healthy level of engagement with the significant amount of data provided to faculty (CFRs 2.1, 2.7, 4.3, 4.7). In group meetings during the visit, faculty from each program articulated changes that were made based on a review of the data, several of which were related to alignment of curriculum with learning outcomes. When asked about the value that was added by program review, faculty and deans indicated that the breadth of data collected, the use of external reviewers, and the addition of a qualitative component served as enhancements to the biannual program assessment report.

Explorations of the connection between program review and budget decisions revealed that program review action plans, when based on data, were routinely funded. Faculty and deans found a strong connection between program review recommendations and subsequent funding (CFR 4.3).

The inclusion of a student/alumni voice in the program review process was less evident (CFR 4.8). Because Brandman routinely surveys its students (CFR 2.10), student data are availa-

ble, and faculty report being able to “tap into” the student’s assessment of program effectiveness; however, the inclusion of student analysis at the programmatic level (rather than the course level) may be worth considering. Some programs reported using student focus groups, exit surveys, and alumni feedback, all of which were found to be effective (CFR 2.7).

The level of adjunct faculty involvement in the program review process was mixed (CFRs 4.1, 4.8). Some adjuncts reported a high level of involvement, having been included in virtual meetings with program faculty and in the review of data. Others seemed disconnected from the process. As mentioned above, full-time faculty acknowledged the difficulty associated with “requiring” adjunct involvement when there was no consideration of compensation. It is suggested that discussions continue around the authentic involvement of adjunct and distance faculty in matters of program evaluation. As part of this exploration, the use of more stable technologies to invite outside participation is suggested.

Program review at the co-curricular level was not evident (CFRs 2.11, 4.6). In meetings with various offices, it was clear that data were used to respond to issues of effectiveness, but no systematized process seems to exist for a comprehensive review of non-academic units or other offices, which could include the CII, Office of Assessment, One Stop Student Services, academic advising, and others (CFR 2.11). The benefits of academic program review (external reviewer, more comprehensive data, etc.) would translate into other areas, and the team suggests a move in this direction.

Brandman is to be commended for its commitment to educational quality through the systematic collection of educational effectiveness data and for creating a culture of evidence-based decision-making (CFRs 1.2, 2.7, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7). The use of data for decision-making is evident in the development of curriculum and in the support of student success (CFR 4.5). The program

assessment report and program review process utilize multiple methods of data collection and result in meaningful reflection about student learning (CFR 4.1).

A recommendation to improve this process would be to establish and communicate clearer criteria and benchmarks that represent educational effectiveness (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4). Although data collection and analysis is evident, less evident is an established goal that would represent that sufficient student learning has taken place and that programs are, indeed, effective. Setting benchmarks at both program and institutional levels would be an important step in the assessment process (CFR 4.4).

3. General Education Revision

General Education Curriculum: Brandman University's general education curriculum was originally adopted from Chapman University. In May 2009, Brandman began the process of defining its own general education curriculum led by the General Education Team (GET) chaired by the Dean of the School of Arts & Sciences and comprised of full-time faculty from all four schools, staff from the Office of Institutional Assessment and Planning, and staff from student services. The four-year comprehensive process is summarized in the document "Brandman University General Education Program Revision Summation" (June 2013).

Brandman University's general education program has three components: 42 credits of general education curriculum which make up the AA degree in the College of Arts & Sciences; disciplinary skills foundation courses in each undergraduate major; and five institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). The five ILOs (also called "University Degree Qualifications") are: (1) applied learning; (2) innovation and creativity; (3) civic engagement; (4) global cultures; and (5) integrated learning. The ILOs and their rubrics are based on the Lumina Degree Qualifications Profile (2011), the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Liberal Education

and America's Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes, and the Brandman University mission.

Using the WASC General Education Assessment Rubric, Brandman has developed ILOs with faculty across schools agreeing on common rubrics, common definitions of various levels of mastery, and signature assignments. The ILO alignment with curriculum is highly developed; however, it is lacking in alignment with the co-curriculum as that is just under development at Brandman in the form of student organizations. The assessment plan for the ILOs is also developed with an initial plan to assess each of the ILOs through 2016.

The CPR team commended Brandman for the integration of the five ILOs into all programs at the upper division, using standardized ILO rubrics across all programs (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, 4.4). The process reached a significant milestone in May 2013 with the first round of assessment for the first two of the five ILOs. The assessment of all ILOs is scheduled to be complete by December 2016. The general education curriculum in the AA program is scheduled for program assessment in fall 2013 and fall 2015 with program review in fall 2017.

Brandman is to be commended for its design and successful initial implementation of a formal assessment process for the General Education Degree Qualifications across the university (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, 4.4).

Assurance of Learning: The assessment of general education goals focuses on the five ILOs. The "Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Report: Civic Engagement and Integrated Learning" (spring 2013) provides evidence of a well-organized and comprehensive process across the university's four schools and 12 undergraduate degree programs. Signature assignment rubric data were collected and analyzed. GET members and full-time faculty reviewed data aggregated and disaggregated by degree program. The summation report provides evidence of GET discussion and analysis of the findings and summarizes the major themes resulting from

the conversation. A summary table includes an action plan for each ILO assessed. Closing the loop on the action items is in progress, and results are not yet evident.

The initial assessment for the first two ILOs provides evidence of the GET's evidence-based problem solving, but not of the discussion with the program faculty. Since this is the first time through, the faculty have yet to set a target level of proficiency. Initial findings indicate over 90% of students are proficient or exemplary, which the GET interprets as the need to further refine elements such as the rubrics, the signature assignments, and the grading processes. Subsequent iterations of the ILO assessments will refine the process and provide stronger evidence of student learning.

During discussions with the GET, the visiting team found that the new student alumni association's board of advisors based their key values on the ILOs. This is a strong indicator that the ILOs reflect the Brandman mission and values (CFR 1.1). It was also discussed that Brandman's ILOs provide an important framework for the university in addressing the new WASC initiative to define the meaning of the degree (CFR 1.2). The ILOs have an important role in Brandman University's further development and brand identity.

4. Effective Advising

A hallmark of the institution's student services is its dual advising model, which has demonstrated effectiveness in meeting student learning outcomes regarding the students' understanding of their degree requirements and knowledge of resources to aid in their success (CFR 2.12). The staff involved with advising recognize their role as educators. The annual student advising survey, along with other survey data and students successfully completing their educational plans all serve as evidence that the professional advisors are serving in an effective capacity to support student retention and degree completion (CFR 2.10).

As part of the institution's priorities, there was a commitment to building effective learning communities through communication, particularly as it relates to training and development (CFR 3.4). The successes in this area are very pronounced in the work with the professional academic advisors. Because of the reliance on the advisors to help deliver the customer service commitment to the educational program, the communication mechanisms between faculty, one-stop service specialists, and the deans are critical to ensure the effectiveness of this distributed model. At the off-campus sites visited, the advisors testified to being informed of curricular changes and being heard as they expressed concerns about a student or about a systemic barrier in an academic program. Additionally, the students and alumni unanimously praised the effectiveness of the advising relationship.

5. Assessment-Based Decision-Making

During the EER visit, it was evident in meetings that Brandman has a culture of assessment-based decision-making among its staff and its faculty (CFRs 2.10, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6). Brandman's EER report includes survey results for every student-facing function including courses, career services, alumni, advising, one-stop services, and help desk. To assess faculty satisfaction, the CII surveys each participant in their trainings and their certification program, providing evidence of using those results in decision making to improve their trainings. Adjunct faculty members are also surveyed for their input during the program assessment process. Through site visits at the main campus in Irvine and other off-campus sites, the visiting team found a wide variety of examples of data being used in decisions from improving classes, to improving student advising, and to managing sites. It is evident that data permeates the institution's faculty and staff discussions and decision-making.

Planning: Staff and faculty at the Irvine main campus and the other off-campus sites reported involvement and input in Brandman's annual strategic planning process. The EER report

provides evidence that the planning process is comprehensive and informed by market assessments, SWOT analysis, stakeholder feedback, program reviews, program assessments, the student opinion survey and a wide variety of other survey findings (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.7). The strategic plan was written by the Office of Academic Affairs with input from Deans' Council, faculty leadership, campus directors, administrators, and with final input from the Board of Regents. It was vetted at the mid-August retreat with senior administrators and deans. It was then disseminated for feedback through the senior staff and deans to the faculty and staff, who report providing input on the pipeline of revision to the plan. The institution's EER report and campus visits provide evidence that the strategic plan is the basis for budget planning and that the strategic goals are budget priorities (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

Quality Assurance Processes: Brandman's quality assurance processes combine a wide variety of regular data collection with a schedule of regular meetings for discussion of findings and decision-making within student support functions, sites and programs. Results are evident in the EER documents that quality assurance is built into process for the curriculum and program development and approval processes, course development and revision processes, program review, faculty evaluation, staffing reviews, and student service functions including advising and One-Stop Services (CFR 4.4).

Brandman routinely engages in quality assurance processes with the evaluation of faculty (CFRs. 3.3, 4.4). As it relates to instructional effectiveness, faculty members are evaluated by students in every course, and faculty engagement with the instructional technology is routinely monitored by the deans, via the Center for Instructional Innovation. Faculty advisors are evaluated in the "Student Opinion Survey" and in a survey administered specifically for the advising process. The evaluation of faculty effectiveness as instructors and mentors is thorough.

The evaluation of full-time faculty for continued employment has also been refined (CFR 3.3). Faculty and deans considered triangulated system of annual review to be effective and fair. Faculty interviewed reported a clearer understanding of the criteria being used to assess their effectiveness, and Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) members reported an increased culture of trust when it comes to reporting the activities and service in which faculty are engaging. Additionally, the FPC has recently created a formative peer review process that is being piloted with adjunct faculty and is designed to highlight best practice, as well as encourage areas for professional development (CFR 3.3).

An area of further exploration for Brandman stems from the lack of clarity related to the acquisition of extended contracts and subsequent job security (CFRs 3.2, 3.8). Conversations with faculty during the visit indicated confusion as to what criteria must be met in order to earn a contract that extends beyond one year. Deans also appeared to be using various criteria that may not be standardized across the university. In conversations at the Irvine main campus and at off-campus sites, some faculty reported “concerns” about the lack of job security, even when they are performing well.

The team recommends clarifying the criteria for earning an extended contract, considering not just rank or status, but loyalty, longevity, and, most importantly, performance standards (CFR 3.8). Recognizing that Brandman’s faculty model does not mirror a traditional academic model, the team recommends that the university continue to identify and articulate an academic model that values its faculty, including its adjunct faculty (CFRs 3.3, 3.4). Issues related to faculty workload, criteria for contract longevity and job security, and academic freedom in course design remain areas that need clarification and consistency (CFR 1.4). Given the substantial resources that are invested in faculty through training and support, it would be beneficial to reward the good work of faculty and to ensure that high-performing faculty remain at the institution.

Continuous Improvement: Continuous improvement is clearly part of the culture of Brandman. Numerous examples permeate the EER report and site interviews. For example, CII instructional designers in the schools work closely with course owners on the design and revision of courses. Designers and faculty course owners report frequent conversations about courses during each semester. They consider assignment results, student opinion surveys results, and formal and informal feedback from students and adjunct faculty. Reported changes include tweaking rubrics, changing assessment tools, and changing textbooks. Bigger changes were reported through the program review process such as changes in signature assignments.

Another example of continuous improvement is the annual faculty review process. Faculty reported that this process has improved every year. There is now one form that is used in a transparent way for deans and course owners to give input in a more formative process. Faculty reported that this process now demonstrates trust. It was also reported that the School of Business didn't have to implement the full process in the first year – they modified it. This is another good example of Brandman's flexibility to customize their ever-improving processes to specific needs.

System-wide Data – Strategic Indicators: Brandman's use of data to make decisions is commendable. The extensive use of surveys provides campus leadership with the opportunity to focus on areas for strategic improvement or critical decisions regarding program delivery (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7). The use of data from the "Student Opinion Surveys," the "Student Advising Survey," and the "Student Satisfaction Survey" helps produce the dashboard indicators that are reviewed each session. Staff in marketing, advising, and outreach complete a functional review. The collaborative process allows for institutional response to key areas of focus.

As the university develops strategies for its future, a large focus has been on space utilization, enrollment in blended classes and average class sizes, student-faculty ratios, and retention

rates. This focused analysis has helped the university, for example, develop practices with the cancellation of low-enrollment courses, and move average class size from nine to eleven, and to sixteen. A close monitoring of the data has allowed Brandman to review if the increased class size affects the quality of learning in the classroom, while creating more efficiencies in the use of resources. Low space utilization at some of the Brandman sites has generated exploration of other possible usages, including community partnerships. It has also lead to a strategic initiative of offering courses in partnership with community colleges. The use of shared space at a community college creates more effective space utilization at lower costs of operating an entire building. Simultaneously, it presents Brandman with some unique educational opportunities to work with students at the community college.

Stakeholder Involvement: As evidenced in its EER report, Brandman uses a variety of vehicles to gather evidence of effectiveness from stakeholders (CFR 4.8). In addition to advisory focus groups and stakeholder interviews in the program development process, advisory members provide comments and feedback as an integral part of the program assessment process. Annual alumni surveys, conducted in 2011 and 2012, indicate 90% of respondents agree or strongly agree that they are satisfied with their self-perceived learning outcomes. Results also indicate that online alumni satisfaction is on par with the campus sites.

Through interviews during the EER, the team noted a promising “e-visit day” innovation using virtual meetings to seek feedback from students, faculty, and alumni. The deans schedule a day of meetings using Adobe Connect to seek external reviews for program review. External reviewers are paired with a Brandman person who also participates in the e-visit. They also enable external reviewers to use LiveText e-portfolios to review documents. During the EER visit, faculty reported satisfaction with this process.

6. Student Success

Brandman's commitment to its mission of educating adult learners and providing them with the opportunity to complete their degrees was evident in both site visits and at the main campus (CFRs 1.1, 1.7). The institution measures the success of its students through the review of retention rates, graduation rates, and default rates (CFR 2.7). In the classroom, the use of rubrics to assess program learning outcomes helps measure the student accomplishments related to course material.

The commitment to student success is reflected in the professional development efforts across the institution (CFR 3.4). It is widely recognized that the customer-service focus of Brandman means that staff need to be armed with the resources to respond effectively to student needs. The most widely used resource is information, so the assurance of quality and frequent communication across the university is critical for staff to successfully serve students. The physical layout of the main campus in Irvine allows for an ease of communication between the academic schools, advising, marketing, and student services. Staff and faculty attend national and professional conferences, and training webinars are scheduled regularly. A commitment to benchmarking and innovation in the delivery of programs is evidenced in the on-going development of the CII and IT support. All of this equates with a highly satisfied student population. As the institution looks to grow, diversify its programs offerings, and outreach to targeted population, how it effectively scales its efforts around student success will need intentional planning so that budget and resource allocations continue to support their mission.

The visiting team commends Brandman for its commitment to student success overall, which is evidenced by their responsiveness to student survey feedback and the development of the dual-advising model, One Stop Student Services, Disability Services Center, Office of Career Development, student organizations and the Alumni Advisory Board. The team encourages

Brandman to evaluate the effectiveness of these newly established offices and services as they are only now in the stage of development that separates them from the Chapman University System and are too new for the EER team to evaluate (CFRs 2.11, 4.6).

B. Theme Two: Building an Effective Learning Community through Communication

1. Institutional Reflection, Planning, and Continuous Improvement

Institutional Planning and Assessment: The team found that Brandman has a very efficient structure for conducting its strategic planning and for communicating the planning and assessment information to the university community. The process does seem to rely most heavily on administrative decision-making, although there are opportunities for full-time faculty to inform the process. There does not seem to be involvement of students in the process and little room for participation from the adjunct faculty. The off-campus sites are engaged virtually at a number of points in the process.

Key Performance Indicators: The CPR team noted that Brandman's "Institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPI) indicate strategic priorities, cyclical trends, and issues" (page 22, CPR team report). The current nine KPI focus areas include student enrollment, average overall rating of faculty, average overall student satisfaction, online credit hours as percent of total credit hours, credit hour trends, classroom occupancy, financial results, low-enrolled courses, and enrollment and staffing analysis. In addition, the institution's EER report illustrates a robust dashboard of 11 operational graphs in the "Sample Strategic Indicators Report," including student enrollment, classroom capacity, finances, program revenue and expenses, and student and staffing FTE.

Senior administration and the Board of Regents use student retention, degree completion, and student loan default rates as important indicators of student success. This aligns with national trends. Senior leaders also use other signals of effectiveness including anecdotal student and

faculty experiences; the program review process with its aligned course, program and institutional learning outcomes; and results of the “Student Opinion Survey” given at the end of every class.

The visiting team did not see evidence of what was noted in the CPR team report (page 21): “Among the KPIs are student learning outcomes, the metric for which is still being finalized” (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8). The team recommends that Brandman use its plentiful learning outcome data and culture of assessment among its faculty to develop a KPI representing direct student learning measures. The team believes that Brandman can be a national leader in this regard by developing at least one KPI tied directly to its PLO and ILO data.

2. Communication, Training, and Development

During the visits to the main campus in Irvine and the off-campus sites, the visiting team found that Brandman has a strong and effective culture of distributed communication. Social bonds among faculty are evidently strong at the off-campus sites and within schools distributed across sites. The same is true for staff within their functions across sites. Frequent use of telephone conferencing and synchronous web conferencing is second nature to faculty and staff. In addition, a regular schedule of weekly and monthly virtual meetings and biannual meetings at the main campus in Irvine are evident within the faculty, within schools, and within staff functions. Senior staff members also visit the campus sites on a regular basis. This highly-communicative culture was also noted in the CPR team report (page 27): “Brandman’s culture is highly collaborative with multiple modes of communication evident for formal and informal meetings and communication. Faculty and staff are used to using the campus synchronous communication system (Adobe Connect) as well as connecting with each other by numerous other means – from phones to Facebook.”

The institution reports on a number of investments in training and information systems. These include moving to the Banner system, implementation of a new MyBrandman central portal, introduction of Lynda.com and five to six hours of Brandman-specific standardized training as part of a new six-month on-boarding process. Further staff training is planned. According to the first “April 2013 Communication Training and Development Survey” of staff and full-time faculty, the majority feel informed about Brandman news, are satisfied or very satisfied with the various channels of communication for information dissemination. They are also satisfied with the level of information they receive from their supervisors. Judging by the variety of suggestions for communications and training, the respondents to the survey are engaged and overall very positive with Brandman’s strategies and investments in this critical part of their operations and culture.

C. Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs

1. Governance as It Relates to Educational Effectiveness

In the area of governance as it relates to educational effectiveness, the EER team notes that Brandman's Board of Regents is made up predominantly of representatives of the Chapman University administration and Board of Trustees.

As a member of the Chapman University System, Brandman University is governed by a Board of Regents, the members of which are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees of Chapman University and may be removed and replaced by the Board of Trustees of Chapman University at any time. The President of Chapman University is a regent *ex officio* (with right to vote) of the Board of Regents of Brandman University. Furthermore, Brandman’s bylaws require that at least a majority of the Board of Regents be members of the President’s Cabinet or Board of Governors of Chapman University in addition to also being members of

Chapman University's Board of Trustees. The remaining regents are appointed by Chapman, following a process in which they have been identified, vetted, and recommended by Brandman's Board of Regents.

Given the independent and separately accredited institutional identity of Brandman, the team strongly recommends that Brandman increase the number of its Board of Regents who are not dual appointments to Chapman's administration and Board, and the team further recommends that Brandman's CEO (chancellor) be represented *ex officio* on the Board of Regents (CFR 3.8, 3.9).

2. Doctor of Education (EdD) in Organizational Leadership

The visiting team paid special attention to the Doctor of Education (EdD) in Organizational Leadership, which was initiated in fall 2012. The team found the plan for the degree to be well thought out and executed with coursework that engaged and supported the dissertation level work of a transformational change project (CFR 2.2b). The School of Education faculty and staff are strong at Brandman and deeply committed to this innovative degree that serves the institution's core mission (CFR 1.1). The handbook and other materials are well developed (CFR 1.7), and the student body comes from a cross section of society, including teachers, law enforcement officers, community college staff, and organizational consultants (CFR 1.5). The number of applicants was strong. Since initial enrollments in 2012 and 2013 were larger than expected — 130 and 112, respectively — the team strongly recommends that Brandman monitor the growth of this program as students in its first cohort approach the completion of their degrees, and that the faculty and staff manage those who are engaged in the transformational project as well as the students engaged in coursework, webinars, and the six immersions over the first two years (CFR 4.4). The team also suggests the continuing assessment of the mentors who work with the students on their transformational change projects.

3. Marketing and Recruitment Practice Review and Student Complaints Review

Brandman's marketing includes a three-fold effort: (1) finding avenues to share their story (data) in front of the right customer; (2) organic marketing efforts using local news sources; and (3) the Brandman Hub (social media efforts). The institution makes information sharing transparent, and there is credibility and consistency in the messaging (CFR 1.2); however, no clear strategic marketing plan was shared. Brandman has relied on word-of-mouth or social media referrals. As it looks to its strategic growth, developing targeted outreach efforts to attract that student population will be critical to assist the institution's efforts to diversify its educational programs. Connecting marketing efforts with a long-range enrollment plan will allow for opportunities to measure effectiveness. Understanding the regional influences on a marketing campaign in rural Washington, compared to San Francisco Bay area, for example, should also influence an overall marketing plan. As an institution reliant on tuition, how marketing helps meet enrollment goals will be crucial for the long-term sustainability of the university. (See Appendix H for marketing and recruitment practice review.)

Student Complaint Review Report is attached as Appendix I.

SECTION III

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The EER visiting team is pleased to have had this time with the Brandman community. It appreciates the institution's thoroughness of the preparation and the institutional care in connecting the two parts of the comprehensive review. The team learned much from the institution and its well-prepared materials. The team also learned from and appreciated the thoroughness of preparation from the six off-campus sites it reviewed in addition to conducting the EER at the main campus in Irvine.

The following are several key findings that are the underpinnings of EER team's commendations and recommendations.

Key Findings

The visiting team found Brandman University:

- To be highly responsive to the recommendations of the CPR and engaged in the accreditation process.
- To be a thriving, engaged, and forward looking university community willing to take risks in developing new programs, adopt new systems, invest in new modes of educational delivery, and adjust to changing external factors, ranging from the demand for new programs to economic constraints facing all of higher education and society.
- To be a community that has shared values focused on student success and academic quality across a wide variety of sites and programs.
- To be a university firmly rooted in a "culture of evidence" where members of the community value rubrics, measurable goals, and solid information on which to chart its future.

- To have innovative programming in response to the emerging needs of adult learners.

In light of these findings, the visiting team cites the following commendations.

Commendations

1. The visiting team commends Brandman for its engagement in the accreditation process and the amount of time and effort it has invested in the process and for having been responsive to the recommendations of the CPR. The team appreciates very much the openness and responsiveness it encountered as it engaged in meetings and reviewed and requested materials.
2. The team commends Brandman for its commitment to educational quality through the systematic collection of educational effectiveness data and for creating a culture of evidence-based decision-making (CFRs 1.2, 2.7, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7). The use of data for decision-making is evident in the development of curriculum and in the support of student success (CFR 4.5). The program assessment report and program review process utilizes multiple methods of data collection resulting in meaningful reflection about student learning (CFR 4.1).
3. The team commends Brandman for its commitment for student success overall, which is evidenced by their responsiveness to student survey feedback and the development of the dual-advising model, One Stop Student Services, Disability Services Center, Office of Career Development, student organizations and the Alumni Advisory Board. The visiting team encourages Brandman to evaluate the effectiveness of these newly established offices and services as they are only now in the stage of de-

velopment that separates them from the Chapman University System and too new for the EER team to evaluate (CFRs 2.11, 4.6).

4. The visiting team commends Brandman for the integration of the five ILOs into all programs at the upper division, using standardized ILO rubrics across all programs (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, 4.4). The visiting team commends Brandman for its design and successful initial implementation of a formal assessment process for the General Education Degree Qualifications across the university (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, 4.4).
5. The visiting team commends Brandman for the development of signature assignments with rubrics that measure student learning and for the level of faculty involvement in the development and continued improvement of these assessments (CFRs 2.3, 2.4).
6. The team commends Brandman's innovativeness and responsiveness to the emerging needs of adult learners.

The team makes the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Recognizing that Brandman's faculty model does not mirror a traditional academic model, the team recommends that the university continue to identify and articulate an academic model that values its faculty, including its adjunct faculty (CFRs 3.3, 3.4). The team also recommends clarifying the criteria for earning an extended contract, considering not just rank or status, but loyalty, longevity, and, most importantly, performance standards (CFR 3.8).
2. The team also recommends that Brandman continue to find ways to systematize the integration and engagement of adjunct faculty in decision-making about program

and institutional effectiveness. Given the significance of their role with educational effectiveness, adjunct faculty should be supported in their responsibility to engage in reflection and analysis at multiple levels in the institution (CFR 3.2).

3. While commending Brandman's innovativeness and responsiveness to the needs of adult learners, the visiting team recommends that the pace of growth, particularly in newly developed programs, be balanced with the ability to measure effectiveness and quality. Institutional financial sustainability will require careful attention to long range planning, enhanced marketing and focused attention to educational quality (CFRs 4.1,4.2). This is particularly true for programs that are too new to have students who have completed their academic programs. The team strongly recommends that Brandman monitor the growth of the new EdD program as its first cohort approaches the completion of its degrees (CFRs 2.2b, 4.4).
4. To ensure compliance with federal policy, the team recommends that Brandman close the loop with their credit hour policy and consider instituting a periodic audit to ensure course time estimates in the course design process, recorded in instruments such as the IQ Tool, be regularly compared with actual student time spent engaged with the course. The results of the audit should then be used to inform course improvements. To ensure compliance with federal policy, the team also recommends that Brandman imbed student authentication interventions as an explicit component in the course design process and that data on the effectiveness of the interventions be part of formal, periodic course and program review processes.
5. The team recommends that Brandman establish clearly defined criteria for student academic success and benchmarks for accomplishment of student learning out-

comes and that the KPI's include evidence of student learning (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8). The team recommends that Brandman use its plentiful learning outcome data and culture of assessment among its faculty to develop a KPI representing direct student learning measures (CFRs 4.4, 4.7).

6. Given the independent and separately accredited institutional identity of Brandman, the team strongly recommends that Brandman increase the number of Board members who are not dual appointments to Chapman and Brandman and the team further recommends that Brandman's CEO be represented ex officio on the Board of Regents (CFR 3.8, 3.9).

Appendix A: Off-Campus Site Summary (Roseville)

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Tomoko Takahashi**
Date/s of review: **September 23, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

Roseville Campus
3001 Lava Ridge Court, St. 250
Roseville, CA

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

Nine bachelor's, 14 master's, and 1 doctoral degree programs as well as eight credential programs are offered at this site — a total of 33 programs — with a total headcount of 221 students (178.86 FTE) enrolled (according to fall 2012 data provided).

This site has a total headcount of three full-time and over 30 adjunct faculty members (FTE unknown).²

The site is staffed with well-trained full-time staff members — including Campus Director, One-Stop Specialist, Academic Advisor, Campus Clinical Coordinator, Faculty Services Specialist, and Senior Academic Advisor.

The Sacramento Valley campuses were established in 1968 and were first located on military bases (Mather AFB and McClellan AFB). Several years later they expanded to various sites in the Sacramento region consolidating in 2000 to three sites -Sacramento, Diamond Springs and Yuba City, after the Federal government closures of the military bases. The Sacramento campus then moved its campus to Roseville, which opened on April 29, 2005. The Roseville Campus serves the Placer County and Sacramento Counties.

The Roseville site is designated as an off-campus site by WASC.

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

Brandman provided a campus-based report with appendices detailing its operation of the Roseville site, including information about programs offered, student enrollment, graduation and retention rates, staff and faculty, physical plant, etc. The materials were reviewed prior to the visit and found to be informative and helpful.

The review began with a tour of the site with Campus Director, followed by: meetings with 10 Student Support Services staff, 20 full-time & adjunct faculty, and 15 current students & alumni. They shared their candid opinions about the university and its operation and effectiveness.

² Some of the adjuncts also teach at other Sacramento Valley campuses (e.g., Folsom), which makes it difficult to calculate the FTE of faculty.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	The Mission is permeated throughout the Roseville Campus. It is also well reflected in its student body — career-oriented adult population. It is apparent that the Mission Statement plays a pivotal role at the site as much as it does at the main campus.	
<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)	Brandman provides student-centered services to its students, which is confirmed by the students interviewed on site, whose overall experience is very positive in terms of class instruction as well as student services. Students particularly appreciate the services and education with a “personal touch.” The campus has held “student appreciation” events each term in order to integrate the students with Brandman, which those students interviewed appreciated a great deal.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The physical site is very clean and modern, well organized, well structured, and well managed. It fosters students’ interactions among themselves and with staff and faculty. The campus has computer labs and conference rooms available for group works and discussions. Throughout the building, bulletin boards post information of news, announcements and updates. Each classroom has built-in technology and supplies for instructors. The students interviewed said they feel a sense of community being generated on campus.	
<i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	<p>The campus is committed to promoting student support services for continuing and new students. It has two full-time one-stop specialists who deal with all student needs such as registration, financial aid, etc. The students interviewed all appreciated the student support services provided by the university. Many of those students compared Brandman with their former institutions (e.g., state university) and praised Brandman’s “personalized service” for each student. They feel they are “not just numbers.”</p> <p>Students are regularly surveyed to provide their feedback on various aspects of the university life, especially student support services. The students interviewed confirmed that the university responds to their feedback quickly and is always willing to make changes and improvements. One student mentioned “a survey fatigue” due to the institution’s eagerness to hear from its students.</p>	Students are grateful for opportunities to provide feedback, but the institution may find a way to survey students in a more efficient and less burdensome way.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and as-	Both full-time and adjunct faculty teach students. The adjunct faculty attend meetings at the campus and meet with the full-time faculty to discuss teaching strategies and best practices. The faculty interviewed all shared their passion for teaching and love for Brandman. They are all very well qualified and many of them bring “real life” experiences to their classroom for class discussions. The students interviewed commented on the fact that interactions between students and faculty are highly	

Report of the WASC Visiting Team, Educational Effectiveness Review
Brandman University

<p>assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>encouraged in and outside the classroom. One student said, “I look forward to coming to class because we have a lot of lively discussion and I learn so much from it.” Another student also commented on the “hands-on” and practical nature of the instruction.</p> <p>All faculty interviewed were familiar with the assessment work Brandman has done. Full-time faculty members in particular are very knowledgeable about program reviews.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>The deans and faculty develop and revise degree programs per the curriculum process, which involves full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. Instructional designers develop course shells with the assistance and guidance of faculty. Any approval of new programs or relevant changes goes through the faculty, deans, Deans’ Council, the Board and WASC when needed. The academic schedules of classes are planned with the faculty and staff, with the dean’s approval. The schedule at the Roseville Campus is set for two full academic years in advance, based on student’s education plans. The staff and faculty are all essential for the Roseville class schedule.</p> <p>The credit hour policy is provided and is found to be in compliance.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>The Roseville Campus has a high overall graduation rate of 84.21%, which is significantly higher than the university-wide rate 67.14%. The staff members interviewed attributed it to their student-centered service with a “personal touch.” The students interviewed also acknowledged that the staff and faculty are keenly interested in students’ learning and success. Students also appreciate the cohort model that has been implemented at both the undergraduate and graduate programs to support a networking camaraderie and enhance student support.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The Comparative data for the Program Learning Assessment vary between each PLO from university-wide and the Roseville Campus. Highlights for the Roseville programs are in MA in Educational Leadership (PLO 1 – Vision – Exemplary 85%) and MA in Special Education (PLO 4 – Assessment – Exemplary 89.3%). All program PLO’s are reviewed by faculty and assessed both university-wide and campus wide to ensure optimal learning results. The faculty interviewed are all familiar with the assessment results. Full-time faculty members, having the ownership of the program reviews, spoke of their “closing the loop” efforts as well, which was found to be praiseworthy.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Quality assurance is one of Brandman’s fortes. The off-site campus is well integrated in the university-wide quality assurance system. The process is individualized to fit the off-campus’s needs and characteristics as well.</p> <p>The Roseville Campus’s high graduation rate (84.21%) is evidence of the educational effectiveness of the programs and courses provided at this site.</p>	

Appendix B: Off-Campus Site Summary (Ontario)

Institution: **Brandman University**
Kind of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Stephanie Juillerat**
Date: **September 26, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

Ontario
3990 E. Concours, Suite 100
Ontario, CA 91764

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

The Ontario campus opened in 1995 in the city of Ontario as Chapman University College. Originally the campus was located on the Norton Air Force Base but was closed due to military downsizing. By the second year of operation the Education Credential and Masters of Education became the predominant programs. In 2008 the campus was relocated to a new state of art facility, and in 2009 Brandman University became a member of the Chapman University System.

As the economy shifted and teacher layoffs continued, the predominant programs shifted to Undergraduate Business, Social Science, Organizational Leadership and Graduate Marriage Family Therapy, Organizational Leadership and Masters in Business Administration. The shift in Program selection reflects the Universities Mission, which provides “lasting value and relevance for evolving careers”.

Over the years partnerships have been developed with local community colleges, school districts and public agencies. The Premier Partner MBA outreach program assisted the campus in establishing meaningful relationships with local businesses and corporations. Extended Education courses have been developed for the local corporations and business community. Ontario is the major warehousing hub in Southern California, so a “Certified Supply Chain Professional” certification course was developed.

The Ontario site offers 31 programs at all three academic levels and has an FTE of approximately 311 +/- 7 if Ameritas students are included.

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

All materials provided by Brandman (campus-based report and appendices) were reviewed in advance of the visit. Three group interviews were conducted: with student support services, full-time and adjunct faculty, and students (current and alumni). Lines of inquiry followed WASC’s suggested protocol for off-campus site visits.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	Discussions with students and staff indicate that Brandman operates in a manner congruent with its mission. Students were not able to articulate a rationale for transition to unique Brandman identity. Believe it was because of a large donor and believe Brandman is simply the satellite campuses of Chapman.	
<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)	Exterior signage was difficult to see; however, internal branding was evident in the building. Students reported a desire for student organizations that had been unmet until a week ago, when a flyer was produced announcing an opportunity for student groups. Students reported a desire for more internship and job placement opportunities as it relates to their eventual careers.	Explore timeline for implementation of student groups. Was this a last-minute “add”?
<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)	Beautiful facility with 12 smart classrooms and 2 well-equipped computer labs. Faculty and staff offices are on-site and students report excellence access to both. Conversations with staff and students indicate a great “team approach” to service, which fosters student success and learning. Faculty contact with students is high, with the exception of faculty who teach online courses.	None
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	A review of the student satisfaction survey and conversation with support staff and students confirm highly effective and responsive support services. One critique arose from both staff and students regarding the reliance on “main office” to provide necessary information for financial aid, registration, and other student information. This reliance was mentioned by both groups as a glitch in an otherwise responsive environment.	Why is centralization necessary?
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Most courses are taught by adjuncts at this site, but students give favorable critique of the quality of teaching. Conversations with full-time and adjunct faculty indicate a collaborative and collegial environment as it pertains to curriculum development. Adjunct faculty reported feeling “heard” by course custodians when they propose changes to courses and see the innovation taking place. However, there is no formal process for involving adjuncts in curriculum development. Additionally, other than grading signature assignments and reporting scores, adjunct faculty do not seem to be involved in the review of assessment data. They indicated that they don’t see the results, but they see the changes to the courses. In fact, none of the faculty interviewed could speak knowledgeably about the assessment process, including an inability to articulate changes to courses that resulted from assessment data.	Very important to determine if faculty at other sites have same level of disconnect from assessment data. I am very concerned that the faculty had not even read the report, which summarized Program Learning Assessment findings. Blank stares all the way around.

<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>Faculty report that course custodians and curriculum teams design and approve courses, but they are responsive to any feedback adjuncts provide at their own initiative. Course custodians do not appear to formally solicit feedback from adjunct faculty on the effectiveness of the course. With the move to blended learning, all course shells are standardized; therefore, course content is comparable.</p>	<p>Is adjunct faculty involvement different at the Irvine 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>The Ontario site reports data on retention and graduation. In most cases, rates are higher at Ontario than at Irvine with the exception of undergraduate retention. Graduate-level retention rates are significantly higher than the main campus.</p>	<p>None; students are succeeding at this site.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>While some rudimentary comparative results of student learning assessment were provided in the campus-based report, the faculty seemed to have no working knowledge of these findings. Only one example was given when asked what changes had been made to courses or programs as a result of assessing student learning.</p> <p>Interestingly, students were aware of student learning outcomes and use of signature assignments to assess student learning. They see the connection between the syllabus SLOs and assignments.</p>	<p>Big concern needing follow-up: Is lack of knowledge a function of being adjunct-reliant, off-site, or do faculty not fully engage in this process? Data is provided, but is it utilized?</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Conversations with students and alumni indicate that they believe they are getting an effective education. Explorations with faculty about the program review process yielded only one faculty member who had participated in the process.</p> <p>The quality assurance process of determining faculty effectiveness has not been modified for off-site faculty. They participate in the same evaluation system. Most report that the system is fair, although they also indicated concern at the lack of job security from continuous one-year appointments.</p> <p>Adjunct faculty had no working knowledge of how they were evaluated for effectiveness. They assumed course evaluations were used, but most reported that they did not engage in a formalized process of review at this time. A pilot peer review process was referenced.</p>	<p>It appears as though quality assurance around programs is not well-integrated; however, quality assurance around services is.</p> <p>The faculty evaluation system is still new, and concern exists over inability to earn job security. Need to explore this further.</p> <p>Evaluation of adjunct faculty beyond the course evaluation is necessary.</p>

Appendix C: Off-Campus Site Summary (Palm Desert)

Institution: **Brandman University**
Kind of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Stephanie Juillerat**
Date: **September 27, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

Brandman University – Palm Desert
42-600 Cook Street, Suite 134
Palm Desert, CA 92211

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

Brandman University, Palm Desert Campus has been serving Coachella Valley for 34 years. The campus opened as Chapman's Academic Center in 1979 in Indian Wells on Manitou Drive.

The campus was first named Chapman University College, Coachella Valley and became Brandman University, Palm Desert Campus in 2009. The name change was driven by the commitment of the Brandman Foundation who keeps supporting the mission of serving working adults and other non-traditional students in their quest for higher education.

In August 1993, the campus moved to the present location, the HN and Frances C. Berger Foundation Building. This private foundation supports education and charities throughout Southern California and the United States. Other local non-profits are housed in the building, along with Brandman University.

The Palm Desert Campus offers 32 programs and has an FTE of 190 when considering all students.

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

The campus-based report and all accompanying appendices were reviewed prior to the visit. Three group interviews were conducted, one with support staff, one with adjunct faculty, and one with current students and alumni.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	Students report that Brandman is offering the education they expect. Brandman graduates are well-received in the community and the institution has a good reputation in the Coachella Valley. The site is organized to serve students effectively with a few limitations (noted below)	
<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)	Based on reports from staff and students, all efforts are made to create an environment where students are fully known and appreciated. Efforts to integrate students into the academic culture are limited by the current physical space. Students do not have any area in which to congregate or study, and there are not any offices for students to meet with adjunct faculty. Students did not have any specific information about the opportunity to form clubs or organizations, as an e-mail was sent out only last week.	
<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)	While classrooms are sufficient, the technology is outdated, with older model TVs and VCR players, rather than flat screen TVs with DVD players. Some classrooms still have overhead projectors. Students report that the computers are very slow in the lab and are questioning the value of the \$40 technology fee. Staff report that they have requested new technology and space for some time. The Palm Desert site is significantly less equipped than Ontario.	What is the process for acquiring more space and updated technology?
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Data from the student satisfaction survey indicate the Palm Desert campus provides excellent support. Conversations with students verified the data, with students indicating that they felt "known" and important to the staff and that all efforts were made to ensure a smooth admission and integration into the program. Academic Advisors are touted as exceptional.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	The majority of courses are taught by adjuncts, with only one full-time faculty member. Students report the desire for more full-time faculty with whom they can connect. Students report that most faculty are competent, although there are still concerns about adequate management of Blackboard in the blended and online environment. See below re: curriculum development and assessment.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Courses are designed by course custodians, most of whom are at different sites. Adjunct faculty report feeling empowered to provide feedback about a course, but also acknowledged that there was not uniformity in how feedback was solicited (other than an end-of-course form). It appears as if adjuncts are heard if they provide feedback, but their feedback is not actively and routinely solicited on course design matters.	To what degree is academic freedom compromised by course shells? Can faculty make changes to courses? Should a more common message be disseminated to students to prevent the impression that adjunct faculty are not

Report of the WASC Visiting Team, Educational Effectiveness Review
Brandman University

	Students have a lingering impression that courses are controlled by an external entity and are not “owned” by the faculty at the site. Many complained about the transition to blended learning and the apparent loss of faculty control over the course. This perception may be exacerbated by comments from faculty that they cannot make changes to a course shell.	given freedom to teach as they wish?
<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)	Retention and graduation rates are provided on the site. The fall 2011 undergraduate retention rate (87.5%) is significantly higher than the University-wide rate of 70.78%. However, the graduate retention rate of 63.64% is lower than the graduate rate University-wide (72.85%). Graduation rates are slightly lower (61.54%) than the University-wide rate of 67.14%	
<i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Student learning is uniformly assessed by signature assignments that are standardized across sites. Adjunct faculty have a basic understanding of signature assignments and how they are used to assess student learning, but they do not seem to have the big picture. They report that they have very little to zero involvement in examining student learning data or responding with strategies to improve student learning. With the exception of one program, adjunct faculty had not seen any assessment results.	Faculty at regional sites seem disconnected and uninvolved in any discussion about student learning. Systems need to be put into place that involve such a major constituency.
<i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	<p>Student learning data was provided in the campus-based report. However, when asked how they knew if they were effective in their courses and programs, faculty and staff referred to positive word-of-mouth, retention, graduation, and student comments.</p> <p>As it relates to determining faculty effectiveness, adjunct faculty could not identify how they were evaluated and retained. The majority believed that the course evaluation played some role, but could not say with certainty how decisions were made to re-hire.</p>	<p>There seems to be a continuing theme that off-campus sites do not see the connection to the bigger program of which they are a part and do not contribute to determinations of effectiveness.</p> <p>Adjunct faculty seem grateful for continued employment and believe they would be told if they were performing poorly, but they do not know how judgments of effectiveness are made.</p>

Appendix D: Off-Campus Site Summary (Walnut Creek)

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Janet L. Holmgren**
Date/s of review: **September 26, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

Brandman University,
Walnut Creek Campus
2950 Buskirk Avenue, Suite 200
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

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

The enrollment is just under 400 students with a total of approximately 20 faculty.

Brandman has been in Walnut Creek at various locations since its inception and was previously there for many years as Chapman University College. The Walnut Creek site is a hub for the Northern California region that includes about half of the 26 off-campus sites.

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

Materials for the site available and well presented; participation in meetings well coordinated and attended.

A four hour visit which included a 1) tour of the 21000 sq. ft. site - library, classrooms, computer labs, lunch room, administrative offices; 2) a meeting with 10 members of the Student Support Services Staff; 3) a meeting with 6 full-time faculty and 11 adjuncts; 4) meeting with 21 current students and alumni; 5) a meeting with site director, a Brandman Irvine staff member, and the Regional Administrator.

The team found the site to be well prepared for the visit. It is a thriving community of students, faculty, and staff organized to support the mission of educating the adult learner. The site was strongly identified with Chapman University College and so it has had to make a special effort to engage with the new name, Brandman.

The staff seemed very enthusiastic about the engagement with student success and the one-stop student services. Overall staff and management were well attuned to the mission and the ethos of Brandman.

The faculty - a mixture of full-time and adjunct - expressed some fatigue at the pace and amount of change they've experienced in recent years. They did see the need for innovation, but it came very quickly. There was also some concern expressed about the amount of top down curriculum planning and some dissatisfaction with not knowing or understanding how faculty workload and faculty contracts were determined.

Students were generally most satisfied with the on-site and blended course offerings - only a few who attended had taken courses completely on line and there were mixed reviews. Little was known about student organizations or alumni activities, but the students were very pleased with the help they received in job placement and career development.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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>This site has been heavily focused on the education degree for some time but it also has a good range of other degree programs and it is clearly well tied to the local community as well as to the main campus.</p> <p>The site is connected through faculty and staff to the main campus and to other Northern California sites. The technological as well as personal connections seem to work well. The team on the site are regularly engaged in Webinars and meetings with other sites and the main campus.</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)	The signage and communication are excellent. The students are largely working adults who have busy schedules and are aided by the convenience of one-stop student services, by regular email and telephone interaction with campus personnel, and by the blended classes that reduce the amount of seat time that they are required to have.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The site is in a new office building, and the classrooms, offices, and auxiliary services well equipped. The site director appears to manage the site well and is experienced within the system.	
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	The site has the one-stop student centered support system and good quality support systems including computers, a library, a cafeteria, and financial aid and advising services. Students are satisfied with these services.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	There is a healthy mix of full-time and adjunct faculty, all of whom are regularly reviewed by the site director and/or the main campus. The faculty develops and uses assessment tools consistent with the main campus and work together across disciplines to deliver the curriculum at this site.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	The University system has a homogenous system of course creation and delivery and this site is synchronized and coordinated with the main campus.	

Report of the WASC Visiting Team, Educational Effectiveness Review
Brandman University

<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>Walnut Creek's retention and graduation rates are consistent with those of the University overall. Most of the students are in graduate or credential programs.</p> <p>70.78/76.92 UG 1st year; 72.85/83.33 1 yr grad; 67.14/62.5 graduation rate</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Student Learning is assessed as it is throughout the system.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The faculty and staff of the Walnut Creek site are well informed and engaged with their students and colleagues as well as the administration. They are well connected to the main campus and, in fact, several academic leaders of the University are sited at Walnut Creek.</p>	

Appendix E: Off-Campus Site Summary (Modesto)

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Charles Nies**
Date/s of review: **September 25, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

Modesto Campus
5222 Pirrone Court
Salida, CA 95377

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

The Modesto campus has served the northern Central Valley of California for over 30 years. The campus was previously located on Sisk Road in Modesto, with satellite operations in Stockton and Merced. The Stockton and Modesto campuses were consolidated and the campus has been at its current location on since 2003. The campus was one of the largest single site campuses, serving over 1000 undergraduate and graduate students per year during statewide surge in teacher training programs. The campus continues to have the majority of its enrollments in training educational professionals.

The campus enrolls roughly 324 FTE students, with approximately 42% undergraduate and 44% graduate, and 14% credential students. Eleven bachelor's, 13 master's, and ten credential programs are offered at this site.

This site has a total headcount of three full-time and 44 adjunct faculty members (FTE unknown).³ One of the full-time faculty members is the Associate Dean of the School of Education.

The site is staffed with 10 staff members that include the Campus Director, three One-Stop Specialists, two Academic Advisors, a Campus Clinical Coordinator, a Faculty Services Specialist, and the Assistant Director of Academic Advising.

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

Brandman provided a campus-based report with appendices. The review began with a tour of the site with Campus Director, followed by: meetings with Student Support Services staff; 16 full-time & adjunct faculty, and 15 current students & alumni, with several other students participating through on-line services.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	The Mission of serving adult learners through accessible educational delivery program was evident with everyone. It is clear that the Mission plays a role at the site as much as it does at the main campus.	
<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)	Brandman is committed to student-centered customer service. The students interviewed confirmed the responsiveness of the on-site staff to students' needs. Students particularly appreciate the services and education with a "personal touch." There is a sense that the staff on-site run interference for the "bureaucracy that is the main campus, whether real or perceived.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The building was new with well-designed – interactive classroom environments. Designed to foster students' interactions among themselves and with staff and faculty, the space more than meets the campus' needs. The rooms are equipped with basic technology to allow instructors to access IT resources for instruction. The campus has computer labs, a library, a break room for students and conference rooms available for group discussions. The site director has great knowledge of the space and how it is being utilized. Additional "outreach" programs are also sponsored to expand services but to also connect with the community.	
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	The staff are revered by the students for providing great services and meeting their needs. The close relationship between the staff and the faculty allow for good information sharing to help assist student success. The student satisfaction data and the advising survey supports the feelings expressed during the student interview.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Full-time and adjunct faculty teach students. The adjunct faculty attend meetings at the campus and meet with the full-time faculty to discuss courses and to get advice on responding to student needs in the classroom. For the most part, faculty interviewed enjoyed teaching at Brandman. There was some expressed concern over moving to on-line learning as a way to educate and train future teachers, but that view was not widely expressed. The presence of the Assistant Dean for the School of Education at the site helps facilitate conversations about course design and curriculum that has fostered a feeling of participation in course and curriculum adjustments.	

Report of the WASC Visiting Team, Educational Effectiveness Review
Brandman University

<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>The deans and faculty develop and revise degree programs per the curriculum process, which involves full-time faculty and adjunct faculty. Instructional designers develop course shells with the faculty. The continuity of course design throughout Brandman allows for standardization in course curriculum across all the Brandman sites. Any approval of new programs or relevant changes goes through the faculty, deans, Deans' Council, the Board and WASC when needed. The academic schedules of classes are planned with the faculty and staff, with the dean's approval.</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>Retention for undergraduate students is above the system rate at 78.38% (system rate = 70.78%), when measuring retention year over year. Graduate cohort rates are lower at 61.54% (system average of 72.85%) when measuring students fall to fall. The Modesto staff are concerned about campus retention and graduation rates, and attribute some of the recent changes to the economic stress of the central valley, seeing some of the highest unemployment rates and foreclosure rates in the country, subsequently forcing individuals to leave the region or stop out of college to alleviate financial burdens.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Research Learning Outcomes in all BA programs was consistently in the 90% or above range for programs measured, which is above other university averages.</p> <p>The highlights for the Modesto campus include a strong measure of "leadership" in the MA of Educational Leadership program when compared to university averages. Similar findings existed with the MA in Counseling</p> <p>In the MA in Teaching, the assessment data shows campus performance consistent with the university average with the exception of instruction: students from Modesto exhibited particular strengths in the design of differentiated instruction based on the needs of students in the classroom.</p> <p>The Modesto campus recognizes a need in the MA in Special Education to improve program learning in the areas of Culture—describing the differences in culture of individuals served as well as in Behavior—the implementation of positive behavioral supports.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The off-site campus is well integrated in the university-wide quality assurance system. Additionally, regionally based partnerships with surrounding community colleges and NPOs has helped embed the campus into the community.</p> <p>The Modesto Campus's high graduation rate (81.25%) is evidence of the educational effectiveness of the programs offered at this site.</p>	

Appendix F: Off-Campus Site Summary (San Diego)

Institution: **Brandman University, San Diego Campus**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Name of reviewer/s: **Christine Geith**
Date/s of review: **October 2, 2013**

1. Site Name and Address

San Diego Campus
7460 Mission Valley Road
San Diego, CA 92018

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

San Diego is one of the larger Brandman campuses and was established at its current location in 1996 (originally in San Diego at military bases in the 1960's). Approximately 1/3 of the student population is either active military or veterans. The Education and Teacher Credentialing programs were formerly the driving force in enrollments but due to the decline in that market, the full range of diverse Brandman programs are offered at the site. The campus supports 279.42 FTE students, the largest program at the campus is the MBA. There are 5 full-time and 30 adjuncts at the campus site. There are 9 staff members including an outreach coordinator, military liaison, two one-stop, two advisors and one faculty services specialist.

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

Examination included the Brandman Campus-Based Report and on-site meetings with students, staff and faculty.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	San Diego is one of several campuses in the southern region. According to interviews and documents, its mission, operations, structure and branding is aligned with its peer campuses and with the central administration at the campus in Irvine.	
<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)	San Diego is primary place for on-campus class sessions, on-campus advising and one-stop support, access to full-time faculty teaching at the campus, and access to library resources. The campus signage is Brandman and there does not appear to be any student service at Irvine that is not also offered at San Diego.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The campus is managed by an experienced full-time director and is well appointed with conference rooms, a student break room, 12 standard classrooms and 1 computer lab which is also used for virtual library access. Students report satisfaction with the learning facilities. IT upgrades and facility enhancements are handled routinely through the university planning and budgeting process.	
<i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	The site currently has room to grow with facilities as well as staff. There are 3 advisors and 2 one-stop specialists at the campus. Student opinion surveys indicate positive student satisfaction scores.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	5 Full-Time Faculty have offices and teach at the San Diego campus. They are supported by a faculty services specialist. Full-time faculty report full engagement in program review and program assessment. Most are course coordinators as well, preparing and managing adjunct faculty teaching the courses. Adjuncts report being involved in course revisions and program reviews. Frequent virtual and face-to-face meetings, including the deans visiting the campus, and annual events at the Irvine campus enable faculty to equally participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Interviews with faculty indicate they follow the Brandman practice where curriculum is designed by the full-time faculty across all sites, specifically the course owners, with support from the CII and school instructional designers. Faculty are provided with standard course shells/templates and have the flexibility to customize certain aspects with their own expertise. Faculty report being well-prepared for teaching and well-supported during the teaching experience.	

Report of the WASC Visiting Team, Educational Effectiveness Review
Brandman University

<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>Reports and interviews indicate a data-driven decision and planning culture at the campus. Persistence rates, undergraduate retention rates, alumni data, student satisfaction survey results, and advising survey results reflect positively regarding campus effectiveness. The overall graduation rate is slightly lower than the University average (61.54 vs 67.14). Their data show relatively low retention rates in the MAT program at the campus which are being addressed through more contact and planning with advisors and more support interventions by one-stop specialists. Interviews indicate campus staff are responsive and pro-active in continuous improvement.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Staff and faculty report assessment practices aligned with Brandman practice. Reports are disaggregated by and show the PLO and ILO results for the campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The campus fully participates in Brandman assessments including program reviews, faculty surveys and student opinion surveys. Reports indicate results on par with other campuses. Data is shared and discussed frequently with all campus staff, full-time faculty and adjunct faculty through regular, frequent meetings and newsletters.</p>	

Appendix G: Credit Hour Policy Review Report

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Date: **September 30-October 2, 2013**

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Reviewed Yes/No
Policy on Credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations? <i>Yes</i> Comments: <i>The Brandman policy adopted 1/26/2012 is consistent with WASC policy and federal regulations.</i>	Yes
Process(es)/ periodic review	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)? <i>Yes, through the course design iDEAL credit hour accountability form. In addition, statements of credit hours are defined in the "Contract for part-time faculty appointment, full-time overload and administrator part-time teaching" and in the "Student Registration Landing Page" for each course. The "Course Feedback Survey Tool for Faculty" includes questions about the percentage of time students spend on certain course activities.</i> Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <i>Instructional designers and associate deans report examples of courses adjusting level of activity to align with credit hour requirements.</i> Comments: <i>No formal periodic reviews are in place at this time.</i>	Yes – with need to formalize periodic review.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <i>Brandman does not have any fully on-ground courses.</i> Comments: <i>The schedule indicates the on-ground meeting days and times for the on-ground portion of blended courses.</i>	Yes
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and blended courses	What kind of courses (online or blended or both)? <i>Online and Blended</i> How many syllabi were reviewed? <i>3</i> What degree level(s)? <i>(2) Undergraduate, (1) graduate</i> What discipline(s)? <i>Math, liberal studies, business</i> Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <i>Yes</i> Comments:	Yes
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)	What kinds of courses? <i>Clinical, student teaching/fieldwork, internship/practicum.</i> How many syllabi were reviewed? <i>9 (3 of each type)</i> What degree level(s)? <i>(2) Undergraduate, (7) Graduate</i> What discipline(s)? <i>Education, Psychology, Nursing, Social Work</i> Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <i>Yes</i> Comments: <i>In addition, the total hours in the field are aligned with common practice where applicable.</i>	Yes

Appendix H: Marketing and Recruitment Practice Review Report

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Date: **September 30-October 2, 2013**

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments: <i>There is no indication that the university participates in recruitment practices that would violate federal regulations.</i>	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	<p>Comments: Graduation rates are calculated with the same methodology as reported in accordance with the Student <i>Right to Know</i> regulations.</p> <p><i>The institution does not serve first-time freshman, therefore, it's institutional definition of a graduation cohort includes all undergraduate degree-seeking students who applied to a 4-year degree and who started their studies in either session of the fall of 2005. Graduation rates assess the percentage of students in this cohort completing their degree within 6 years after starting at Brandman University, regardless of experience at a prior institution.</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, given the transfer student experience at Brandman, the overall cost of education may not be easily calculated upfront. However, the per unit rates are clearly advertised in their print and on-line material.</i></p> <p><i>One can interpret accurate information about the overall cost of the "degree" reflected on this Brandman University website link: http://www.brandman.edu/files/attachments/Brandman-Tuition-Fees-2013-2014.pdf</i></p>	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	N/A
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	N/A
	Comments: <i>Given the nature of the students who enroll at Brandman, the majority of their students are already employed and are returning to school to complete a degree or to obtain a degree to assist with career advancement within a current employment situation. As such, the institution does not track employment status of its graduates.</i>	

*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.

Appendix I: Student Complaints Review Report

Institution: **Brandman University**
Type of Visit: **EER**
Date: **September 30-October 2, 2013**

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	No
	Comments: <i>There is a discrimination policy and a harassment policy that is part of the campus' Code of Student Conduct, which is a downloadable PDF file available through the students' MyBrandman portal. The policy that covers what is harassment and discrimination uses standard US Department of Education language.</i>	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: <i>There is a clear process for student-to-student issues that includes review boards. Discrimination and harassment complaints involving faculty or staff can be filed locally, with the Campus Director at the various site, or centrally through the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Learning and Development. The procedures for resolution to a complaint are subject to the guidelines in the faculty manual or the staff administrative handbook. Given the sequencing of the policies and the procedures in the appendices of the Student Code of Conduct, it is unclear if the procedures relate only to the Sexual Harassment Policy or include the Discrimination Policy.</i>	Yes/No
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	NA
	Comments: <i>On-campus action is outlined for student-to-student conduct related complaints and complaints related to sexual harassment. It is unclear if the action outlined includes complaints filed for discrimination on the basis of other protected groups. Decisions appear to be made by administration; there is a lack of clarity about the process that the student should anticipate.</i>	
Record	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? <i>Student conduct records are maintained by the home campus. Complaints filed against faculty or staff are kept in HR files.</i>	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	N/A
	Comments:	