

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

March 26-29, 2012

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

WASC Chair

Barbara H. Karlin
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Golden Gate University

WASC Team Members

Silas Abrego
Vice President for Student Affairs
California State University, Fullerton

Patricia Breen
President (Interim)
The Chicago School of Professional
Psychology/Chicago Campus

Ludmila Praslova
Professor of Psychology and Director of
Educational Effectiveness and Institutional
Research
Vanguard University of Southern California

WASC Assistant Chair/Team Editor

Maria Zack
Professor and Chair of Mathematical,
Information and Computer Sciences
Point Loma Nazarene University

Stephanie Bangert
Executive Director, Office of the President
Samuel Merritt University

Maryann Jones
Dean Emerita
Western State College of Law

WASC Staff

Teri Cannon, Executive Vice President

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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

A. Description of the Institutional Visit.....	3
B. Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report.....	5
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review	
1. Shared Vision, Mission and Future.....	6
2. Promoting Faculty Diversity	7
3. Organizational Structure and Decision-Making.....	7
4. Assessment, Program Review and Educational Effectiveness	9
5. Faculty Workload and Scholarship	11

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

A. Theme 1: Student Achievement Through Assessment	
1. Assessment.....	15
2. Program Review.....	17
3. Student Success.....	20
B. Theme 2: Campus Climate, Inclusivity and Diversity.....	22
C. Theme 3: Strategic Planning	26
D. Regional Centers and Other Issues	
1. Regional Campuses	30
2. Capacity Issues.....	32

SECTION III - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Commendations.....	33
B. Recommendations.....	35

APPENDICES

A. Details of Program Review Evaluations	
1. Curricular Program Reviews: GE, Mathematics, MBA, Marriage and Family Therapy, Ed.D., Organizational Leadership, School of Law.....	37
2. Co-Curricular Program Reviews: Center for Teaching and Learning, Office of Multicultural Services.....	45
B. Off-Campus Reports	
1. Kern County Regional Campus.....	49
2. Santa Clarita site.....	53
3. San Fernando Valley Regional Campus.....	57
4. Ontario Regional Campus.....	63
5. Whittier site	69
6. Westchester site.....	72
7. School of Law	75
C. Credit Hour Report.....	78

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), a seven-member team of evaluators visited the University of La Verne (ULV) on March 26-29 for its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). This report presents the findings from the EER site visit.

A. Description of Institution and Visit

Founded in 1891 as a small religious academy (Lordsburg College), the University of La Verne (ULV) developed into a nonsectarian liberal arts college offering undergraduate programs for teachers and ministers. By the 1930s ULV expanded its program offerings and in the 1960s and 1970s it expanded further with master's degrees (1960s), adult and off-campus programs (1968) and doctoral programs (1970s). In 1970 ULV opened its College of Law.

Per its materials and website, the mission and values of ULV are as follows:

... to provide opportunities for students to achieve their educational goals and become contributing citizens to the global community.

This is accomplished by offering high-quality degree programs to both traditional-aged and adult learners; providing liberal arts and professional programs from undergraduate to doctoral levels; and delivering programs to students at the central La Verne campus as well as regional campuses and satellite class locations throughout California.

The university provides a student-centered, values-based, and diverse learning environment. It takes pride in offering small class sizes in a highly personalized setting.

The university encourages effective teaching, research, scholarly contributions, and service to the greater community by sharing its academic, professional and individual resources.

The University of La Verne shares four core values that promote a positive and rewarding life for its students through fostering a genuine appreciation and respect for: a Value Orientation, Community and Diversity, Lifelong Learning, and Community Service.

The University of La Verne offers undergraduate and graduate degree programs in a variety of fields and disciplines through the following four colleges:

- College of Arts & Sciences
- College of Business & Public Management
- College of Education and Organizational Leadership
- College of Law

In addition to offering degree programs at its main campus in suburban La Verne, California, the university offers several online degrees and some of its undergraduate and master's degrees at a current list of 70 off-campus locations including nine regional centers located in southern and central California. In preparation for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit, the WASC CPR visiting team reviewed the online programs and visited six off-campus sites and regional centers. In preparation for this Educational Effectiveness Review, the visiting team visited an additional six off-campus sites. The visiting team's findings regarding the regional centers are discussed in Section IIE and in Appendix B.

According to the La Verne Fact Book 2007-2011, undergraduate enrollments account for nearly 50% of the enrollments at the central campus and 60% of the enrollments at the regional campus sites. The undergraduate student body is 60% per percent female, 46% Hispanic/Latino, 31% Caucasian, 8% Black/African American, and 5% Asian. The age of the undergraduates at the central campus averages 20 years old. Master's-level students make up the sizable majority of the graduate enrollments, with 29% Hispanic/Latino, 28% Caucasian, 9% Black/African American, and 8% Asian. The average age of the master's-level student is 30. The average age of all off-campus students regardless of degree level is in the mid-30s.

The ULV Fact Book reports a total of 217 full-time faculty members in 2012 compared to 194 in 2007. In 2011 ULV hired 437 part-time faculty members who teach 50-57% of the courses outside the College of Law.

In the spring of 2011, the university's president retired after serving as president for 26 years. ULV inaugurated its new president in July 2011.

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

The University of La Verne submitted an Institutional Proposal to WASC Commission in 2007. ULV's intended outcomes of the WASC review process articulated in the Institutional Proposal were to establish an institutional culture of evidence and to establish a foundation that supports ongoing student outcomes assessment across academic departments and programs. La Verne set forth the following three themes as focus areas in its EER report: Improving Student Achievement, Building on Quality in Campus Climate, and Building on Excellence through Planning.

The visiting team found the report to be well aligned with the proposal. The report was organized around the three themes, with a discussion about the institutional culture for each theme along with an analysis, conclusions, strengths, challenges, and recommendations. The report also contained a chapter focused on educational effectiveness and a culminating chapter looking back on the past and into the future. While the report was sufficient to prepare the team for its visit, it did not adequately reflect the quality and systemic nature of the impressive work the university has accomplished since the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit.

Through interviews with university personnel, the team confirmed that the report was a product of significant community engagement, spearheaded by a workgroup led by the Provost

with 12 other members of the faculty and staff. This workgroup engaged the campus community through open forums, dissemination of the draft reports and discussions with various faculty and Board of Trustee committees. Unlike its findings during the CPR visit, the visiting team was pleased to hear from Board members of their awareness and familiarity with the EER report.

In preparation for the visit, team members carefully reviewed the EER report as well as the Commission letter that followed the CPR. In addition to the team member visits to several of the regional sites, the team spent two full days at the La Verne central campus reviewing additional documents and meeting with a large number of faculty members, students, administrators and board members. The university was an excellent host and the team found all those with whom it met to be interested in helping the team understand the university, answering inquiries with sincere reflection and honesty. The team particularly enjoyed being able to meet the student ambassadors who ushered team members to and from the many campus interviews.

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

1. Shared Vision, Mission and Future

The WASC Commission letter dated July 8, 2010 that followed the CPR visit stated:

Although strong consensus exists concerning ULV's student-centeredness and service to a diverse student body, a shared vision and mission is important as ULV moves into the next stage of its development. ULV needs to answer the question framed by the team, "Who are we and what do we really want to be?"

ULV initiated conversations about the vision, mission and values across the University shortly after the CPR visit concluded. These conversations have continued under the leadership of the new president as the university community works on the 2020 Vision, a new strategic plan and the development of the "La Verne Experience" (CFRs 1.1, 4.1- 4.3, 4.8).

This process has involved a notable cross-section of the institution including the Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, students, and alumni. ULV indicated in its EER report that the institution

hopes to adopt the new strategic plan and university-wide shared vision by the end of December 2012. The president has established a timeline that is in alignment with that goal. Further information about institutional work in planning can be found in Section IIC where Theme 3: Strategic Planning is discussed in more detail (CFRs 1.1, 4.1- 4.3, 4.8).

2. Promoting Faculty Diversity

The July 8, 2010 letter from the WASC Commission states:

ULV is to be commended for the diversity of its student body.... What remains to be addressed is the diversity of the faculty, which has not improved or kept pace with the demographic changes in the region served by ULV... ULV needs to develop a 'concrete and measurably strategic plan for the diversity of the faculty, staff and academic leadership.

The team found significant evidence that the ULV embraces inclusivity and diversity. This commitment is expressed in the Draft Strategic Plan for Diversity (April 23, 2010) which was finalized after the conclusion of the CPR visit in 2010. This plan lists several goals and objectives. However the plan does not yet have sufficient implementation strategies and accountability measures to assess progress and success. Since the 2010 visit, ULV has made some progress in hiring diverse faculty members, moving the overall percentage of diverse faculty from 79% in 2010 to 76% in 2011. Further discussion of this and other issues related to diversity can be found in Section II. B. of this report which discusses Theme 2: Campus Climate, Inclusivity and Diversity (CFRs 1.5, 3.2).

3. Organizational Structure and Decision-Making

The Commission stated in its July 8, 2010 letter:

The ULV should examine its decision-making processes, organizational structures, and administrative roles and responsibilities to ensure that they are clear, well understood, and provide both an appropriate voice for faculty and adequate oversight of all aspects of the University's functioning. Related is the need for consistent and strong leadership, control, and integration of the off-campus sites and programs, which has been a persistent challenge.

The university has responded in three significant ways: a reorganization of its administrative structure, appointment and retention of a new provost, and a change in the reporting relationship of the off-campus sites and programs. The 2011-2012 organization chart illustrates three distinct organizational areas: academic affairs, finance and operations, and advancement. The provost oversees the deans of each of the four colleges and the heads of each academic support function. Added to the provost's responsibilities in the reorganization were the regional campuses, enrollment management, financial aid, student affairs and athletics. The executive vice president oversees finance and budgeting, facilities and technology, and human resources. The advancement vice president oversees all related functions.

One significant goal of the reorganization is to create a greater balance and alignment of academic functions, particularly with respect to the regional campuses. Through interviews with the deans and regional directors, the team was able to confirm that the new reporting structure of the regional campuses to the provost has provides greater decision making clarity. Deans and chairs are responsible for academic matters and regional campus directors are responsible for logistics. They work together through regularly scheduled meetings.

ULV also made changes in the Faculty Senate and Faculty Assembly with the goal of enhancing shared governance (CFRs 3.8, 3.10, 3.11). This new faculty governance structure was an area of satisfaction in a survey administered to the faculty in 2010. Continuing challenges in shared governance relate to budgeting and policy, the authority vested in the office of the Provost, and the desire to see a "oneness" in the academic vision of the university.

It is clear that ULV seriously considered the recommendations of WASC regarding organizational structure and decision making. While confirming evidence as to the effectiveness of these changes is not yet available, the university's strategic planning indicates a continued

commitment to the intent of these changes. The plan commits to ensuring a “clear priority to educational excellence,” a “common, integrated, liberal educational experience shared by all student populations,” and the “challenge of maintaining the identity of the different units of the University while clearly defining La Verne as a whole.” The continuation of its institutional values, the engagement of a broad faculty and staff perspective in the development of the plan should fulfill these commitments. The EER report indicates that the university will “continue to review and assess the organizational structure to meet the needs of the strategic initiatives arising from the new strategic plan and the implementation of the La Verne experience.” The team encourages ULV to continue to monitor the impact of its recent organizational changes (CFRs 3.8, 3.10, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2).

4. Assessment, Program Review and Educational Effectiveness

In its July 2010 letter, the WASC Senior Commission observed that "...it would benefit ULV to address several aspects of assessment and effectiveness by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review." Among the areas cited were ensuring that assessment is undertaken at the program level in all the colleges; promoting direct methods of assessment for all programs; using external reviewers in program reviews, connecting program reviews to planning and budgeting; and expanding the distribution and use of important data for assessment and decision making (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7,4.4, 4.5).

Since the 2010 CPR team review and Commission recommendations, ULV has made true progress in assessing student learning. ULV introduced new university guidelines and strengthened its assessment infrastructure by adding the position of Associate Vice President for University Assessment and increasing the oversight role of the Educational Effectiveness Committee.

Three of the four colleges [the College of Educational and Organizational Leadership (CEOL), the College of Business and Public Management (CBPM), and the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)] are now engaged in assessment work and use a variety of assessment structures. The visiting team did not find evidence that the School of Law engaged in assessment at the program level. Although currently in the planning stages, the Law School does not yet have program learning outcomes, a written assessment plan, data collection, or a curriculum map (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6).

A sample of programs reviewed by the EER team provided evidence that ULV has increased collection and use of direct data in some programs. Examples include assessment of dissertation chapters in the Organizational Leadership Ed.D. program and assessment of student work in the Mathematics program. However, some programs still strongly rely on indirect data and student self-assessments and some of the indirect data, such as use of student evaluations in CBPM program reviews, may also be of problematic validity (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Regarding the use of external reviewers, well-qualified external reviewers have provided helpful feedback and suggestions to the MBA and MFT programs.

Since the CPR visit, ULV has made progress in incorporating results of program reviews into planning and budgeting by using the results of program review as the source of action plans for some colleges. The College of Arts and Sciences, in particular, has created a sustained pattern of data-driven academic decision making. Appendices H, I, J, and K of the ULV EER report provide evidence of how program improvement recommendations were acted on for each of the four colleges (CFRs 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7). However, the team also found a significant absence of interpretation of assessment results or translation of data into improvement or action in some colleges (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7). See Section IIA in this report for a more detailed analysis.

5. Faculty Workload and Scholarship

The July 2010 Commission letter noted persistent concerns about “the need for more full-time faculty members to match the growth of the student body and programs, and for the uniform application of policies that limit the amount of faculty instructional overload.” The letter also indicated that “plans should be developed to address workload, staffing, and scholarly expectations.” Furthermore, the CPR visiting team found a lack of policies concerning adjunct faculty workload as well as a coherent philosophy to guide the use of adjunct versus full-time faculty members (CFRs 2.8, 2.9. 3.1, 3.4, 4.1).

The June 2010 Full-time Faculty Climate Survey conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment was sent to all full-time faculty members in all four colleges. The survey included questions on teaching support, research support, professional development and pay, as well as several other topics. The survey had a 65% response rate. The faculty overall had positive impressions as to the support they received from colleagues, program and department chairs, and library and technology services. However, there was an overall dissatisfaction with salary and benefits, concern about workload, and a desire for more support for conference attendance and release time for research.

The institution increased the number of full-time faculty members by 7% from 2011 to 2012 to its current level. The hiring process for adding additional full-time faculty members for the next academic year is underway. The Board of Trustees has committed to hiring more full-time faculty members during the next three years to raise the percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty members, which currently ranges from 43% to 50% to a level consistently at 50%.

The regional campuses remain heavily dependent on part time faculty. While ULV states in its report and in interviews that there is a commitment to utilizing full-time faculty at its

regional campuses, the regional directors also articulated a strong belief that adjunct faculty bring to the classroom invaluable insights from the working world. Results from student surveys indicate students are satisfied with the quality of the adjunct faculty. The institution plans to establish metrics for the level of full-time faculty teaching at the regional campuses and to provide more oversight of adjunct faculty by the full-time faculty members at regional centers. Currently the regional directors monitor adjunct performance and each course has a full-time faculty member assigned to manage the curriculum for that course.

There is a high level of stability among the adjunct ranks, and adjuncts appear to be very well integrated into the academic life of the institution (CFRs 3.1, 3.2 and Guideline, 4.1). Although the team consistently heard praise for the commitment and teaching excellence of the part-time faculty, the team did not hear or find a rationale behind the goal to have 50% of the courses taught by full-time faculty. Nor did the team find any goals for student/faculty ratios for each academic unit.

Tenure and promotion policies provide explicit expectations regarding responsibilities of full-time faculty for teaching, service, and scholarship. The established teaching load for full-time faculty members is three courses per semester, six courses per year. Overloads still exist, but to a considerably lesser extent, and the institution now has a policy governing the maximum load any full-time faculty members may teach. No full-time faculty member may teach more than three additional courses per year, exclusive of summer term, and then only with decanal approval (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

The institution has now articulated the maximum workload for adjunct faculty members and has accordingly updated its policies regarding promotion, compensation, and benefits (CFRs 1.8, 3.3). Specifically, the Adjunct Instructor or Adjunct Professor may teach no more than two courses per term, four courses per semester, or 12 courses in a calendar year. No Senior Adjunct

Instructor may teach more than three courses a term, four courses per semester, or twelve courses in a calendar year. Through interviews with adjunct faculty and review of agenda for all-university faculty development events, the team was able to confirm that there are ample opportunities to participate in the life of the institution.

The College of Law has 21 full-time faculty members and 27 adjunct faculty members. Full-time faculty members teach virtually all required courses. Full-time faculty members teach two courses per semester and are expected to engage in scholarship and service. There is support for faculty scholarship which includes generous summer research grants. The most recent ABA site visit report did not comment on the quality or quantity of faculty scholarship, but noted that with smaller class sizes, some faculty members aspire to greater scholarly productivity. The WASC visiting team found that the current level of scholarly output for the College of Law is quite thin. While bar pass rates and working toward full ABA approval will certainly be the most compelling issues for the College of Law, scholarship should not be ignored, as scholarship is an important factor in programmatic accreditation.

In the schools other than the law school, ULV has made faculty scholarship a high priority. Scholarly productivity has become increasingly important in tenure decisions, evidenced by the denial of tenure in three recent cases due to a lack of adequate scholarship (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.3). Review of scholarship materials indicate that scholarly productivity is at the highest point ever in terms of research, publication, and conference presentations. An increase in the number of full-time faculty members and the decrease in faculty overloads have been instrumental in this increase.

In addition, several changes have been made to further support scholarship. The budget for conference attendance and research has increased and is administered within the colleges, which faculty members perceive as a good arrangement. The Office of Sponsored Research,

which supports faculty grant activity, was created in 2009 and has already secured approximately \$9 million in Title V grants. The provost has a one-million-dollar academic prominence discretionary fund. A permanent director for the Institutional Review Board has been hired. Faculty members reported a palpable change in the institutional culture of scholarship. Scholarly publication is “advertised and celebrated.” Faculty members are given course release time in order to conduct scholarly research. There is a Young Scholars Research Program and “The La Verne Academy,” a scholarly organization for which admission is based upon peer voting. In addition, the provost has created a Faculty Development Committee (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.4).

The team noted that faculty policies consist of a series of individual policies with no comprehensive overarching organizing framework. The team also observed an inconsistent awareness among faculty member of the existence of policies and a difficulty in being able to quickly refer to existing policies. The team was encouraged with the current faculty discussions exploring the potential for establishing a comprehensive faculty handbook that incorporates all faculty-related policies fully vetted and approved by the Board of Trustees (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.3). This would assist in ensuring consistency in application of faculty policies and enhance faculty and administration awareness of pertinent policies.

SECTION II - EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

A. Theme 1: Student Achievement Through Assessment

According to ULV’s EER report, assessment at La Verne is:

...a multi-tier process encompassing activities from basic student achievement in academic programs to performance effectiveness of administrative and co-curricular units, and evaluation of campus climate throughout the University. Program reviews are used to generate action recommendations that support requests for funding, program improvements, and organizational and pedagogic adjustments (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6). Climate surveys are used to inform policy discussions that identify needs in the student body and among faculty, administrative and classified employees of the University.

The team focused much of its attention on the assessment of student learning and program review, interviewing several individuals involved in assessment. Two team members also conducted a focused inquiry into the state of assessment at the College of Law in conjunction with an in-depth review of other law school practices. The evidence reviewed by the team included university assessment and program review documentation, samples of curricular and co-curricular program reviews, external reviews, university-level assessment guidelines and reports, syllabi, examples of student work and retention and graduation data and analysis (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 4.6, 4.7). The full list of program reviews examined and detailed discussions of these program reviews can be found in Appendix A of this report.

1. Assessment

The ULV EER report suggests that during the accreditation cycle, the university made significant progress in the area of assessment, moving from “equating assessment with grading” to a much better developed system of “outcomes assessment, educational effectiveness, data-driven decision-making, closing the loop, and linking budgeting with strategic planning.”

The team reviewed the foundational elements for sound assessment practice: student learning outcomes, alignment with curriculum, and assessment planning. The visiting team found that all but one of the academic program reviews considered by the team included student learning outcomes. The type and quality of outcomes significantly differ among programs and colleges. The number of outcomes range from three overarching outcomes (Ed.D. in Organizational Leadership) to ten objectives with multiple outcomes under each objective (MBA). Some of the programs include institution-wide outcomes (such as communication outcome in Math), although there is little consistency among programs on the integration of institutional outcomes.

Many students appear to know the program outcomes. Traditional undergraduate and graduate students from CAS programs stated and demonstrated with examples that they understand how various courses fit into the overall program of learning. Team members observed CBPM students who were aware of course outcomes but not program level outcomes.

Most programs state that outcomes and curriculum are aligned. The Mathematics program review included a standard curriculum map, and the Ed.D. Organizational Leadership program review included a modified version of a curriculum alignment. The visiting team members compared the alignment of the MBA as described in program reviews with syllabi and found that the actual syllabi and assignments did not correspond well to stated outcomes. Given that the CBPM programs use a standardized curriculum, this was an unexpected finding.

The team observed that the campus may need some additional guidance with regard to assessment planning. Assessment plans presented to the visiting team included no timelines. ULV may wish to consider encouraging programs to create sustainable, multi-year assessment plans which would help programs in accomplishing meaningful and manageable progress in assessment annually.

A major challenge for ULV in the area of assessment is the current state of assessment of general education (GE). The university is reconsidering its approach to GE given that it serves both traditional students and non-traditional students (see comments regarding GE Appendix A). It is expected that part of this revised approach will involve the use of electronic portfolios for gathering GE artifacts. It was also mentioned during one of the interviews that ULV has begun its research on potential general education benchmarking instruments. The team encourages ULV to continue investigating the use of external benchmarking for direct assessment of student learning, in areas and in ways consistent with institutional mission (CFRs 2.2a, 4.4, 4.7).

Regarding co-curricular assessment, student affairs and academic support units have developed goals and outcomes that are aligned with the institutional mission. There are logical differences between the goals and outcomes for the main campus and for the regional campuses. These differences stem from the unique student populations served. The system for review of these units is in place. NSSE data and locally created surveys are used to inform institutional understanding of these services. Some units, such as the career center, have also used direct measures of student learning to evaluate some of the aspects of their effectiveness (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 4.4).

2. Program Review

As described in the EER report and in detailed in ULV's Educational Effectiveness Framework (EEF), the program review system at ULV was established in the mid-1990s under the purview of the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee changed its name to the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) in 2006 and continued efforts to refine program review guidelines, implement the external review process, and oversee the quality of the program review process (CFRs 2.7, 2.11, 4.4).

It is clear that in the last few years ULV has made progress in its program review system. ULV provided a very helpful flow chart of the program review process. The team used the chart as a guide to understanding how program review results are communicated, evaluated and acted upon including the respective roles of the EEC, deans, unit heads and provost. A review of several academic and non-academic program reviews conducted by the team demonstrated that protocols were generally followed. In these samples there was also some evidence of follow-up by deans, unit heads and the provost, which included budgetary considerations (CAS) or curricular changes (CBPM, CEOL). Interviews with both academic and non-academic program representatives showed keen interest in on-going discussions about program review results with

colleagues and decision-makers, however leadership and explicit accountability for initiating those conversations was not clear (CFRs 2.7, 2.11, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).

All program reviews provide a list of student learning outcomes; most also include general descriptions of the program and curriculum. ULV's guidelines do not require summaries of annual assessment findings nor annual assessment progress reports, and many programs appear to summarize and analyze data only at the time of the program review, although data collection may be more continuous.

Recent increased attention to external reviews was evident in the sample of documents reviewed by the team. Well-qualified external reviewers have provided helpful feedback and suggestions to ULV programs. For example, the MBA external review emphasized the quality of assessment work and provided valuable advice for improvement. The MFT review was also helpful in many ways, although it focused mostly on structural elements of the program, admissions criteria, and licensure pass rates. Because these reviews are quite recent, the follow-up is difficult to assess at this point. One area of potential process improvement might be the timing of external reviews. Currently, some are submitted a year and even two years after the program review is submitted. More timely external reviews would allow programs to incorporate helpful suggestions from reviews sooner.

Since the CPR visit, ULV has made progress in incorporating program review results into planning and budgeting. Results of program review form the foundation of action plans. The team suggests that ULV continue building on successful examples, such as CAS, in creating a sustained pattern of data-driven academic decision making. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

Annual feedback on assessment efforts, as well assessment planning in the form of organized activities within a program review cycle, is largely missing from the ULV's program review guidelines and practices. A number of programs seem to consider annual reports on

follow-up actions created prior to the program review cycle to be the same as annual assessment studies. CEOL appears to be the one school that produces semi-annual data reports on key learning areas; however, there seems to be little discussion or feedback on this work and it is unclear how the results are used beyond professional accreditation reporting. ULV may want to develop a process for providing programs feedback on annual assessment efforts. The Educational Effectiveness Committee appears to be an appropriate body for this work. Such annual feedback will likely lead to better quality data for program reviews and will facilitate continuous incremental improvement rather than reliance on five-year program reviews.

The team believes that building on the momentum of the last two years and on the experience of more developed programs in CAS, ULV will be able to continue making good progress. The team encourages ULV to pay increased attention to direct assessment of student learning, validity of direct and indirect assessment methods, data interpretation and analysis of assessment in the context on meaning of the degree. Further “closing the loop” and a demonstrated, long term pattern of linking assessment to budgeting will strengthen the process (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.6, 4.7). Continued professional development opportunities for members of the Educational Effectiveness Committee, and all faculty and program administrators will be important for ULV progress in areas of assessment and program review (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.4, 4.7).

3. Student Success

The University of La Verne has a diversity mission statement that states in part that the university is committed to “providing a quality, personalized educational experience for leadership and participation in a diverse society to a student population that reflects the full diversity of this country.” ULV reflects the population of California and serves a diverse group of students (CFR 1.1).

The first-time freshman retention rates for the university as a whole have been at approximately 80% for the last several years. This is a strong number and particularly notable because of the number of first-generation and underserved students in the student population. The university disaggregates the data by both gender and ethnicity. The retention rates are strong for all groups of racially/ethnically diverse students. Retention rates are stronger for female students than for male students. The university has established a list of 28 comparator institutions and the most recent IPEDS data available indicates that the Fall 2010 retention rate for ULV was 84% and the average of their comparator group was 88% (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 4.4).

The university runs the First Generation Student Success Program (FGSSP) for traditional-age students on the main campus. This program appears to provide valuable support for first-generation students; however it currently serves only 10% of this group. A review of the retention and graduation data shows that first-generation students are succeeding at the same rate as students who are not first-generation (CFRs 2.6, 2.10).

The six-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen have been steady over time at 50 to 55%. The rate reached a peak of 66.9% for the 2004 cohort and declined to 53.5% for the 2005 cohort. Graduation rates for first-time freshmen are also disaggregated by college, gender and race/ethnicity. The graduation rates are fairly consistent across all groups except the small group of non-resident aliens. African-American students show variability in their graduation rates.

The one-year retention rates for transfer students hover at approximately 80-85% and are consistent across all genders and across racial/ethnic groups other than Native Americans. However, the sample size for Native Americans is so small, that this change is not statistically significant. There is a consistency in the data across all sites (main campus, regional centers/online). The retention rates for female and male transfer students are roughly equivalent (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.14).

Six-year graduation rates for transfer students is approximately 50-55% and consistent across racial/ethnic groups and across sites (main campus, regional centers/online). However, as with first-time freshmen, the graduation rates for female students are significantly higher than for male students and there is variability in the graduation rates of African-American students. It is however difficult to determine the meaning of the six-year graduation rates for transfers because of the difficulty in establishing a cohort for transfer students (CFRs 2.10, 2.14).

The retention rate for graduate students is approximately 85% and is consistent across genders, racial-ethnic groups and degree level (master's and doctorate). However, African-American students in the JD program show lower retention rates than other groups (CFR 2.10).

The university has done a good job in analyzing the data in the report: *Graduation and Retention Trends over 10 Years: A Summary Analysis*. This report contains much richer data than was available in the CPR report. It is clear that ULV has given consideration to the implications of the data. For example, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment recently surveyed students who elected not to return to ULV after taking courses for at least one semester. The survey had a response rate of 11% (total population was 1454 students).

The survey did not reveal anything surprising: students left for financial reasons; they were generally happy with classes and student support and several plan to eventually return. There were notable differences between the responses of the doctoral students, master's students and undergraduate students. The doctoral students who departed appear to be less satisfied with their educational experience at ULV but the sample is so small (N=22) that it is difficult to draw any conclusions from these differences. Two issues that appear to need further research are the number of students who "felt uncomfortable because of racial/ethnic or religious background" (highest percentage at the regional centers) and those who were not satisfied with how their grievances were addressed (highest percentage for CAPA and Online). Because the sample size is small for this

study, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the existing data. Meetings held with the staff responsible for enrollment management, retention and graduation demonstrated that they are working to better understand these issues and have put in place a leave-of-absence system that has undergraduate students meet with financial aid, academic advising and others before leaving the school (CFRs 2.10, 2.13).

B. Theme 2: Campus Climate, Inclusivity and Diversity

It is evident the university embraces inclusivity and diversity. This commitment is expressed in the Draft Strategic Plan for Diversity (April 23, 2010) and includes a number of goals. One of its goals is to promote “community within a context of diversity, encouraging students to understand and appreciate the diversity of cultures that exist locally, nationally, and internationally.” In addition, the mission statement asserts commitment to “providing a quality, personalized educational experience for leadership and participation in a diverse society to a student population that reflects the full diversity of this country” (CFR 1.5). One of the core values of the university is diversity and inclusivity.

The team engaged in many conversations with members of the Board, administration, academic leadership, faculty, students and staff about diversity and inclusivity. In those conversations, the team became more familiar with the current new strategic planning process and the compelling development of the “La Verne Experience.” The La Verne Experience as understood by the team is seen as the foundational articulation of the university’s model of education, reflective of the four core values on which planning, accountability and outcomes will be based and measured (CFRs 1.1, 4.6, 4.7).

The team observed that while the ULV community embraces the core value of diversity and inclusivity, the 2010 planning effort that produced the Draft Strategic Plan for Diversity has yet to be aligned and explicitly connected to the on-going strategic planning for the institution

and for the implementation of the La Verne Experience. The team heard members of the university community suggest that student academic and co-curricular experience would be enhanced if there were a more focused conversation about how diversity and cultural competency are woven into the La Verne Experience, including its relationship with the core value of “community engagement”. The team recommends that ULV work to align and connect the diversity effort with overall institutional planning and clarify leadership and accountability around this goal (CFRs 1.5, 4.2, 4.6).

ULV is currently interviewing candidates for the position of Chief Diversity and Inclusivity Officer (CDIO). It will be some months before a new CDIO will be active. While the team appreciated the perspectives of staff and faculty members involved in multicultural activities and services on campus that the CDIO position will provide leadership and “legitimacy” at the senior level, it remains unclear the role the CDIO will play during this important time of strategic planning for the institution (CFRs 1.5, 4.2, 4.6).

It is important to note that the student body of the university largely mirrors the demographics of the State, and ULV enjoys the US Department of Education status as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). In its previous visit, the WASC team commended the university on its student diversity but also challenged the leadership to address concerns expressed by segments of the ULV community. Of special concern was the lack of deliberate efforts to attract, retain, and promote diverse faculty. The team heard members of the university community express a perspective that the strategic plan needs to include a more intentional and explicit plan for honoring and acknowledging diverse opinions and attitudes, and that faculty of color, especially African-Americans, be supported by increased and more effective retention efforts (CFR 3.2).

Attracting and recruiting diverse faculty continues to be challenging for the university. In the last few years ULV has attempted several initiatives including diversity training for faculty

and staff to serve on search committees as diversity consultants. These efforts and others have resulted in modest gains. Some departments have been more successful than others. The ULV Fact Book indicates that between fall of 2009 the number of full-time faculty members increased by 19 (from 198 to 217). The ethnicity of these 19 is two Hispanic, four African-American, four Asian, five White, and four who declined to state their ethnicity (CFR 3.2).

It is perhaps easier to consider the changes in terms of percentages. In 2007, 73.7% of the full-time faculty was White; in 2011, 76% of the full-time faculty was White. In 2007, 3.6% of the faculty was African-American and in 2011 African-Americans made up 6% of the full-time faculty. In 2007, 7.2% of the faculty was Hispanic/Latino and in 2011 that number had increased slightly to 7.8% (CFR 3.2). “Unknown” was 7.7% in 2007 and 1.8% in 2011.

Data on adjunct faculty are more difficult to evaluate because more than 45% of the adjuncts did not report their ethnicity to Human Resources during the application process and the total number of adjuncts at the Regional Centers includes both active and non-active faculty as well as some that also teach on the main campus. The institution conducted a climate survey of the adjuncts in 2009-2010 and with a response rate close to 75%. Of the 255 respondents, 10% indicated they are Hispanic, 6% African- American, 3% Asian, 1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 2% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 79% White, and the rest “other.” As ULV continues to develop a faculty that reflects the ethnicity of its students, it would be useful to obtain more complete data on adjuncts (CFR 3.2).

The Draft Strategic Plan for Diversity lists eight objectives to increase the hiring of diverse faculty, staff, and administrators. Examples of those objectives are: to develop human resources procedures to ensure that the hiring process includes diversity-related criteria and perspectives, to improve the advertisement of job opportunities, to assign a diversity representative to each search committee, and to evaluate the ongoing success of the hiring

process. The team encourages ULV to take advantage of its strengths in attracting diverse faculty: the student demographics, an institutional climate conducive to learning and supportive of diversity, and commitment to providing a quality education. It will be important that these and other initiatives in the plan be aligned with current institutional planning efforts and the development of the La Verne Experience (CFRs 3.2, 4.1, 4.2).

During the EER visit, some faculty members voiced concerns about the efficacy of the HR training program on diversity in increasing the number of diverse faculty. Concern was also expressed about whether or not the Faculty Mentoring Program for new incoming faculty members is meeting the desired outcome. To improve new faculty retention, the team learned that beginning in the fall 2011 ULV assigns senior faculty mentors to new faculty members based on discipline or program. The team encourages further review of the Faculty Mentoring Program to identify best practice methods for improving faculty retention (CFRs 3.2, 3.3).

C. Theme 3: Strategic Planning

ULV prospered and grew during the long tenure of the former president. Under his leadership, the institution demonstrated the capacity for strategic planning resulting in the 2007 Strategic Plan that created a system for “multi-year planning and data driven decision making.” The institutional EER report noted that significant progress was made during these years in assessment, organization and diversity (CFRs 1.3, 3.8, 4.1-4.3).

The 2007 plan has now expired, and a new university-wide strategic planning process has begun under the leadership of the new president with broad campus participation of faculty from each of the four colleges, students, staff and administration from the regional campuses, advancement, student affairs and human resources. The Board of Trustees and President’s Executive Committee (PEC) have also been important stakeholders in the process. Through

November 2011, 14 meetings with different campus groups had been held to gather input (CFRs 4.1, 4.6, 4.8).

The EER report notes that this is the right time in the development and growth of the institution to develop a strategic plan that reinforces its core values of community and civic engagement, lifelong learning, values orientation, and diversity and inclusivity. The core values provide a powerful and compelling frame for unifying the different constituencies and learning experiences of the university, embraced and clearly articulated by the new president. ULV is to be commended for the overarching coherence and relevance of its new strategic planning effort. The new plan has been initiated in response to changing pressures from growth, individual college resource needs, and organizational changes, and it is being constructed in concert with the La Verne Experience, a well-supported effort to articulate and advance the university's model of education. Together, the planning process and the plan itself have the potential to bring focus and energy to the university's purposeful achievement of its mission (CFRs 1.1, 4.1, 4.2).

In separate meetings with WASC team members, both Board members and the La Verne Experience Steering Committee members described similar hopes for the plan, including focus sufficient to govern and unify university-wide strategies and clear articulation with the La Verne Experience. Chaired by the provost in whom faculty express high confidence, and built upon university established core values, the La Verne Experience project has generated considerable positive regard with every group interviewed by the WASC team. The Steering Committee also reflects broad representation, with faculty members from each of the four colleges as well deans from the regional campus administration, and student affairs. It has an equally broad purpose through its subcommittees that are addressing traditional undergraduates, non-traditional undergraduates, graduate/professional/doctoral students and community engagement. Groups involved in the planning process were found to be uniformly conversant and energized by the

campus conversation about the La Verne Experience; the Faculty Senate will review and contribute to a concept paper drafted by the Steering Committee for broader distribution (CFRs 4.1-4.3, 3.8-3.11).

Recommendations made in the ULV EER report with respect to institutional expectations of current strategic planning include such elements as adopting the proposed shared vision, incorporating diversity and inclusivity goals and outcomes, identifying priorities for linking to multi-year budgeting, and refining procedures to assure that assessment and program review results are integrated into planning efforts for measuring student achievement. The team engaged with the many constituent groups involved in the planning process where these recommendations were endorsed and anticipated (CFRs 4.1-4.3)

ULV's Educational Effectiveness Framework document provides further analysis of strategic planning, including the evolution of the organizational structures and committees responsible for oversight of activities and progress related to educational effectiveness and assessment. The roles of the Educational Effectiveness Committee, workgroups and administrative leaders were detailed with respect to accountability for review of program reviews and survey results, allocation of resources, and referral of appropriate action recommendations to the President's Executive Council for prioritization and decision-making. Conversations with faculty program chairs involved with program review confirmed that action results were communicated by deans, and that departmental or program meetings and retreat venues were emerging for discussion of improvement including coherence with the "La Verne Experience." These same venues appear to be now seen as places where priorities need to be determined and communicated (CFRs 4.1-4.3, 4.4, 4.6-4.8).

In reviewing the number and kinds of recommendations requesting additional personnel or other resources, the team observed that analysis of costs associated with departmental or

college-wide initiatives were not reviewed in the aggregate with respect to institutional strategic and financial planning. It will be increasingly important for decision makers to tie program costs to the university budget process given internal and external factors that impact the sustainability of the institution. Factors include reaching enrollment growth thresholds, potential decreases in state grants, demographic changes in student and faculty populations, and the implementation of the La Verne Experience across all academic and co-curricular programming (CFRs 2.10, 3.5).

The optimism and energy surrounding the university's recent enrollment growth, the creation of the new strategic plan, and the implementation of the La Verne Experience suggests that careful financial planning will also be necessary to assure sound management of its resources as it seeks to optimize its impact. This is particularly critical given the university's plans for its law school to become fully accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA). The school was opened in 1970 and was provisionally accredited by the ABA in 2006. It lost its provisional accreditation in 2011 then was again granted provisional ABA accreditation immediately prior to this visit. Meeting the ABA's expectations will most likely involve a substantial economic commitment by ULV.

Aggressive goals that may include increased faculty, support for the law school's ABA accreditation, and implementation of curricular changes, together with a potential decrease in state grants will require deliberate planning at an operational level as well as a strategic level to identify implementation needs and associated costs. The WASC visit team recommends that a three- to five-year financial impact analysis be conducted and considered for each initiative prior to inclusion in the university's strategic plan (CFRs 4.1-4.3, 4.5).

The overarching coherence of the strategic planning process suggests opportunities to reinforce the university's goals through multiple approaches. In concert with efforts to establish

the La Verne Experience as a unifying and defining educational strategy, the team suggests that ULV consider recognizing its core values of diversity and inclusivity, values orientation, life-long learning, and civic and community engagement as essential elements of its EER architecture and therefore include them as institutional learning outcomes in every program (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 4.1-4.3).

D. Regional Centers and Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs

1. Regional Campuses

As part of the 2010 CPR visit, team members visited three regional campuses and three satellite teaching sites. In preparation for the EER visit, team members met with faculty members, administrators, advisors and students at an additional three regional campuses and three satellite teaching sites. Excitement about the new leadership and the La Verne Experience was universal. Faculty and staff expressed an increased feeling of being included as part of the university, often referring to the new president's "one university" mantra. There is plentiful evidence of increased connection with central campus: the director of the largest regional campus is part of the strategic planning committee; the president has visited each one of the regional campuses and has included regional students and staff in university-wide discussions through the use of video technology. In meetings with deans and regional campus administrators, the team saw a high level of collaboration and sense of team.

Through review of student satisfaction and climate survey results from regional center students, it is clear that the provost, deans and regional staff are attentive to the student satisfaction and climate and pay particular attention to any differences in responses between the regional campus and the central campus students. Overall, the results indicate significant

commonality between the two groups and a level of satisfaction in a five-point scale that tends to be in the three- to five range.

Regional campuses are significant to ULV in terms of revenue and enrollments. Of nearly 8,000 students, one-third attend one of the nine regional campuses and the 70-plus satellite locations. One-third of the undergraduate students and 60% of the master's-level students attend classes at the regional campuses. The business school offers most of the regional site programs. Sixty percent of the regional students are pursuing bachelor's degrees and 40% master's. Doctoral and law students are exclusively at the central campus.

In reviewing FY 2011/12 gross tuition revenue budget and projections, the regional campuses are budgeted to contribute approximately 20% of the institution's gross tuition revenue. As of the time of the visit, university gross tuition revenue is projected to exceed budget. Two central campus programs make up most of this excess: "traditional undergraduate" and "graduate business studies." In addition, online business programs exceeded their budgeted.

While the central campus has seen significant growth in the past five years, between FY 2007/08 and FY 2010/2011, the regional campuses substantially declined in net revenue after direct expenses. During that time period, the number of students remained fairly consistent around 2,500 and revenues essentially remained flat. However, direct expenses for the same period substantially increased. For FY 2011/12, the university projects the regional campuses will fall slightly short of their budget target.

Given heavy dependence on tuition revenue, it will be critical that as ULV engages in its strategic planning, the role of the regional campuses in the ULV of the future be thoughtfully considered. Will the current model of on-the-ground small satellite cohorts be sustainable? How will the growth of online options impact enrollment? How does the commitment to respond to the educational and service needs of the growing traditional undergraduate student population at

the central campus fit with the decreasing revenues and increasing direct expenses of the regional campuses? (CFRs 3.5, 4.1-4.3)

2. Capacity Issues

While the focus of this visit was effectiveness rather than capacity, the team members heard a relatively quiet but emerging discomfort during many of its meetings. Since Fall 2007, ULV has experienced a substantial increase in the number of traditional undergraduate students and an even greater increase in the number of master's level students at the central campus. This growth generated a significantly higher amount of net tuition dollars in FY 2010/11 compared to FY 2007/08 (Fact Book 2007-2011). Total expenses during that same period increased significantly as well. Dependence on tuition to cover expenses increased slightly. Many ULV administrators and faculty expressed to team members concern that the university no longer has the physical capacity to accommodate more growth in these programs. One leader stated that the central campus growth is quickly reaching an end. The team did not validate this concern nor see any direct evidence that there is indeed a space capacity challenge.

The team recommends that ULV review and determine whether growth is truly at an end due to facilities constraints. It is the revenue from this growth that has enabled ULV to withstand the significant reduction in enrollments in the law school caused primarily by the uncertainty of ABA accreditation. In addition, the revenue from the central campus growth made possible the investments aimed at enhancing the student services and the quality of the student academic experience.

There will be cause for concern if capacity constraints places limitations on growth in its main growth areas at the same time that ULV is seeing a reduction in the net contribution of the regional sites, increasing expenses, an identified need for significant investments particularly in the law school, and a threatened policy change which could possibly reduce by half the funding

in Cal Grant support. As ULV engages in strategic planning, serious consideration of these financial factors will be absolutely critical (CFRs 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

While fundraising will not solve this financial challenge, the team strongly encourages the university to seriously consider how it might significantly increase giving to the university. In reviewing ULV's audited financials for the past several years, the team observed significant transfers out of endowment/quasi endowment funds with far fewer transfers into the endowment. The team did not further explore fundraising efforts but was pleased to read that the need to increase the endowment and the annual fund was one of the five goals identified by the president when she took office.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Commendations

The University of La Verne is to be commended for:

1. The significant progress it has made in becoming one university with four colleges and ten campuses. This increased sense of unity and shared mission is recognizable throughout the University in both formal structures and informal interactions (CFR 1.1).
2. Its commitment to data-informed decision making. This can be seen in the strengthening of the infrastructure to support data gathering and analysis. It is also evident in the growing institution-wide awareness of the role that systematically gathered information can play in understanding complex issues (CFRs 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8).
3. Its commitment to providing the best possible general education program for both its traditional and non-traditional students. It is evident that ULV has learned a great deal from its most recent general education revision and that those lessons will inform the process of developing the "La Verne Experience" (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.10).

4. The extent to which everyone at ULV truly cares and is committed to the success of the students. Student-centeredness is deeply engrained in the DNA of ULV (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 3.1).
5. Impressive progress made since the time of the CPR accomplished with good speed and palpable enthusiasm. The institution has embraced with spirit and energy its core values, new presidential leadership and organizational structure, and a commitment to plan well for quality educational effectiveness (CFRs 1.3, 3.1, 3.9-3.11).
6. The overarching coherence and relevance of its new strategic planning effort. The new plan has been initiated in response to changing pressures from growth, individual college resource needs, and organizational changes, and it is being constructed in concert with the “La Verne Experience,” a well-supported effort to articulate and advance the University’s model of education. Together, the planning process and the plan itself have the potential to bring focus and energy to the University’s purposeful achievement of its mission (CFRs 4.1-4.3).
7. The College of Law’s robust skills training as well as its commitment to the rigorous preparation of its students for the actual practice of law. The College of Law’s students have achieved outstanding results in national moot court and trial competitions and are confident that they will be competent and skilled practitioners (CFR 2.2b).
8. The Board of Trustees for its active engagement in and concern for the university (CFR 3.9).

B. Recommendations

1. The WASC team recommends that the Strategic Plan for Diversity be examined and revised to align with the new La Verne Experience initiative. Further, the team recommends deliberate college-based efforts that include accountability measures to

grow and retain a faculty that is reflective of the student body. The team encourages the university to identify and adopt best practices of other colleges and universities that are successful in diversifying their faculty ranks (CFRs 1.5, 3.2).

2. While ULV has made significant progress in the areas of program review and use of data for improving student learning and educational effectiveness across much of the institution, the team recommends that ULV assure full implementation of defined standards and procedures for program review in every college and program. Further, the team recommends that program review results and recommendations reflect thoughtful analysis of valid data to assure sustained continuous improvement in educational effectiveness (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6).
3. The team recommends that the university's assessment system be significantly deepened to incorporate evolving knowledge of best practices in higher education. Specific areas of attention include alignment of student learning outcomes, syllabi, curriculum maps, and assessment methodologies. In addition, attention is needed on comparative data from external sources, consistent use of direct assessment, and documented follow through for closing the loop (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).
4. The optimism and energy surrounding the university's recent growth, the creation of the new strategic plan, and the implementation of the La Verne Experience suggest that careful operational and financial planning is necessary to optimize and sustain its impact. The WASC team recommends that ULV carefully connect financial considerations with the university's strategic planning (CFRs 3.5, 4.1-4.2).
5. The team recommends that as the university engages in strategic planning, it is critical to thoughtfully address the role of the regional campuses in the ULV of the future. Is the current model of on-the-ground small satellite cohorts sustainable? How will the growth

of online options for students impact enrollment? How does the commitment to respond to the educational and service needs of the growing traditional undergraduate student population at the central campus fit with the University's financial plan? (CFRs 4.1-4.3, 4.5).

6. The team finds that the College of Law lags substantially behind the rest of the institution in terms of assessment of student learning. The team recommends that the College of Law take immediate steps to develop student learning outcomes at both the course and program level and create and implement an assessment plan as well as a data collection

Appendix A: Details of Program Review Evaluations

The following section presents more extended evaluations of recent program reviews sampled and examined by the EER visiting team.

Curricular Program Reviews: GE, Mathematics, MBA, Marriage and Family Therapy, Ed.D.
Organizational Leadership, School of Law

Co-Curricular Program Reviews: Center for Teaching and Learning, Office of Multicultural
Services

CURRICULAR PROGRAM REVIEWS:

General Education: The EER report states and interviews with faculty confirm that the current GE program was a compromise that tried to meet the needs of two distinct populations: traditional students on the main campus and adult learners in other locations. As stated by the report this compromise program “left deficiencies for both traditional and non-traditional populations. It has not been wholeheartedly embraced by faculty or administrators, especially in CAS, where most of the GE courses were taught, and in the professional colleges, where most non-traditional students study” (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, 4.4).

The EER report also states that,

The growing consensus of faculty and administrators working on GE is that a set of baccalaureate learning goals need to be established that are common for all students. Once these are established, the curriculum can be tailored to the needs of the student population to ensure a common set of learning outcomes. As the university moves into a broader strategic planning exercise with the concomitant development of the curricular initiative referred to as the La Verne Experience, GE curricular issues will continue to be addressed.

Discussions with faculty confirm this belief. Faculty and administrators indicate that one of the many expected outcomes from the development of the “La Verne Experience” is the

creation of a set of institutional learning outcomes that can then inform GE learning outcomes. Faculty members have become familiar with the AAC&U LEAP learning outcomes and the Lumina DQP and they report that this is informing the discussion about GE learning outcomes (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.7, 4.4).

Some components of the GE program have been reviewed. For example the Writing Program Review was thorough and addressed each learning outcome for writing. The review used some critical data from a university-wide assessment of the discipline-specific junior writing project and made specific recommendations for strengthening the writing program. The review provided evidence for requesting additional resources to support writing and for bringing greater consistency to the writing rubric used to evaluate students in the junior-level writing assessment. Reviews have also been conducted for Quantitative Reasoning, Humanities, and Service (CFRs 2.2, 4.4, 4.7). These reviews used both direct and indirect assessment, and relied on internally developed criteria and rubrics. No comparative data for any of the outcomes were provided (CFRs 2.2a, 2.7, 4.4). There appear to be significant gaps in the timeline of GE reviews.

Discussions with faculty involved in assessing GE indicates that the program reviews have used both indirect (e.g. NSSE data) and direct measures of student learning. They have learned a great deal about ways to improve the process, which includes the use of two-reader agreement in applying rubrics to student work and the potential usefulness of having student portfolios to make it easier to sample student work, particularly because they have 10 campuses (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.4, 4.7).

The GE Committee has become responsible for coordinating the assessment of GE learning outcomes in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and

program review appears to be the main vehicle for assessing student learning (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.4, 4.7).

Mathematics: The department of Mathematics has a solid history of program reviews, and several documents were examined: the 2003 program review and its 2006 action update; the 2008-2009 (final drafted 2011) program review and its 2008 update on mathematics program goals (2004-2009) and external program review recommendations (2003); the mathematics program 2011-12 budget requests and 2010 update on mathematics program review (2008-2010); and the most recent external review report (2011).

Of all departmental reviews the team sampled, Mathematics demonstrated the most consistent commitment to the assessment cycle of program review with extensive data derived from surveys, analysis of course and senior project achievement, review and evaluation of program goals and related syllabi and curriculum comparison with peer institutions. Importantly, student learning outcomes were analyzed in detail, leading to a number of action recommendations that have been thoroughly tracked and described in update reports. Impressively, recent action recommendations are linked to specific budget requests including ratings for the highest priority recommendations.

It is interesting to note that the highest priority recommendation was to hire a full-time tenure-track faculty member and a non-tenure-track faculty position. As with other program review results, those recommendations that could be achieved at the department or program level were completed or well on the way for completion; recommendations tied to increased enrollment and growth requiring additional positions were in progress or stalled. The 2011 external program review commended the quality and thoroughness of the department's program review studies and commended the faculty as the greatest strength of the program. Using data

and analysis provided by program review documents, the external reviewer made a number of constructive suggestions for curricular enhancements consistent with what was described to be “learning outcomes...and program goals that are well articulated.”

The mathematics department also prepared an assessment plan (undated) that defined procedures and examples of evidence to be consulted. In sum, the program review process provides evidence of a well-engaged faculty eager to offer a relevant and meaningful program based on sound learning outcomes that lead to authentic competencies deemed appropriate in the field and profession.

Overall, the program review meets the Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Outcomes into Program Reviews as highly developed in the area of student experience and learning outcomes, and developed in the category of planning and budgeting. Annual action updates on action items are provided; however, no annual feedback on continued assessment efforts is provided or documented (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4).

Master of Business Administration: The MBA program identifies five overarching program learning goals and 10 specific learning objectives. The MBAX (for experienced professionals) identifies the same overarching goals and eight specific learning objectives. Both are related to AACSB standards. AACSB accreditation is a long-term goal of ULV.

Instead of typical assessment plans, the CBPM embedded assessment system facilitates assessment (data collection) of outcomes linked to specific courses every time the course is offered, making for an “autopilot” data collection. Student work is evaluated by the use of standard rubrics. Although the use of embedded assessment is a very positive characteristic of CBPM approach to assessment, currently student work is only evaluated by the course faculty members in the process of grading and there are no other raters or inter-rater reliability checks

involved. During the team interview the CBPM leaders acknowledged that this is a problem and stated that using multiple raters of student work for assessment purposes is the next step. Clarifying connections between course-embedded assessments, course-level outcomes, and program level outcomes is another area for further development .

The MBA program collects indirect assessment data through multiple methods, such as an alumni survey, course evaluations, an Educational Benchmark Institute survey, focus groups, and employer feedback. MBAX uses course evaluations, alumni surveys, and input from the advisory board. One issue with indirect data is that CBPM (in addition to MBA, the team also reviewed materials from the undergraduate business program, which uses a very similar approach) heavily relies on student course evaluation to assess student learning outcomes. Although course evaluations are important for feedback regarding course design and classroom interaction, construct validity of student course evaluations as the indirect measure of student learning outcomes may be problematic. As confirmed during interviews, currently ULV uses the aggregate score of the average student evaluations as a method of indirect assessment of student learning of specific learning objectives linked to the course. However, the average score on items that tap into students' general perception of achievement of course objectives, instructor behaviors, and classroom environment is not likely to provide information regarding specific learning objectives. This issue was also noted by the external reviewer, who provided very helpful feedback to the program.

In sum, CBPM made progress in establishing a system of data use in program review. Ensuring that the data is valid and clarifying connections between course-embedded assessments, course-level outcomes, and program level outcomes should be the next step in development of systems for use of assessment data in program review (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 4.4).

Marriage and Family Therapy: The internal program review prepared by the program and department chairs in fall 2008 was examined for the MS: Marriage and Family Therapy. Two progress reports on action recommendations were available for review, 2009 and 2010. In 2010, an external review of the program was conducted.

The MFT program review is a comprehensive document of 24 pages, organized into an overview of the program, curriculum, advising and assessment procedures, and importantly a detailed analysis of findings related to student learning outcomes and recommendations for improvement. The analysis of learning outcomes included evidence that direct and indirect methods of assessment were used such as results of competency exams, oral presentation evaluations of graduate seminar projects, fieldwork supervisor ratings, and results of faculty, student and alumni surveys. Specific data were presented to support conclusions.

Ten action recommendations were presented with some but not many targets identified. Key recommendations were the need to increase number of full-time faculty members, ensure that resources aligned with the number of enrolled students, examine admission requirements for improving the quality of applicants, consider limiting class size, further study of particular learning outcomes for effectiveness, and follow-up with graduates for satisfaction with mastery of competencies.

An external review of the MFT program took place in 2010. The report of the reviewer was thorough in its methodology and review of documents and appropriate interviews, although there was little attention to evaluation of actual student work. The review highlighted areas of strength, concern and made several recommendations:

- Develop additional faculty positions for the program to maintain current levels of quality and to support enrollment growth;

- Restore more meaningful faculty involvement in the student recruiting and admissions process;
- Maintain program strengths including coordination with fieldwork agencies, diversity in the student population, small class sizes, and programmatic leadership;
- Develop a clear sense of program identity including reassessment of learning objectives that is responsive to growth and external accreditation requirements;
- Consider professional accreditation through COAMFTE and/or CACREP;
- Offer students greater preparation on the comprehensive exam process.

The external review report supported many of the recommendations made by the program evaluators, and identified important new issues for improvement such as the need for addressing the below average MFT licensure exam pass rates when compared with California licensure data.

Progress reports examined each action recommendation. The general observation gleaned from the review of 2009 and 2010 reports is that there has been limited progress in some areas (e.g., increase of full-time faculty and resources), no progress in resolving class size limits, and progress in fieldwork coordination, analysis of core learning outcome effectiveness for “scientific information,” and admission requirements. Action recommendations that fell within the purview of the department appeared to get acted upon, but recommendations dependent upon broader institutional support or resources have seen limited improvement.

The MFT program review in general meets the *WASC Rubric for Assessing the Integration of SL Assessment into Program Review* in that the report provides earnest effort to organize the evaluation around meaningful metrics, e.g. required elements, efficacy of the process, and the student experience. Nevertheless, follow-up interviews with department members suggested that the faculty members often rely on their perceptions of how a particular group of students is doing as a method of assessing student learning. A close read of the review

and subsequent progress reports suggests improvement is needed for the criteria of budgeting and feedback on assessment efforts. In the aggregate, the MFT department program review appears to be approaching “developed” in the integration of student learning assessment into the review process. (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.4)

Ed.D., Organizational Leadership: The program has three overarching SLOs that are supported by specific outcomes, which are in turn supported by more specific competencies. Outcomes are linked to individual courses. They do not appear to relate to any external professional standards, which is not unusual for organizational leadership programs. Program review extensively used self-report to measure SLOs, although other methods, such as supervisor evaluation, were also included. Data used include a self-reported leadership profile, input from students’ supervisors, and faculty evaluation of the dissertation. A “social change capstone” project is described but no data are provided. The document presented to the visiting team was not titled “Program Review.” It is titled “Outcomes, Competencies, Assessments.” Other than enrollment and graduation, no other program data is provided, and the report lacks correspondence to institutional guidelines. (CFRs 2.7, 4.4)

College of Law: The law school’s efforts at assessment of student learning can be best characterized as “emerging.” The school’s goal of achieving ABA approval has resulted in an institutional focus on satisfying the standards of that accrediting agency, which, for the most part, do not focus on assessment of student achievement beyond graduation rates, bar passage rates (with an emphasis on first time), and placement rates. Accordingly, the law school has yet to establish student learning outcomes at the program level and does not require them at the course level. In fact, most syllabi reviewed failed to include measurable student learning

outcomes. There is no written assessment plan in place, no data collection plan in place, and no curriculum map. The academic dean is aware of these requirements, and is bringing in experts in legal education to begin training the faculty (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6).

Following the CPR visit, the Commission requested that all colleges of the institution ensure that assessment be undertaken at the program level, to include direct methods of assessment as well as external review and to connect program reviews to planning and budgeting. In the list of program reviews provided by the institution, the law school is the only one of the four schools with nothing listed (although there is a brief entry in the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators). It appears as though the law school lags substantially behind the rest of the institution in terms of assessment of student learning. Using the University Program Review Assessment Rubric (Appendix Q of EER report), the law school is at best at the “emerging” stage of program review (CFR 2.7). The Law School also does not currently have a representative on the Educational Effectiveness Committee.

CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAM REVIEWS

Center for Teaching and Learning: The Center for Teaching and Learning conducted a program review in 2010; this review was followed up in 2010 with external review and 2011 action plan. The center provides training for faculty in instructional technology and supports student learning with technology through programs and services aimed at ensuring their academic success at La Verne.

The program review was based on a significant amount of data: the Center conducts an average of four annual formal surveys to measure the department's effectiveness and adjusts accordingly to meet the needs of the academic community. Service data are tracked regularly (daily, quarterly, and annually) to measure work-place demands and evaluate capacity to fulfill these demands.

Some of the recommendations of program review included: requests for additional positions to help meet increased demand for teaching-focused services, facilitating consistent and appropriate reporting structure within the university, and additional budget resources. External review concurred with these recommendations and affirmed the work of the center and its value in serving ULV. The 2011 action update described partial progress on recommendations: for example, there was no progress on staffing, but a one-time funding allocation was received to support faculty technology training for online teaching. Currently, the program is working on further expanding their service to the university beyond technology, and becoming a center for instructional excellence for all teaching formats (CFRs 2.11, 4.4).

Office of Multicultural Services: The 2010 program review and the 2011 external review documents for the Office of Multicultural Services (OMS) were examined. The reports complied

with guidelines provided for co-curricular programs, and the external reviewer guide for administrative and co-curricular departments and programs.

The program review report followed the typical organization of most reviews, i.e. an executive summary, program mission, department initiatives, effectiveness indicators, findings and recommendations and action plans. Evidence used in the review, NSSE/Cultural Appreciation Survey data, CSS/College Senior Survey data, and OMS stakeholder data was gathered by the Institutional Research Office and used in the department's program review analysis. Those data showed that while the OMS compared favorably with other regional and national data there is room for improvement.

Selected action recommendations follow:

- A. Improve the work of the cultural clubs and organizations;
- B. Encourage cultural club leadership to collaborate on programming;
- C. Advertise and promote training opportunities for increasing understanding about the diverse population of ULV;
- D. Improve support and mentoring for first-generation students;
- E. Increase the OMS staff (only one full-time staff member who is the director);
- F. Allocate funds to hire an associate director;
- G. Increase funding to support development of a cultural resource library;
- H. Increase visits and support of regional campuses.

The report specifies a number of action plan steps for implementing recommendations, suggesting team follow up on progress.

An external review was conducted in 2011 by the senior coordinator for the office of student life and cultural centers at another nearby university. The report was thorough, providing analysis of data as well as assessment of progress and feasibility of achieving improvement

goals. This external evaluation summarized OMS primary strength as the high quality and integrity of the director's effectiveness in leading the diversity initiative through OMS programming and outreach to students.

The external reviewer made a number of suggestions for addressing areas of weakness including: OMS cannot be solely responsible for cultural programming and levels of consciousness regarding the role of diversity on campus. Importantly, the review suggested that OMS needs to develop a culture of assessment, align OMS outcomes with ULV learning outcomes, and focus on measures of success beyond satisfaction.

Due to limitations in program capacity and staffing, it did not appear that the OMS program review included assessment based on the rubric for administrative program reviews provided by the university (CFRs 2.11, 4.4).

Appendix B: Off-Campus and Distance Education Reports

Individual members of the team visited each of the campuses discussed in this appendix. The comments reflect the observations of the individual team member visiting the site. These observations were conveyed to the team for consideration in writing the team report

TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne, Bakersfield
Type of Visit: Off-site visit
Name of reviewer/s: Silas Abrego
Date/s of review: March 21, 2012

1. Site Name and Address: University of La Verne, Kern County Regional Campus, 1201 24th St., Suite D 200, Bakersfield, CA 93301
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)

In 1999, the University of La Verne established the Bakersfield Regional Campus to support the academic goals of working professionals in the Kern County area through quality degree programs in business, education, health administration and more. The baccalaureate programs offered include;

Business Administration
Health Administration
Liberal Studies
Organizational Management
Public Administration

Graduate Programs include:

Master of Business Administration for Experienced Professional, M.B.A.
Doctor of Organizational Leadership, Ed.E
Special Education, M. Ed
Educational Counseling, M.S.
Educational Management, M.Ed
Master of Health Administration, M.H.A.
Leadership and Management, M.S.
Multiple Subjects (Elementary) Credential
Single Subject (Secondary) Credential

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

Nora Dominguez, Regional Campus Director
 Kathryn Mears, Academic Advisor
 Faculty Members: 8 faculty members from various programs

4. Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The off campus site fits well with the mission of providing quality educational opportunities for working professionals in the Kern County area. The programs offered at the site are the same as on the main campus. The course syllabus of each course are developed on the main campus by lead faculty and taught by faculty at the site. The Centers for Educators also offer programs at the center and the courses are also developed by lead faculty on the main campus. The site programs are market driven and a minimum of students is required to sustain the programs. The site is overseen by a full time Regional Campus Director, assisted by two full time administrative assistants and one full time Academic that report to the Dean of Regional Campus Centers. Each of the Academic Programs has their own designated coordinator that report to the respective College Deans.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The visibility of the main campus at the Regional Center is minimal. There was a lot of excitement created when the ULV President visited the campus. Other offices from the main campus such as the Career Center, Library, Bookstore, are limited to one visit per term. The students, most working adults, appreciate having the main campus services brought to their site on a regular basis but they didn't show much enthusiasm for wanting to drive a long distance to participate in campus activities. The Regional Center Students do receive information via email on campus activities such as invited guest speakers, sports events, and other announcements. There was little evidence of integrating the off campus students into the life of the main campus.</p>	<p>Develop strategies designed to connect the main campus with off campus students.</p>

<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The Bakersfield Campus has ample space to conduct teaching. The students did express concern over the sub-par technological capabilities of the building. The students and faculty had complaints about the inability to connect to the internet. While I was there optic fiber was being installed so in the near future students will have the capabilities to connect without disruptions. The building included classrooms, office space, lab room, and storage space.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>The site has sufficient space to provide student services. On site is an Academic Advisor that provides preparatory advising upon request; student orientations prior to their first term; meet one on one as requested; the campus bookstore visits once each fall and spring term. Additionally, the bookstore has a mini store on site to sell school paraphernalia. Other services offered to students include the 24/7 Library services; Blackboard; graduation fair; a bus to the homecoming game; and online option for general educational and courses available to them. Some students raised concern about paying a shipping fee for text books while their counterparts on campus didn't. They recommend the bookstore deliver the books to the Regional Campus. Having to drive to the main campus to acquire their student ID was another concern. Supposedly they need to be on the main campus so a picture of them can be taken. They suggested the Regional Campus staff take a digital picture and forward it to the main campus. Students also mention their Instructors are second to none. They provide challenging work for them and know their subject matter well.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>Faculty is assigned depending if they are teaching for the Regional Campuses or for the Centers for Educators. For courses being taught under the auspices of the Centers for Educators main campus, lead faculty assigned the instructors. Courses being taught under the auspices of the Regional Campus the Regional Campus Director recommends the instructor to the campus department and they make the final judgment. It's not clear how off campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs. Off site campus faculty are invited to participate in monthly department meetings. The class syllabus and learning outcomes for core courses are developed by faculty at the main campus. Instructors at the offsite centers are required to shadow the lead faculty and learn technique and the material.</p>	<p>A consistent off campus faculty selection process needs to be adopted University wide. Additionally, strategies to involve off campus faculty in developing class learning outcomes.</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>Lead Faculty on the main campus develops the courses for both on and off campus programs. Other than the instructor and teaching style the content of the off campus course is the same as on campus.</p>	<p>None</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 Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects and compile the data on retention and graduation. The Office of Institutional Research provides the Regional Centers with Retention trends over 10 years. How this information is used at the Regional Center was not determined.</p>	<p>Data collected at the Regional Centers should be meaningful and helpful for the operations of the centers. Regional Directors should be asked what base line data they wish to have to run the Centers more efficiently and effectively.</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>Course Syllabus for 6 courses was reviewed. Each of the course syllabus listed learning objectives. Some objectives were written clearly with measurable criteria. Others course listed general skills students would acquire if they successfully complete the course. Required Core Courses did list learning outcomes. No comparative material on how learning assessment results compare to the main campus students was presented for review.</p>	<p>Develop common learning domains across all academic programs and criteria for assessing learning.</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>Assessing staff at the regional centers can be difficult because reporting structures differ so much. Regional Directors are evaluated by the Dean of the Regional Centers. However, academic program leaders are evaluated by their home department supervisors. Faculty is provided feedback via an evaluation form at the end of the class term. Additionally students are asked surveyed and asked about the qualities of the facilities, support services and their academic programs.</p>	

TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne @ Santa Clarita Satellite Center
 Type of Visit: Off-site visit
 Name of reviewer/s: Silas Abrego
 Date/s of review: March 20, 2012

1. Site Name and Address: 26455 Rockwell Canyon Rd., Santa Clarita, CA 91355
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 University of La Verne partnered with the College of the Canyons (COC) to serve students working towards their AA degree and continuing towards a Bachelor’s degree. There are two administrative units from the University that offer degree programs at COC, the Centers for Educators which is located at the main campus in La Verne and the San Fernando Valley Campus located in Burbank. The San Fernando Valley Regional Campus has been serving the Valley for over 30 years. It offers the following accelerated degree programs at the COC site: BA in Business Administration; BS in Organizational Management; BS in Child Development; MBA and MS in Leadership and Management. The Centers for Educators offer the Educational Counseling/Pupil Personnel Credential and the Educational Management/Administrative Credential at the COC site. The University of La Verne rents office and classroom space from the College of the Canyon. Staffing at the site is on an as needed basis and the courses and/or programs offered fluctuate depending on market demand.

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

The following individuals were interviewed;
Pam Bergovoy, Assistant Dean, Educational Programs
Dr. John Gruenewald, Assistant Professor, Counseling
Dr. Lanney Mayer, Associate Professor, Regional Director, Teacher Education
 Adjunct Faculty:
Dr. Ellen Longo, College of Education & Organization Leadership, teaches
 EDUC 504, Methods and Research
Dr. Skip Boyd, College of Business and Public Management, teaches BUS 665, Strategic
 Marketing Management
 Met with ten graduate students pursuing an MBA.

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,	The off campus site fits well with the mission of providing opportunities for working adults to pursue their educational and professional objectives. The programs offered at the off campus sites are similar if not the same as the main campus. The	None

<p>operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>bachelor degree programs and graduate programs follow the same core courses offered on the main campus, however, the site programs are market driven and a minimum of 7 students is needed to make a class. The programs are administered through the San Fernando Valley Regional Center and the Centers for Educators. The off-site centers require close collaboration with the main campus lead faculty, academic departments, Regional Centers, and Centers for Educators. Both the Regional Center Directors and Director of the Centers for Educators report to the Dean, Regional Campus Administration.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The main campus visibility at the off campus sites is minimal. The bookstore visits the off campus sites once a term. Students occasionally will receive emails from the main campus announcing activities and events. However, in my meetings with the students they didn't see the need for making a connection with the main campus. The MBA students I met with are adult working professionals with family, school, and work obligations. They expressed little interest in wanting to drive to the main campus. Off site adjunct faculty and full time faculty participate more regularly on the main campus through departmental meetings. Advisors and other staff only meet with students once a term and/or when an appointment is scheduled. The main contact for students at the off campus sites with ULV is through their instructors.</p>	<p>The MBA student cohort was minimal so it's not an accurate reflection of all students at the site. The ULV should inform students of the benefits of connecting with students from the main campus, joining clubs and student organizations, and interacting with faculty involved in research.</p>
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The University Center at the College of the Canyons was designed to house several universities and colleges. Campuses such as Cal State Bakersfield, Cal State Northridge, Brandman University, UCLA Extension and National University are all located in the building and provide educational programs for COC students. The University of La Verne rents office and classroom space which seemed appropriate for their purposes. The space also includes a student lounge and computer lab.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> <i>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>	<p>Student Support Services such as advising, financial aid counseling, career counseling, and learning support services are provided on an as needed basis. An advisor meets with the students once per term to develop individual educational plans. Students have access to the library 24/7 via on line. Students have access to content for multiple disciplines through 70+ online databases, 37,000+ online journals, and 65,000+ electronic books. Additionally, students have access to professional academic librarians via online chat. The graduate students I met with found library services more than satisfactory. Students pay a \$30 fee for library services and access to a computer lab.</p>	<p>Survey students to determine preferred frequency of contact with advisors. Provide more access to the Learning Enhancement Center for second language learners.</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure those off-campus faculties 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)</p>	<p>Faculty are selected or assigned depending if they are teaching for the Regional Campuses or the Centers for Educators. For courses taught under the auspices of the Centers for Educators the main campus faculty assigned to an area of instruction informs the Centers director who is assigned to teach the courses. For the Regional Campuses, the director recruits faculty and forwards their portfolios to the Dean of the College of Business and Public Management and that person approves or disapproves the faculty. It was not clear how off campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at the off site location. Off site campus faculty are invited to participate in monthly department meetings but I am unsure if they regularly attend the meetings. One off site faculty member did participate in developing the course syllabus and learning outcomes for the course he is teaching. The class syllabus and learning outcomes for core courses are developed by lead faculty at the main campus. Instructors at the off-site centers are required to shadow the lead faculty and learn instruction techniques for teaching the course. The faculty assesses student learning by evaluating and grading assignments. Additionally, students are asked via written assignments to provide evidence of meeting learning outcomes.</p>	<p>A consistent off campus faculty selection process should be adopted University wide. A more proactive process for involving off campus faculty in course and learning outcome development should be developed. A lot of the off campus faculty have years of hands on experience that may assist main campus faculty in developing learning outcomes.</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>Lead faculty on the main campus develops the courses for both on and off campus programs. Other than the instructor and teaching style the content of the off campus courses are the same as on campus.</p>	<p>No follow up recommendation</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>Evaluator did not have the opportunity to review data. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment does compile data and provided Graduation and Retention Trends Over 10 years; A Summary Analysis Report. However the report did not include segregated data by Satellite Centers or Regional Campuses.</p>	<p>Collect student data specifically for the satellite centers and Regional Campuses and make it easily accessible.</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>Each of the core courses has a set of Student Learning Outcomes however it was difficult to identify common goals across the degree programs. Additionally, there was no indication how the result would be used to improve programs.</p>	<p>Develop common learning domains across all academic programs and develop criteria for assessing learning.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurances 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>Each course syllabus outlines course description, goals of the course, learning outcomes, if it's a core course, and grading evaluation criteria. The course, Education 573, included a grading rubric and an assignment to be used in determining evidence for meeting the learning outcomes. At the end of the class students have an opportunity to provide the instructor feedback.</p>	

Appendix B: Off-Campus and Distance Education Reports
TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne, San Fernando Valley Campus

Type of Visit: Off-site visit

Name of reviewer/s: Barbara Karlin

Date/s of review: March 26, 2012

1. Site Address:

University of La Verne, San Fernando Valley
Regional Campus
4001 W. Alameda Ave, Suite 300
Burbank, CA 91505

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)

According to the web, The San Fernando Valley Campus has been serving the valley area for over 30 years. We offer accelerated degree programs for working adults in Burbank, Santa Clarita/College of the Canyons University Center, and at 10 corporate locations we are partnered with within a 25 mile radius. Our campus is led by the Executive Director with a team of professional and friendly staff. Most of the staff has been with La Verne for more than ten years.

Approximately 500 students take courses at the regional campus or one of its 10 corporate locations, approximately 65% at the undergraduate level. On average, the undergraduate students at this site transfer in to ULV approximately 60 units. Most are in the business programs. Attrition is around 15%.

Classes are offered during four ten week terms. Students typically take one or two classes each term. The average age of the students is mid-30s.

The majority of the classes are taught by a consistent group of adjunct faculty. In addition, the campus has two 75% full-time faculty members.

The baccalaureate programs offered include (2/3rds of the site enrollments);
Business Administration, B.A.
Organizational Management, B.S.
Child Development, B.S.

Graduate Programs include:

- Master of Business Administration for Experienced Professionals, M.B.A.
- Master of Science, Leadership and Management, MSLM.
- Educational Counseling, M.S.
- Educational Management, M.Ed.
- Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential

3. Nature of the Review):

Interviewed Administrators

- Nelly Kazman, Executive Director
- Nilva Nalbantian, Assist. Director & Academic Advisor

Faculty Members Interviewed: Caroline Cizever, Full time faculty liaison and faculty members from various programs

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The off campus site fits well with the mission of providing educational opportunities for working professionals in the San Fernando Valley area. The programs offered at the site are the same as on the main campus. The course syllabus of each course are developed on the main campus by lead faculty and taught by faculty at the site. The site is overseen by a full time Regional Campus Director, assisted by two full time administrative assistants and one full time Academic that report to the Dean of Regional Campus Centers.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The Campus Director is very involved in the life of the main campus. She is a representative on the university strategic vision committee and is at the main campus at least once a week. The Faculty indicated a feeling of closeness with the main campus and great enthusiasm for the new president who was at the Burbank site a few weeks before the WASC visit. The Director has close working relationship with the College Deans, particularly with the Business dean. The Director is also involved with the General Education rewrite committee, and attended an AACU Conference with the university provost, the regional dean and several of the college deans. The regional directors meet together once a month to discuss common issues and frequently talk throughout the week</p>	<p>None</p>
---	---	-------------

<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The campus has ample space to conduct teaching. The building is safe with student parking available. Classrooms are fully equipped with appropriate technological aids.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>The site has sufficient space to provide student services. An Academic Advisor is onsite who, along with the director, provides new students with an orientation to ULV and shares the support services available. The campus has 4 advisors who go to each class at least once a term during the first 5 weeks. Library and career services are provided centrally from the main campus.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The Regional Campus Director and the full-time faculty campus liaison recommend the instructor to the campus department who makes the final hiring decision. The class syllabus and learning outcomes for core courses are developed by faculty at the main campus. New faculty members are put in touch with a course champion to assist in mentoring the new faculty member. The faculty with whom I met indicated that they have a definite voice in the development of the course curriculum and are invited to participate in curricular discussions.</p> <p>Faculty indicated that once a year they are invited to an “all faculty” meeting on the main campus.</p>	<p>None</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>Lead Faculty on the main campus develop the courses for both on and off campus programs. Other than the instructor and teaching style the content of the off campus course is the same as on campus.</p>	<p>None</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 Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects and compile the data on retention and graduation. The Office of Institutional Research provides the Regional Centers with Retention trends over 10 years. It was unclear how the staff or faculty used such data in decision-making.</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>All core classes in the business program use the same assessments and the share with the dean. The adjunct faculty indicated they have been invited to help create a consistent assessment tool.</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>It appears that quality assurance is gained through the university-wide assessment process as well as analysis by the central campus of the retention and graduation results. There was a good deal of evidence that the performance at the regional campuses is compared to the performance of students at the central campus to identify areas of inconsistency.</p>	

Appendix B: Off-Campus and Distance Education Reports
TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne, Ontario Regional Campus

Type of Visit: Off-site visit

Name of reviewer/s: Barbara Karlin

Date/s of review: March 26, 2012

1. Site Address:

University of La Verne, Ontario Regional Campus
3237 Guasti Road, Suite 300
Ontario, California

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)

According to the web,

The Ontario Campus, first established in 1993, serves a diverse group of adult learners in the San Gabriel Valley, and along the I-10, I-15 and I-215 corridors. In addition to the Ontario campus location, the regional campus operates multiple satellite programs at corporate and other sites throughout the east San Gabriel Valley and the Inland Empire.

ULV reported that there are 330 students who take classes at the regional site or at one of 10 of its sites. It is the 2nd largest regional campus in the ULV system. UG units make up approximately 60% of the units and are declining. Graduate enrollments are reported to be stable. Business administration is the largest undergraduate program. Classes are offered during four ten week terms. Students typically take one or two classes each term. The average age of the students is mid-30s.

The majority of the classes are taught by a consistent group of adjunct faculty

The baccalaureate programs offered include (2/3rds of the site enrollments);

Undergraduate Programs

- Business Administration, B.A.
- Child Development, B.S.
- Health Administration, B.S.
- Liberal Studies, B.A.
- Organizational Management, B.S.
- Public Administration, B.S.

Graduate Programs include:

- Master of Business Administration for Experienced Professionals, M.B.A.
- Leadership and Management, M.S.

3. Nature of the Review:

Interviewed Administrators

Allen Stout, Campus Director
 Sylvia Lopez, **Academic Advisor**
 Millicent Spencer, Academic Advisor

Faculty Members Interviewed: 3 adjunct faculty members

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The off campus site fits well with the mission of providing educational opportunities for working professionals in the Inland Empire region. The programs offered at the site are the same as on the main campus. The course syllabus of each course are developed on the main campus by lead faculty and taught by faculty at the site. The site is overseen by a full time Regional Campus Director, assisted by two full time administrative assistants and two full time Academic Advisors.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The director sits on the university library committee and participates in the meetings with the Director of Regions and the other regional directors and college deans. The University president recently came to the campus to visit with faculty, students and staff and the administrators and adjunct faculty expressed a sense of connection to the central campus.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The campus has ample space to conduct teaching. ULV just moved into the building which is new with 6-8 well equipped classrooms The building is safe with plentiful student parking available.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>The site has sufficient space to provide student services. Two Academic Advisor are onsite who, along with the director, advise students. Library and career services are provided centrally from the main campus.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The Regional Campus Director hires the instructors who are also approved by the full-time faculty located at the central campus. The class syllabus and learning outcomes for core courses are developed by faculty at the main campus. New faculty members are put in touch with a course champion to assist in mentoring the new faculty member. The faculty with whom I met indicated that they have a definite voice in the development of the course curriculum and are invited to participate in curricular discussions.</p> <p>Faculty indicated that once a year they are invited to an “all faculty” meeting on the main campus.</p>	<p>None</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>Lead Faculty on the main campus develop the courses for both on and off campus programs. Other than the instructor and teaching style the content of the off campus course is the same as on campus.</p>	<p>None</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 Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects and compile the data on retention and graduation. The Office of Institutional Research provides the Regional Centers with Retention trends over 10 years. The director was not able to put his hands on the retention data for the site.</p>	<p>Each regional director should be examining the retention and graduation data to determine areas for possible 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>The adjunct faculty indicated that 20% of each class is determined by central campus for assessment purposes. Student evaluations are completed online and result in a very low return rate, so they do not provide much helpful information.</p>	<p>Determine a more effective method for gathering student opinion about the quality of instructors and individual classes.</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>It appears that quality assurance is gained through the university-wide assessment process as well as analysis by the central campus of the retention and graduation results. There was a good deal of evidence that the performance at the regional campuses is compared to the performance of students at the central campus to identify areas of inconsistency.</p>	
--	---	--

TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne, Whittier campus

Type of Visit: EER

Name of reviewer/s: Ludmila Praslova

Date/s of review: March 22, 2012

1. Site Name and Address
Rio Hondo Community College, 3600 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601
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)

Rio Hondo site offers 2 programs: BA in Business Administration (currently 23 students) and BS in Child Development (currently 12 students). Organizational management program does not have a current cohort. Students typically complete an AA degree at Rio Hondo community college prior to applying to ULV programs. This is a satellite, teaching only off-campus-site, with administrative units located at Irvine Orange County campus, served by faculty from the main campus at La Verne as well as by adjunct faculty. The site has been established in 2005 to serve students in Whittier area. During 2010-2012 academic terms, the average percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty 28% and part-time faculty 72%.

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

Review was conducted as a part of EER visit. Visit included

- Interviews with Jane Courcy, Director, Orange County Campus-Irvine; Alison Rodriguez-Balles, Admissions and Corporate Education Specialist, Lisa Murphy (Academic Advisor), and Cynthia Olivas (Associate Professor of Education/Faculty Coordinator for the Child Development Program).
- Class visit: BUS 346 – Written Business Communication.
- Exploring the facility,
- Syallbi review
- Review of historical site documents, documents about Regional Campus Administration (RCA), retention and graduation reports, assessment reports (program review for BSOM) and program curriculum materials.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>ULV has many off-campus sites; providing multiple degree programs, especially adult programs, outside of main campus, is typical for ULV, which acknowledges its “complex structure” and a mission to serve adult students in convenient locations. Rio Hondo was established in 2005 to provide degree completion programs in a convenient for students location, as a partnership with Rio Hondo Community College.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>This is a teaching site. Student advisor visits the site ones every term (10 wks). Transfer admissions representative visits Rio Hondo campus monthly for transfer fairs. Students are welcomed to participate in a variety of activities and services through Orange County regional center or La Verne main campus.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i>How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>Because Rio Hondo is a teaching site, most student-faculty contact occurs in class. The facility is recently renovated and adequate for learning. Representatives of ULV Orange County campus regularly communicate with Rio Hondo administration.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>This is a teaching site. ULV conducts a new student orientation, and student advisor visits the site ones every term (10 wks). Other services are provided through Orange County regional center or La Verne main campus.</p> <p>NSSE data indicates 3.29 (scale 1-4) satisfaction with advising and institutional support for RCA/non-traditional students (vs. 3.25 for main campus, n.s.).</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>During 2010-2012 academic terms, the average percentage of classes taught by full-time faculty was 28%, and part-time faculty 72%. Full time faculty are from the main campus. Curriculum is centrally designed and is the same across all sites, and overseen by respective schools of the main campus. Adjunct faculty participate in workshops on</p>	

	<p>curriculum and assessment. They also participate in meetings where can provide feedback regarding the curriculum. Assessment elements are embedded into various courses in the curriculum, which is a mechanism through which all instructors participate in assessment.</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>Curriculum is centrally designed, is the same across all sites, and is overseen by the respective college of the university.</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 site reports overall retention rates in the range of 79-95%, which compare favorably to main campus, and cohort graduation rates of 85%-100%. The staff are very satisfied with these rates.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: 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>Assessment elements are embedded into various courses in the curriculum, which is the same across all sites.</p> <p>A brief summary of B.S. in Child Development program data, disaggregated by main campus and RCA, showed generally comparable results, with students scoring between 3 and 4 on 4-point assessments. No other disaggregated data based on direct assessment were provided.</p>	<p>There may need to be further development in understanding the role of direct assessment of student learning.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? EER: What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Based on the information available (a brief summary of B.S. in Child Development program data, which did provide data disaggregated by main campus and RCA and showed generally comparable results, with students scoring between 3 and 4 on 4-point rubrics.</p>	

Other comments.

- Faculty clearly articulated that most assessment activities rely on student work embedded in the curriculum.
- Faculty and staff described meetings and retreat related to the strategic visioning and La Verne experience work, and were excited about their participation in this process.
- The change in the reporting structure (regional centers manager moving to report to provost) impacted them did not seem to impact faculty and staff interviewed.
- Students commented on their enjoyment of the program and on how they are already able to apply material they learned in the previous course to their work.
- Course session visited was the first session on a new term, and was largely focused on building rapport between students and the instructor.

TEAM REPORT APPENDIX: OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Institution: University of La Verne, Westchester site

Type of Visit: EER

Name of reviewer/s: Maria Zack

Date/s of review: March 22, 2012

1. Site Name and Address
Westchester, 5651 W. Manchester Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90045
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)

This location is in a Police Department building and is part of a partnership with the City of Los Angeles to provide education to public employees. There are two cohorts that meet in this location. One cohort is BA and on is MA level in Organizational Management. The instructors are long-term adjuncts who also teach on the main campus.

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

Review was conducted as a part of EER visit. Visit included

- Interviews with Nelly Kazman, Director of the San Fernando Valley Campus (in Burbank), Dr. Monye, adjunct faculty in the College of Business and Public Administration.
- Class visit of graduate business class (this was the first night of the course)
- Brief tour of the space.
- Review of a few documents related to student graduation and retention in Regional Campus Administration (RCA) locations.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The university has a large number of locations beyond LaVerne. It clearly sees providing educational access as part of their core mission. The site is a “satellite” in space that is provided by the City of LA. There are two cohorts (one BA and one MA) being taught at this site. The work of this site is under the supervision of the director of the Burbank Regional Campus.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The presence is limited because they do not occupy the space full time. The students in the class that was visited have been part of a cohort for several months. They indicated that they feel very connected to LaVerne. All have visited the Burbank Campus and many have visited the LaVerne Campus. They appreciated that LaVerne brought both classes and resources to them.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The environment was pleasant and professional. They are using training rooms for the Police Department and there is appropriate technology in place.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>Students said that they appreciated the fact that counselors, financial aid advisors and other were readily available to them by phone and email. All of these students are working professionals so it was critical to them that they can reach a human being quickly when they needed answers. There is an excellent library system which mails books to their home if the resources needed are not available via databases and other electronic means available through the library.</p>	

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The course that I observed was taught by a long-term adjunct. The university appears to have a significant collection of long-term engaged adjuncts and interviews both at the Westchester site and on the LaVerne campus indicate that LaVerne has developed a very good system for integrating adjuncts into the institution (involving them in course design, doing regular trainings with the lead teacher for a course, etc.)</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 university has a centralized system for course development and design. There is a lead instructor for each course and that individual is a full-time faculty member. The lead instructor serves as a resource to all individuals who are teaching the course. LaVerne clearly works hard to maintain consistency in curriculum and class delivery across all 10 campuses. It appears to be working well.</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 and Graduation data appears to be consistent across centers. See the EER report for detailed information about retention and graduation.</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>There is a centralized system for gathering learning outcomes. Assessment is done primarily via embedded course assignments using a single rubric. The work to use two-reader agreement and to calibrate the use of the rubric varies by program.</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>Based on the limited data that was seen it appears that there is relative uniformity in success and achievement across campuses. LaVerne is extremely focused on maintaining consistency and has spent a number of years putting good systems into place.</p>	

OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY – School of Law

1. INSTITUTION:

University of LaVerne

2. SITE NAME and LOCATION (include physical address):

La Verne College of Law. 320 East D Street, Ontario, CA 91764

3. TEAM MEMBERS WHO REVIEWED THIS SITE:

Patricia Breen and Maryann Jones

4. CONTEXT (for example, number of programs offered at site, degree levels offered at site, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition)

The law school is located ten minutes from main campus and offers the JD degree. The school very recently received a new grant of provisional approval from the American Bar Association. There are 171 full-time students and 69 part-time students. There are 21 full-time members of the faculty and 27 adjunct faculty members.

5. DATE VISITED and LENGTH OF VISIT:

March 27, 2012
Visit lasted 2 ½ hours

6. VISITED IN CONJUNCTION WITH (check all that apply):

- CPR
- EER
- Special Visit
- Substantive Change review
- Other (please explain)

7. DESCRIPTION OF ON SITE INTERACTIONS (with whom did reviewers speak, in what contexts?):

Team members met with the Interim Dean, Academic Dean, Dean of Admissions, Director of Career Services, and attended open meetings with students, student leaders, and faculty.

8. OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED (prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit):

EER report and appendix pertaining to assessment efforts at the College of Law
ABA action letters
Self-Study to the ABA
ABA site visit report
A sampling of course syllabi
Samples of Faculty Scholarship

OFF-CAMPUS SITE – OBSERVATIONS, FINDINGS, COMMENTS

<p>Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.</p>	<p>Observations and Findings</p>	<p>Note here if follow-up is needed, and identify the follow-up issues.</p>
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)</p>	<p>The law school is located in a very attractive 65,000 square foot facility in the city of Ontario. There are ample and nicely appointed classrooms, a spacious library with over 300,000 volumes, and ample room for offices and student services. The school has an adequate number of faculty and staff members to meet its educational mission.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)</p>	<p>The law school provides the full extent of student services to include academic and career counseling. The library collection is of an appropriate size for the institution. The computer and technology needs of the faculty, students, and staff appear to be met. The College of Law is essentially self-sufficient in terms of direct student services although some basic infrastructure services are available from the main campus. Students appeared quite satisfied with the level of service.</p>	<p>The College of Law currently conducts no assessment of the co-curricular programs (CFR2.11)</p>
<p><i>Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)</p>	<p>The law school seems eager to become more fully integrated into the university. The law school participates on university committees and the Faculty Senate. The Associate Dean is a member of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, thus involved in critical faculty governance. The law school is just beginning to take advantage of resources of the university in terms of institutional research, assessment, and pedagogy.</p>	<p>Upon achieving full ABA approval, the college of law can then take better advantage of its relationship with the university through more dual degree programs and other cross-disciplinary programs. As the law school works to develop an assessment plan and a data collection plan, it should more fully utilize the resources of the university.</p>

<p><i>Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to off-campus activities.</i> In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to activities at this site? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</p>	<p>The law school does not have an assessment plan or the basic infrastructure elements of such a plan, including defined learning outcomes, a map linking outcomes to the courses, or rubrics for faculty evaluation of student performance. Most syllabi do not have student learning outcomes. The law school does not engage in traditional program reviews and assessment efforts lag substantially behind those of the other schools in the university. The law school does, however, engage in extensive analysis of data on student entrance credentials, law school grades, attrition, support programs, as well as and bar passage, and many curricular and academic and bar support innovations have resulted from this assessment.</p>	<p>Suggest a follow up report on law school assessment efforts in two years. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6 and 2.7)</p>
<p><i>Context of this site in the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>The law school is one of the four schools within the university and fits comfortably within the mission of the school. The law school focuses on legal education for a diverse and underserved community. The mission to incorporate theory and practice is entirely consistent with that of the institution.</p>	
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The College of Law can best be described as in emerging stages of evidence-based decision making and assessment of student outcomes. The law school has been primarily driven by the requirements of its programmatic accreditor (ABA) and has, of necessity, devoted the bulk of its time and energy in achieving ABA approval. Nonetheless, the current state of evaluation of student learning fails to satisfy the expectations of WASC Standards. (CRFs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, and 2.7)</p>	<p>Recommend a follow-up report on status of assessment and data collection efforts by the College of Law in two years.</p>

Appendix C: Credit Hour Report

Team Report Appendix

Institution: University of LaVerne

CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Kind of Visit: EER

Date: March 27, 2012

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all CPR, EER and Initial Accreditation Visits. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	Yes
	Comments:	
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)?	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments:	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	Yes, in most cases, however institutional review of actual practice needed
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The school serves both traditional and non-traditional students. While all of their formats meet the technical requirements for the credit hour, campus reviews indicate that the practice is not aligned with the printed schedule in some cases.</p> <p>The majority of undergraduate classes taught are 4 semester units or 3000 minutes of instruction (using a 50 minute credit hour).</p> <p>Traditional students take classes that last for 16 weeks with an additional week of final exams. The 1, 2 and 3 unit classes appear to meet the standards. The 4-unit classes are very close to the time limit for a credit hour: 46 meetings lasting 60 minutes plus 180 minutes of final exam = 2940 minutes.</p> <p>CAPA (five week classes) and RCA (10 week classes) for non-traditional adult learners are taught in compressed formats. RCA students meet for a total of 3000 minutes over the course of 10 weeks (10 300-minute sessions). However in interviews, some RCA staff members indicated that students are given breaks in the middle of class sessions and that</p>	

	<p>the class sessions can end 30 or more minutes before the end of the period. CAPA students' on-ground classes meet for 5 weeks in a Friday/Saturday format. The scheduled time for the 10 sessions is a total of 3200 minutes, but students in CAPA courses are given 1 hour lunch breaks on Saturdays and other breaks during Friday and Saturday instruction. These breaks drop the instructional time to approximately 2800 minutes.</p> <p>Leaders at LaVerne are aware of the need to sample and test the three types of classes listed above to determine the extent to which classes are in practice are dropping below the 3000 hour level and to see if the instructors are using technology or special projects to compensate for the reduction in seat time.</p>	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	<p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both How many syllabi were reviewed? 3 for hybrid and 3 for online What degree level(s)? bachelors and masters What discipline(s)? Business and Education</p>	
	<p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</p>	Yes
	<p>Comments: The syllabi reviewed for both on-line and hybrid classes appear to contain a sufficient amount of work to justify the units awarded for the classes.</p> <p>One of the sample syllabi provided to the visiting team, the syllabus for EDUC 349 contains the following statement: "Course Format – Hybrid. This course is being offered in a hybrid format. Instead of 5 hours of lecture (in-class time) and 2 hours of study/prep (out of class time) each week, we will be in-class 2 ½ hours, hybrid 2 ½ hours, and plan to spend approximately 2 hours for reading, studying, preparing assignments, etc. each week." This appears to be implying that the total work for a 4 unit class taught over the period of 10 weeks is 70 hours. This is not consistent with LaVerne's policy on credit hours. There may need to be an audit of hybrid syllabi. Based on seat time alone, the credit hour requirement may not be fulfilled in courses such as this one. However ULV defines credit hours based on learning outcomes, so there is not a direct correlation with seat time.</p>	
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)	<p>What kinds of courses? Clinical experiences, internships, studio courses, independent/directed study, laboratory classes, service learning courses How many syllabi were reviewed? 3 for each type other than independent/directed study (which had forms) What degree level(s)? undergrad and grad What discipline(s)? Business, Education, Biology, Sociology, Community Service, Art</p>	
	<p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</p>	Yes
	<p>Clinical courses – 300 hours of experience is equivalent to one unit of credit Internships – The number of hours for credit varies from 24-50 hours of participation per unit. Note that 25 hours of participation is equivalent to 1 unit of credit using a 50 minute hour. The course with 24 hours of internship work per unit also had a few class meetings which appear to more than account for the needed time to satisfy the unit requirement. Studio courses – Two of the three syllabi reviewed seemed to have adequate class time to meet the standards. The length of the class meeting(s) was not stated on the third syllabus. Independent and Directed Study – forms provided but no information about the amount of work per unit. The chair reviews the form but there is no indication of work expected for each unit of credit. Laboratory classes – It appears that these classes align with expectations for laboratory and lecture combinations. Service Learning classes – the class meetings, assignments and service expectations are consistent with the allocated credit.</p>	

