

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

**To John Paul the Great Catholic University**

**March 10 – 12, 2021**

John Derry (Team Chair)  
President Emeritus  
Hope International University

Ludmila Praslova (Assistant Chair)  
Accreditation Liaison Officer, Professor and Director, Graduate Organizational Psychology  
Vanguard University of Southern California

Alice Knudsen  
Director of Institutional Research Planning and Academic Assessment, retired  
Mills College

June Klein  
Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer  
Palo Alto University

Tamela Hawley (WSCUC Staff Liaison)  
Vice President  
WSCUC

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History .....3  
B. Description of Team’s Review Process .....5  
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....6

**SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions .....7  
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators .....10  
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees.....19  
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation .....21  
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation .....23  
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence.....26  
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment .....31  
H. Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes - Not Required.....33  
I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement.....33

**SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW**

Commendations .....34  
Recommendations.....35

**APPENDICES**

A. Federal Compliance Forms  
    1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review .....37  
    2. Marketing and Recruitment Review .....39  
    3. Student Complaints Review.....40  
    4. Transfer Credit Review.....41  
B. Distance Education Review (not applicable)

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

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

In 2004, John Paul the Great Catholic University (JPGCU) was incorporated in California and recognized by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization. In 2005 the university was approved by the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE) to operate as a degree granting institution.

Inspired by Pope St. John Paul II, the founders' vision was to establish a niche university that would develop future creators, innovators, leaders, and entrepreneurs whose work and lives are guided by the spiritual, moral, and social teachings of Jesus Christ. The curriculum rigorously prepares students to challenge a world in which there is an explosion of knowledge but not of understanding, a lack of trust and ethics in leadership and the media, a need for new firms that demonstrate a moral and ethical purpose, and an obligation to recognize intrinsic human value. JPGCU's mission is *to impact culture for Christ by forming students as creators and innovators, leaders and entrepreneurs in the Creative Arts and Business Innovation and steeped in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition.*

The original campus operated from leased facilities in a suburb of San Diego. Then in 2013 it was relocated to the downtown area of Escondido where buildings were purchased and improved to accommodate classrooms, student activities, academic offices, and administrative operations. This major investment included a 24,000 square foot building and a 5,600 square foot student life center. Additional facilities were leased adjacent to the property owned by the university expanding the usable space to over 40,000 square feet. In 2016 two more buildings were acquired with renovations taking place to provide a chapel and facilities for the creative arts program.

The WSCUC accreditation process was initiated in 2007 with eligibility approved in May of that year. Following a Capacity and Preparatory Review and an Educational Effectiveness Review, the Commission granted candidacy status in March 2011 and initial accreditation in March 2015.

Student enrollment grew from 30 freshmen in Fall 2006 to 285 undergraduate and 21 graduate students in Fall 2018. Current enrollment stands at 275 undergraduate students. The university has 12 full-time professors and 27 adjunct professors, as well as 23 full-time and 6 part-time administrative staff.

JPGCU offers a Bachelor of Science in Business and a Bachelor of Science in Communications Media with five areas of emphasis (producing, production, screenwriting, new evangelization, and animation and gaming). In Summer 2016, JPGCU submitted a substantive change proposal to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Humanities. Approval was granted and the program began in Fall 2017. At the graduate level JPGCU offered a Master of Business Administration (MBA) in Film Producing and a Master of Arts (MA) in Biblical Theology (a majority of the students in the MA in Biblical Theology attended in an online modality). Due to the State of California not participating in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), the university found it was not cost effective to maintain approval in all states where students were enrolled. Therefore, JPGCU elected to discontinue online offerings and began a teach out process for this degree program. With growing competition and decreasing enrollment in the MBA program, in July 2019 a decision was reached to discontinue the degree and a teach out process was implemented. Deciding to terminate a program that is aligned with the mission of the university, but is not yielding the anticipated results, can be difficult and impacts students,

faculty, and constituents. The team commends JPGCU for appropriately using data in decision-making and effectively managing the teach-out of graduate programs.

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

JPGCU's Institutional Review (IR) Report was submitted to WSCUC in August 2019, along with supporting attachments. This information was reviewed by the WSCUC appointed visiting team in advance of the Off-Site Review (OSR) meeting. The team requested several additional financial/planning and student success documents, that were provided in advance of the OSR.

The OSR was conducted at the WSCUC offices on October 17, 2019. It resulted in the team identifying seven lines of inquiry to pursue further during the Accreditation Visit (AV). Additional financial, assessment, and student success documents (33 items in total) were requested and received prior to the AV. JPGCU also provided several documents requested as team members were preparing their sections of the report.

The visit was originally scheduled to be conducted in person on March 31 - April 3, 2020. However, due to the COVID19 pandemic, the AV was conducted virtually March 9-12, 2021 during which the team conducted further reviews of institutional documents and video interviews with faculty, staff, administrative personnel, trustees, and students to refine its initial findings. The institution also presented a virtual showcase of student work.

The Accreditation Visit team thoroughly reviewed the institutional report and other materials provided by the institution and several messages received through the confidential email account. Team members accepted responsibilities as primary and secondary readers of each area of review within their areas of expertise. They prepared worksheets reviewing each of the components, standards, federal required policies, the Inventory of Institutional Effectiveness

Indicators, and all other relevant materials. Team members and the WSCUC liaison worked collaboratively to thoroughly evaluate information and to determine the extent of compliance with WSCUC and federal requirements, institutional strengths, and the need for improvements.

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

JPGCU submitted a forty-nine-page Institutional Review (IR) Report and a set of appendices to support reaffirmation of institutional accreditation. Supporting documentation was generally easy to access, primarily using Box.com and hyperlinks. The IR Report followed the eight-component organizational structure outlined in the 2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation with a section dedicated to addressing each topical area.

The report outlined the current state of the institution along with a history of its Catholic and academic mission and vision. Each of the components and standards were addressed with supporting evidence along the lines of inquiry. The report was clearly organized, written, and presented. Some portions were somewhat brief and required further detailed examination. In addition, because the review occurred almost a year later than was originally scheduled, much information needed to be updated and was provided promptly upon request. The completion of the self-study was a campus-wide initiative under the leadership of the (former) ALO that engaged multiple groups and constituencies, including the president and senior administrative leadership, and to some extent trustees, faculty, staff, and students.

Institutional and comparative data provided a helpful foundation for drawing conclusions. Because of the institutional focus on its mission, searching questions, considerations, and reflections during the visit were largely framed through the lens of this mission. Completing the self-evaluation process using the Review under WSCUC Standards helped JPGCU identify areas

of strength and those that need attention. For example, the institution identified philanthropy and creating a more tightly integrated academic and financial planning process as areas of development and began addressing them immediately, although the approach to advancement changed due to the pandemic.

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

### **A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Recommendations**

The Educational Effectiveness Review that took place in October 2014 included six recommendations that were addressed in the Commission Action Letter of March 6, 2015.

1. The team acknowledges the emphasis on professional development and in-service training received by JPGCU staff and recommends this activity be incorporated into regular performance reviews as individual improvement plans to perpetuate a culture of quality (CFR 3.3).

The annual staff evaluation process was reviewed by the team and reflected a focus on professional growth and development that contributes to quality education. Agreements with immediate supervisors identify goals and skills to be developed in the next year along with strategies to achieve the desired objectives.

2. The team recommends that JPGCU continue to build a culture of data-driven decision making and become increasingly proficient in using evidence to assess financial sustainability, progress in operational plans, and student learning outcomes (CFRs 1.7, 4.1, 4.2).

Use of data is becoming a greater part of the JPGCU culture as evidenced in program review and strategic planning processes. The Office of Institutional Research manages the collection and dissemination of relevant information using data integration software that provides

opportunity for further analysis by faculty and administration. This data is communicated to senior administrators and trustees through selected key performance indicators. The admissions office has implemented enrollment management software that facilitates evaluation and timely communication with prospective students.

3. The team recommends that JPGCU carefully manage the growing workload of faculty to ensure they have the time and resources necessary to maintain professional productivity while engaging in teaching, service, and assessment (CFRs 2.4, 2.8, 2.9, 4.4).

JPGCU faculty and administration collaborated to clearly define appropriate levels of academic responsibilities, including instruction and advising. Policies and processes were implemented for department chairs to manage faculty workload using the AAUP standards of teaching responsibility of twelve credits per quarter (four distinct three-credit classes) assigned exclusively to teaching. JPGCU has placed a high priority on faculty instruction and student interaction. Opportunities and resources have been provided for professional development including society memberships, travel to conferences, support for creative scholarly projects, and professional networking. Funds have been allocated in the annual budget for these purposes and faculty acknowledge it has become a part of their professional growth and ongoing evaluation.

4. The team recommends JPGCU engage in proactive efforts to increase gender and ethnic diversity on the faculty and senior leadership (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.1).

The university has made a concerted effort to address diversity with some positive results. Faculty and staff hiring practices have been refined to identify a qualified and diverse pool of candidates for every open position. Twenty-five percent of the President's Cabinet members are women. However, the number of women represented on the eleven-member board of

trustees has decreased from three to one and three trustees are non-white. Among full and part time faculty 31% are women and 12% are non-white.

5. The team recognizes that co-curricular programs utilize data to make decisions in many important ways, and recommends the university develop a more sophisticated suite of methods, including direct assessments, to evaluate and co-curricular areas of student life and spiritual formation (CFR 2.11).

As noted in recommendation two above, the collection of data relevant to evaluation has become more sophisticated and systematic within the university. Student Life has developed and implemented direct measures of co-curricular programs used to document effectiveness. These include retention rates, academic probation rates, GPA data, student participation in co-curricular activities, internship placements, alumni job placement data, and student satisfaction surveys.

6. The team recommends that JPGCU define expected proficiency for undergraduate core competencies (oral communication, written communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, critical thinking) at a level of rigor adequate to a bachelor's degree, and ensure graduates obtain that level of competency (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.6).

JPGCU has designed rubrics, used by faculty in developing courses, to measure institutional learning outcomes which include all undergraduate core competencies, and have aligned these competencies with program learning objectives that are then reflected in specific course assignments. This structure is used for ongoing assessment and evaluation at the course, program, and institutional level. To date, the core competencies are not assessed directly but only through the program learning outcomes, and often without reference to the rubrics.

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

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

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 1.

**Institutional Purposes.** JPGCU has a clear mission statement that describes its purpose and values (CFR 1.1): “to impact culture for Christ by forming students as creators and innovators, leaders and entrepreneurs in the Creative Arts and Business Innovation and steeped in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition.” JPGCU’s priorities are “holistic student formation within a campus culture of excellence in creativity and innovation and a sharp focus on institutional sustainability.”

Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution. An institutional roadmap, detailed in the 2025 Strategic Plan, and assessment documents indicate that curricula and program learning outcomes are aligned with the mission. (CFR 1.2) During the visit, faculty, staff, and administration clearly articulated their commitment to the institutional mission.

The institution defines its commitment to inquiry, creativity, and diversity through the lens of its mission (CFRs 1.3, 1.4). The institution needs to continue to self-monitor and develop in the area of diversity, but there is commitment to continuous learning and improvement.

**Integrity and Transparency.** JPGCU is committed to ensuring all policies and procedures are clearly communicated throughout the organization, especially to faculty and students, as is evidenced through a series of handbooks and related publications. The institutional

website includes pages where JPGCU truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public (CFR 1.6). JPGCU exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations; the institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. (CFR 1.7) Transparency in reporting self-study findings was demonstrated, for example, as the university identified a weakness under CFR 1.4, response to diversity, and made a commitment to additional work. Institutional representatives also demonstrated transparency during the visit and were forthcoming with information. (CFRs 1.6, 1.8)

**Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions.**

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 2.

**Teaching and Learning.** JPGCU laid a solid foundation for its assessment and review processes. Academic programs are systematically reviewed, and assessment processes are in place for the core curriculum and all programs. (CFRs 2.1-2.7) Programs have well-developed learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6) In establishing the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree, undergraduate and graduate levels of learning outcomes were differentiated, assessed, and analyzed for results. (CFR 2.2a-b) Student learning in the core curriculum is tracked by assessing core outcomes and these are aligned with the institutional learning outcomes. (CFR 2.2a) Assessment of outcomes by the faculty makes use of multiple measures, including developmental rubrics with levels of achievement. (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6) The institution self-identified the need to improve its assessment of the institutional learning outcomes and disseminating the results of program reviews and maintaining high standards for all programs. (CFRs 2.5, 2.7)

**Scholarship and Creativity.** Faculty are expected to engage in professional activities. Because of the institutional focus on teaching, much of this creative activity is focused on developing student projects. JPGCU self-identified the need to strengthen connections between faculty creativity and scholarship with student learning outcomes and institutional goals (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

**Student Learning and Success.** Generally, JPGCU provides useful analyses of retention and graduation disaggregated by various student cohorts so these can be tracked separately for their progress in remaining at the institution and graduating in a timely manner. (CFR 2.10) Transfer student information, admissions requirements, and transfer policy are clearly posted on the website. The university is confident in its learning support services for students. (CFR 2.13) However, the institution relies heavily on individual student self-reporting of problems and could be more proactive in targeting support for at-risk groups of students that are revealed in the retention and graduation rate data.

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

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 3.

**Faculty and Staff.** The team found the faculty and staff to be engaged, dedicated to the mission and vision of the university, and collaborative. The current faculty and staff ratios, compared to the student population, are at levels similar to the statistics originally submitted to WSCUC in 2019. Faculty demographics continue to be less diverse than the student body with the entering class of 2019 at 30% Hispanic/Latino. The demographic data submitted as of 2018 does not show any Hispanic/Latino full-time faculty or part-time faculty and only 17% non-

White full-time staff. While the 2025 strategic plan discusses efforts to diversify the faculty and the past problems with the limited prospect pool (low diversity of qualified faculty), most of the candidates still come from personal references.

One of the obstacles to attracting faculty and staff applicants who are both diverse and highly qualified may be the workload. Although JPGCU believes that institutional teaching loads correspond to AAUP standards, they exceed AAUP maximum recommended loads for undergraduate instruction defined as “a teaching load of twelve hours per week, with no more than six separate course preparations during the academic year. This statement of maximum workload presumes a traditional academic year of not more than thirty weeks of classes.” In addition, JPGCU Faculty Handbook indicates that “The faculty senate recognizes that for faculty to create a robust culture of scholarship, they themselves will have to possess a passion and vigor and give generously of their own time for scholarship.” It is likely that this statement was intended as an expression of missional commitment. However, the expectation of investing “vigor and own time” is statistically likely to systematically disadvantage women, who disproportionately carry caretaking responsibilities and have less time to invest, as well as individuals with disabilities and those struggling with economic disadvantage. Such inequities tend to negatively impact the hiring and retention of those from disadvantaged groups.

The team recommends JPGCU develop a strategy and training to address cultural, gender, racial, disability, and ethnic diversity at all levels, including faculty, staff, administration, and trustees, to better prepare students for a multicultural workplace. The team recognized the challenges JPGCU faces with being a deeply committed Catholic institution offering specialized programs. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1)

Staff members report to one of five vice presidents managing enrollment & student success, academics, finances/technology/human resources/advancement, student formation/campus life, and academic administration. New staff are evaluated at six months and then annually. A faculty handbook clarifies employment issues of faculty, as well as faculty specific issues such as faculty responsibilities and common grading rubrics. The employee handbook is thorough, explicit, and up to date (January 2020). (CFRs 3.2, 3.3)

The President is full-time but his compensation for full-time work is 100% contributed and valued at \$205,180 in FY19-20. This in-kind contribution accounted for 29% of the total contribution revenue in FY19-20. If a succession plan includes a search process for a full-time president outside of the current financial arrangement, the budget will need to be adjusted accordingly. (CFR 3.4)

Employee turnover, which the president reported to be twelve in the past year, appears high for an institution with this size of support staff. JPGCU's statistics indicate this has been the case for the past few years. The vice president of human resources, who has been with JPGCU for six years, reported hiring has been a challenge due to several factors including finding individuals with the skill set required, willing to live in California with a high cost of living, and who also "bought into the mission." The example given was the career services position which had thirteen applicants in the pool, but only three who met the requirements. The vice president also reported most employees are paid below market because they "believe in the mission". One of the strategies JPGCU employed to fill vacancies was to look for individuals with "transferable skills" from their past work experience that can be applied in the current situation. The recent promotion of the career services manager to director of philanthropy is an example of recognizing transferable skills as defined by JPGCU. The team recommends JPGCU provide

additional professional staff development resources to ensure greater stability of personnel and adjust faculty teaching load to alleviate excessive demands on time. The team observed a significant number of individuals assuming new positions of service and leadership at JPGCU who may need training and faculty members who are teaching a substantial course load in addition to advising (CFRs 3.1, 3.3).

**Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources.** Despite COVID-19 pandemic, 2020 enrollment was almost 4% higher than forecast in the strategic plan. Fiscal results for year-ending FY19-20 were positive, partially because of the CARES Act funding. JPGCU received \$1,730,393 in CARES Act and CRRSAA monies as of January 2021. The grants revenue in the audited financials of year ended FY19-20 of \$1,068,105 was 100% due to the CARES Act monies downloaded and deployed. The remaining grant monies awarded that can be used in FY20-21 is \$662,287. The forecast and budget for total revenue for FY20-21 excludes the grant monies (both revenue and expense). JPGCU administration believes they can manage in FY21-22 without additional government assistance post COVID-19.

JPGCU generates monthly financials with quarterly reports to the board. (CFR 3.4). Discussion with administration and trustees indicated the university has personnel who are qualified to engage in risk management, but at this time no formal process is in place. The team recommends JPGCU establish a board of trustee approved risk management policy that directs the administration to provide regular reports on the assessment of institutional risks and corresponding mitigation measures. (CFRs 1.7, 3.7)

In the 2019 facilities master plan, the university seeks to be an outstanding creative arts university with the programs focusing on communications media, business, and humanities. JPGCU purchased four buildings in downtown Escondido totaling 71,600 square feet with

additional options to purchase in 2022 at the 220 W. Grand Ave leased location. The university also leases two buildings that contain the administration and faculty offices and apartments/townhouses that are subleased as student residences. The academic building has been renovated and includes state-of-the-art classrooms and computer labs that support the communications media requirements for game development, animation, and graphic design. The student life center was also remodeled recently and connects to a pedestrian plaza and a center for the performing arts. The 2025 facility goals include renovation of the chapel building, the creative arts academic complex, and expanding library resources. Facilities appear to be very well-designed and suited for JPGCU operation and student services (CFR 3.5).

**Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes.** The team found the institution's leadership to operate with integrity, quality, responsibility, and accountability. JPGCU has made effective decisions such as those that mitigate the financial impact of external changes impacting student enrollment and fundraising (CFR 3.6, 3.7).

The president and the vice presidents have key roles and broad responsibilities and are all full-time, with the exception of the vice president for human resources who is fifteen hours per week. The president is currently donating 100% of his services and the vice presidents are compensated at market. JPGCU has a board approved succession plan in place that includes a search committee that will consider both external and internal candidates. The governing board meets three times per year and has six standing committees. Committees meet two to three times a year, at a minimum. The trustees bring a wealth of diverse professional expertise, (legal, finance, higher education, business, Catholic faith) to their leadership role and are actively involved in key decisions of the university. Two individuals related to the president serve on the board as voting members. The team explored potential conflict of interest concerns and

compliance with WSCUC trustee policies and determined the board operated with complete transparency (duty to disclose) and within appropriate guidelines and policies. This line of questioning also was applied to the arrangement of other employees related to the president who are serving in administrative roles and was determined to be in compliance. The trustee handbook is comprehensive and well structured (CFR 3.9).

The faculty handbook covers all major areas of faculty governance and development including providing guidance and website resources. Monthly faculty meetings are generally held, and the faculty senate roles and responsibilities are clearly defined as well as a grievance procedure. (CFR 3.10)

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

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 4.

**Quality Assurance Processes.** The university uses a variety of quality assurance practices (CFR 4.1). Student learning is regularly assessed through the program review process. Most academic programs and co-curricular areas also engage in regular assessments that generally result in changes and improvements (CFR 4.1, 4.3), although by institutional acknowledgement, the data is not always shared widely. (CFR 4.3, 4.5) Student life has also worked to ensure evaluation of its work, mostly via student surveys.

The somewhat limited, due to institutional size, institutional research function helps the academic and co-curricular areas with their data and information needs (CFR 4.2), and the data is used to inform decision-making. The institution is committed to improving access to data

across units and to expanding data analysis and interpretation in all academic and administrative areas.

**Institutional Learning and Improvement.** JPGCU faculty work hard to ensure the academic program assessments are conducted on a regular schedule and used for improvement. (CFR 4.3, 4.4) The institution does communicate with various stakeholders during the assessment process. (CFR 4.5) For example, evaluation and making the hard decision to eliminate graduate programs was a collaborative, evidence-based process involving administration, faculty, and trustees (CFR 4.7). On a larger scale, JPGCU uses collaborative and data-informed strategic planning (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, 4.7). The institution also aims to ensure it is offering new programs that align with the market and the future students' needs by conducting market research as a part of the new program development.

JPGCU has made progress in assessment of student learning. Curricula are revised based on assessment and program review findings (CFRs 4.1; 4.4). Faculty take assessment responsibilities seriously and continuously work to improve assessment methodology as well as curricula and student achievement.

**Federal Compliance with Required Policies.** The institution provided evidence of the required policies; marketing information was available on the website. The appendices to this team report includes a full checklist of required reviews.

**Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.** The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) is comprehensive with most programs having gone through program review recently or have submitted yearly assessments (CFRs 2.7, 4.1).

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

**Defining the meaning of the degree.** JPGCU has a clear mission-based understanding that graduates will impact culture for Christ (CFR 1.1). This is achieved through the university core curriculum as well as co-curriculum. Spiritual formation is integrated in the major courses, in co-curricular activities, and in community life. The university core curriculum is required of all undergraduate students and is designed around the mission. This can be seen in the organization of the program learning outcomes for the university core:

Impact: To have an impact, students must be able to

- Describe strategies and demonstrate a desire to learn independently.
- Use critical thinking and logical reasoning to sift truth from falsehood.
- Communicate and evangelize using empathetic listening and applying reason in a logical form.

Culture: To impact culture, students must be able to

- Analyze the causes of culture and evaluate culture's impact on the individual, family and society.

Christ: To impact culture for Christ, students must be able to

- Demonstrate an understanding of Christian prayer and virtue arising from a friendship with Jesus Christ.
- Demonstrate an intimacy with the Sacred Page through academic work.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the teaching of the Catholic Church.

- Articulate an approach to ethics informed by Catholic teaching, offering an account of the moral responsibilities of the human person and society requisite for human fulfillment.

**Measuring meaning, quality and integrity.** JPGCU aims to ensure the quality and integrity of the degree programs by using the four key processes:

1. Academic Program Review
2. Curriculum Revision Process
3. New Program Approval Process
4. Academic Annual Assessment

Program reviews are used by faculty to examine degree programs in light of the current best practices in their field. External reviews help provide “contemporary relevance and critical feedback.” Program chairs’ and the faculty senate’s oversight of curriculum changes ensure the degree program’s integrity is unaltered. New programs must fit with the universities mission and existing programs, maintain degree program integrity, and align with financial resources available. They are reviewed to ensure they are well-developed and rigorous. These processes aim to ensure the curriculum is appropriately designed and resourced to support the intended student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes are assessed annually using signature assignments as well as student self-evaluations.

The university has explored the meaning, quality, and integrity of their degree (CFR 2.2) with both indirect and direct assessment; indirect self-assessment by students does play a significant role. At the same time, the faculty have recently (February 2021) analyzed the existing direct approach of assessing ILOs using signature assignments and proposed improvements to the process. The overall process of assessing both program learning outcomes

and institutional learning outcomes, the connection these two have to each other, and the mapping of signature assignments to ILO assessment is currently being reviewed. Faculty self-assessment aligned with the team's observation that not all signature assignments match ILOs as intended, and improvement is needed on the level of assignments, as well as on the level of assessing the big picture of accomplishing ILOs (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.6). Moreover, assessment of co-curricular programs also needs to be better aligned with the big picture of JPGCU assessment (CFR 2.11). Relevant observations, conclusions, and a recommendation are also reported under components 4 and 6.

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

Methods used in assessment of student learning and achievement of core competencies were described in the report and illustrated in additional submitted documents, such as program reviews, notes from faculty assessment meetings, student work, and student surveys.

The ILO rubrics, available to all faculty, are used in evaluation of signature assignments and determination of proficiency at graduation. However, application of these rubrics is not always consistent. Some faculty use parts of the ILO rubrics for evaluation of an assignment that connects to a particular PLO. The faculty have recently outlined steps for improving the assessment of ILO. (CFRs 2.2a, 4.1, 4.4)

JPGCU currently assesses ILOs through the assessment of related PLOs. The assessment of PLOs is intended to be applied to the ILOs. However, the PLOs themselves do not appear to align well with the ILOs, nor is the assessment of the PLOs as effective as it might be. The direct evidence from the PLO assessments is supplemented with indirect evidence cited in the core

program review, such as student self-evaluations of their own progress in developing the skills and abilities stated in the core PLOs.

Most examples of closing the loop come from program review in specific programs (e.g., business). Concerted closing the loop on institutional learning outcomes and core competencies is in relatively early stages. Faculty candidly discussed both the need to develop student skills in core key areas such as writing and research and the need for more consistent assessment of core outcomes across programs/majors and outlined a plan for improvement (CFRs 2.2a, 4.1).

Examples of student learning presented to the team reflected high levels of creativity and achievement in disciplinary learning. Program reviews, assessment documents, rubrics and conversations with the faculty and assessment leadership indicate that JPGCU faculty are diligent in reviewing student work and suggesting improvements. They recognize the importance of assessing their ILOs using the rubrics they have developed. At the same time, faculty realize there is a need to improve both assessment methods and student achievement on ILOs. They identified several issues and improvement strategies in their February 2021 meeting, and shared these with the team during the visit. There is a hope that the new chief academic officer will help make the assessment of ILOs and core competencies less fragmented and that the enhanced collaboration with Institutional Research will provide more reliable data (CFRs 2.2a, 4.2, 4.3).

The Team understands the limitations of faculty resources and the impact of JPGCU's small size on collecting data. However, there is some potential for streamlining the work in assessing ILOs separately from PLOs, but via a standardized process. The team therefore recommends that JPGCU clearly articulate the connection between Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), assess ILOs separately from programs, and formalize curricular and co-curricular assessment processes, both direct and

indirect, to create an institutional strategy that uses assessment results for continuous improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)

**E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation**

JPGCU defines student success through its retention and graduation rates and its post-graduation outcomes. Data on retention and graduation rates is collected and analyzed by student type, program, race/ethnicity, and gender. (CFRs 1.2, 4.1, 2.10). The data shows that both retention and graduation rates vary significantly from year to year. The most recent first to second year overall retention rate for the 2018 entering transfers/first-year cohort is 83%. The six-year average ending in 2018 appears to be 77% overall, which is 3% higher than the six-year average ending in 2015, indicating a positive trend. Graduation rates overall show the same positive trend with the 69% rate for 2016 (latest graduating class) well above both the overall and six-year averages (61% and 63% respectively).

However, with the exception of the 2016 entering class, there is a consistent and growing disparity between the retention of males and females which seems to have had its onset with the 2014 entering class. This disparity has grown to 22% for the first to second year retention of the 2018 incoming males and females (74% and 96% respectively). The same is true for the graduation rates for these groups with the six-year graduation rate average for males lower than that of females (59% and 68% respectively). Finally, a breakdown by race/ethnicity shows a dramatic improvement in first to second year retention for the Hispanic/Latinx population but difficulty retaining the Black students. This may be a function of cohort size, with the Hispanic/Latinx population growing and the Black population small and sporadic. Black and Native American students also have a much lower graduation rate (29% and 20% respectively) than do other groups and again, these statistics are based on small sample sizes.

In their reaffirmation report, JPGCU states that it is “finding ways to support male and non-white students” as a priority. (CFR 2.10) However, when asked how they are supporting these groups it became apparent that no targeted efforts had yet been established. In addition to these groups, students who transfer in have a lower retention rate than do first-year students, contrary to the pattern one might typically expect, and the 6-year average graduation rate for transfers is about the same as that of first-time freshmen, where it would typically be expected to be higher. Looking at the six-year average sophomore retention rate by program, it appears the Business program has the lowest rate. This program has a very small cohort which may be a part of the issue since there exists a pattern of smaller cohorts having lower retention rates. Consistent with that, the Business program also had the lowest graduation rates for the last two graduating classes.

While tracking and analyzing disaggregated student retention and graduation data support JPGCU’s efforts to promote student success, it does not appear the data is used to the fullest extent possible. (CFRs 2.10, 4.1) The impression given in the visit was that anecdotal information from individual students who seek help is relied on heavily for targeting support. For example, efforts to gather data on retention rates based on housing would be helpful to support their assumption that students in self-selected residential “households,” have higher retention rates, or considering the support they might provide to counter the pattern of transfer students who represent about 30% of each incoming class having lower retention and graduation rates. In general, taking advantage of the disaggregated data would allow the institution to see how the patterns for each group might differ and to target remediation more effectively. Retention of minority students might also be enhanced by hiring a more diverse faculty and staff, and a more diverse board could provide needed leadership in this area.

JPGCU has established a list of benchmark schools including Franciscan University, Savannah College of Art and Design, Art Center College of Design, California Institute of the Arts, Rhode Island School of Design, and Full Sail (CFRs 4.1, 2.10) for student success data comparison. The reaffirmation reports states “evidence suggests that our students continue to succeed at rates appropriate for our academic environment.” However, there is no discussion of any such comparison, nor is there evidence about how that conclusion was determined. The benchmarking document provided indicates that the institutions were chosen as models for JPGCU. Since they have chosen to benchmark against aspirational schools it is likely that these rates would not compare favorably nor be of any substantial benefit. Adding peer institutions for comparison would yield a more meaningful picture of the degree of student success they are achieving and provide the evidence they need.

John Paul the Great Catholic University’s definition of student success is presented as its mission statement, “to impact culture for Christ by forming students as creators and innovators, leaders and entrepreneurs in the Creative Arts and Business Innovation and steeped in the Catholic Intellectual Tradition.” As such, it is defined in the context of the institution’s mission, values and character. (CFR 2.10, 1.2) The university promotes student success through its curricular and co-curricular programs which are “designed to guide students in achieving this mission.” (CFR 4.1) The institution reports as well that they provide multiple support systems throughout a student’s experience to “ensure that students have the resources they need to be successful at JPCatholic and beyond,” and provides an impressive list of those services. JPGCU believes in supporting and challenging “student life staff along with faculty to work diligently in building a strongly supportive Christ-centered and virtuous community of scholars.” (CFR 2.11) They have recently administered a comprehensive student survey which provides data on

students' use of the services provided, the quality of their interactions with staff, etc. (CFR 2.11) Revising this survey to include demographic data, e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, age, etc., and administering it on a regular basis would provide a deeper understanding of their students' needs and allow a strategic application of the data to increase the efficiencies of their support services and better reenforce the commitment made by their 2025 Strategic Plan to build a "more substantive vision of the student's experience beyond the classroom."

Placement data for graduated students shows that 92% of respondents were employed or pursuing further education and that "this proportion has remained steady over time." It is noted that not all students have gained employment in their preferred field. In response to this they have bolstered their commitment to helping alumni find relevant work by focusing on alumni outreach, including organizing networking events. Alumni feedback is also a source JPGCU uses to find out how alumni are applying their education and how, from the alumni perspective, they might better serve their current and future students. (CFRs 4.5, 4.6)

JPGCU is calculating and analyzing the Graduation Rate Dashboard data appropriately for the institution. (CFR 2.10)

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

All programs at JPGCU undergo periodic program review. A well-developed program review handbook defines the purpose and process of program review and includes a requirement for information on the program and its history, program learning outcomes and assessment, review of applicable data, information on faculty, including effective teaching practices, a description of resources and services supported at least recently by a student survey, an action plan, and an external review. Appendices to the handbook provide a program review schedule,

an example curriculum map, a signature assignment score reporting form, and a sample external review invitation letter along with an example of an external review schedule. Program reviews are required every five years for established programs and three years after implementation for new programs. Program chairs are charged with completing the review or self-study with “close assistance from institutional research for data collection and analysis.” An external review is done upon completion of the report. The self-study and external review are the basis for an action plan to “guide any changes needed in the program.” The final reports are submitted to the chief academic officer for “review and action.” In addition, the action plans presented in the program review reports guide the university’s decision-making and strategic planning processes. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 2.7)

Two examples of program review were provided: General Education (core) and Bachelor of Science in Communications Media. In reviewing these reports, it appears faculty were thorough in their responses to the dictates of the handbook. In addition, the General Education program review includes descriptions of teaching strategies (CFR 4.4). The reports include a thorough external review, including a listing of commendations and recommendations, with a response from the program on each point. (CFRs 4.1, 2.7) JPGCU recognizes that program reviews are relatively new and their current focus is on completing them. Evaluating and improving the process itself is to be completed prior to the next five-year cycle.

Assessment of student learning is a part of every program review. Curriculum maps are provided that show the alignment of the course learning outcomes with the program learning outcomes and the courses to be assessed. Faculty appear to put a great amount of effort into their assessment process with most courses evaluated every quarter (CFR 4.4). To make assessment more manageable, some programs determine key courses to assess. However, when asked,

faculty still struggle with the rationale for selecting and assessing specific courses. Assessment at the course level is accomplished through signature assignments aimed to measure student learning relative to the PLOs. The results are reported on standardized signature assignment scoring forms that include both quantitative and qualitative data for each course (student scores and reflections and recommendations by the instructor). The direct measures are aggregated, and that data analyzed to determine the extent to which students' learning is achieved at the program level. Reflections are also reviewed to give deeper meaning to the assessment.

The emphasis of the university's program review process in terms of assessment, as would be expected, is on assessing PLOs that are also relied on to assess ILOs. For example, the General Education program review states, "by assessing student achievement of the General Education PLOs, the ILOs are implicitly also in view," and essay four of the institutional report states that, "The regular assessment process focuses on the evaluation of PLOs. Through the alignment of ILOs and PLOs, the assessment of PLOs is intended to be applied to the ILOs." Therefore, assessment of ILOs appears to be primarily an extrapolation of information from the assessment of PLOs using signature assignments designed for those PLOs. However, the connections between the ILOs and the PLOs are not obvious. For example, in Table 4.2 a PLO aligned with the ILO for quantitative and qualitative assessment is "examine the intellectual, religious, political, and cultural traditions of western civilization attentively with an eye toward entering into contemporary conversations on those topics." The PLO aligned with the ILO of information literacy is, "use critical thinking and logical reasoning to sift truth from falsehood." JPGCU has developed rubrics to assess their ILOs and they invite faculty to use the, in course assessments of the PLOs, but do not require this. JPGCU would be well served by developing an

independent assessment plan for the ILOs (separate from PLOs), which faculty have started to discuss.

Assessment of the PLOs is an essential component of the program review and heavily relied on by the institution to determine the degree to which students are achieving the intended performance benchmarks. The current means of assessing that learning calls for each course in a program to be assessed independently, with individual faculty members determining which PLOs to assess, designing their own signature assignments for the assessment, and scoring those assignments. The scores are recorded on the signature assignment assessment data form that asks for the PLO being assessed, the level of competency expected, the type of assignment used, and the average GPA on the assignment. Each instructor is using his or her own unique assignment, and although the point is made that instructors seriously consider the relevance of the assignment to the PLO being measured, the process appears to invite questions of validity and reliability. Therefore, it is likely that the data being aggregated are not comparable, leaving the meaning of the aggregated scores in question. The faculty member who teaches the course assessed also evaluates the students' work; independent evaluation is a better practice.

Finally, in the examples provided the grade point averages are given for the PLOs only rather than for the criteria that make up the PLO. Course based signature assignments might well be revised to provide PLO-based signature assignments across courses along with rubrics to ensure that all the components of each of the PLOs are measured and the scores based on a more consistent understanding of what a student's work should demonstrate. Inviting faculty outside a given course to evaluate the signature assignments would serve to eliminate the potential bias. Finally, it is understandable that simplicity increases efficiency. In the case of the new signature assignment assessment data form, however, simplicity has decreased the meaningfulness of the

data. It asks only for an average GPA for an entire PLO, where the original form in Appendix 3 of the program review handbook provided the ability to record a score on each outcome criterion and did not rely on grading. Aggregating these data for each criterion is a much more nuanced approach that would likely yield more valuable insights into students' learning.

Each of the example program reviews includes an action plan to use the results for improvement. (CFR 4.3, 4.6) For example, the action plan for the university's General Education core includes a recommendation to revise the sequence of courses, add courses to align with specific PLOs and create a signature assignment that better assesses information literacy. The Communications Media report includes a section on "observations and suggested actions," that discusses the assessment data and includes reflections of individual instructors who "offer specific strategies and actions steps expected to improve learning."

Meetings with faculty members confirmed they take the results of program reviews seriously and use them to inform academic decisions. At JPGCU, "a key academic program review outcome is to strengthen the market competitiveness of the program and to grow student enrollment over time." Progress on the action plans presented are documented and changes to the action plans are "recorded if needs have shifted." Final program review reports have been used to "guide decision making and changes to those academic departments," and to align academic budgets with the resource needs of the programs. What the reviews reveal about program trends as indicators of viability and sustainability are considered "critical drivers of strategic planning." (CFR 4.3, 4.6)

The team recommends that JPGCU clearly articulate the connection between Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), assess ILOs separately from programs, and formalize curricular and co-curricular assessment processes, both direct and

indirect, to create an institutional strategy that uses assessment results for continuous improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3) It will also be important to ensure that the faculty support and workload take into account the need for rigorous program review and assessment processes.

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

The 2025 Strategic Plan reflects careful thought toward financial sustainability. Given COVID-19 and the economic uncertainty in higher education, in January 2021 future fundraising plans were revised downward. The revised strategy identified goals of \$800K for FY20-21, and \$1.4M for FY21-22 that are more in line with past experience and the actuals of \$706K for FY19-21 (including \$204K of in-kind contributions from the president's compensation). An additional factor was the delay in fully re-staffing the development office team to late 2021. The original 2025 Strategic Plan called for a phase one estimated renovation cost of \$6.4M for the creative arts academic complex with fundraising, debt financing, and permitting to be done no later than year end 2022. The existing \$2.3M loan for the 131 S. Broadway property has a balloon payment due in 2024 in the amount of \$1.9M. The revised fundraising strategy focused the capital campaign strategy to only the chapel and the creative arts academic building as well as building the endowment and assessing the feasibility of when to launch a capital campaign. The decision on moving forward with a capital campaign will be impacted by the pending economic recovery. The DOE financial responsibility composite score and the potential bank covenants compliance should be modeled for the next three to five years with sensitivity analysis for the variation in possible results of the annual fundraising for both capital and operational expenses.

The institution has successfully navigated determination that two programs, the MA in Biblical Theology (primarily online) and the MBA in Film Producing, were not financially viable. The MA in Biblical Theology was impacted by California not participating in SARA and the MBA in Film Producing by a declining market. As a result, no new students were admitted to these programs. As of the summer 2019, there were nine students in the MBA in Film Producing and four students in the MA in Biblical Theology. JPGCU has chosen to focus on the following new growth opportunities in the existing degree programs: animation, illustration, graphic design, advertising, music, product design, and fashion design. JPGCU is projecting a 40% increase in student enrollment by 2025 due in part to these new areas of emphasis, with the largest growth in the Theatre/Musical Theatre (55%) and Illustration & Graphic Design (59%). The current fiscal year audited financials for JPGCU, year ending 6/30/20, show a DOE financial responsibility composite score of 3.0 and a current debt service ratio of 3.92 as is required in the loan covenants to be “not less than 1.26 to 1.00.” The current financial health of JPGCU reflects the administration and trustees’ reallocation of resources to programs that have greater potential for long term success.

The university stated that student retention is a major focus, with a goal to improve retention from 60% to 65% in two years by increasing selectivity for incoming students and adding more distinguished faculty. This alone does not address the concern of support for at-risk students identified through retention studies that found non-continuing students were leaving within their first five quarters of enrollment. Strategies for improving tracking and scaffolding of at-risk students as well as faculty development plans around teaching and learning should be developed and funded as part of the strategic plan and the annual budget process and linked back to retention increases. The team recommends JPGCU determine a list of peer institutions for

benchmarking key institutional metrics and implement strategies to improve tracking and support of at-risk students, including those identified in disaggregated retention and graduation data.

(CFRs 2.7, 4.1)

#### **H. Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes**

- Not Required

#### **I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement**

JPGCU reflected on the findings of the self-study and identified the following key areas where the university has demonstrated stability and progress and others where further investigation and improvement is needed.

##### Past Progress

- Enrollment Growth – In a relatively short time since being founded fifteen years ago, and in the context of having navigated the economic recession and the demographic shift in traditional age students, JPGCU has demonstrated a healthy enrollment trajectory growing from 30 to almost 300 students with 39 faculty members.
- Facility Expansion – JPGCU has transitioned from leased facilities to purchased property that meets the needs of the growing enterprise very well.
- Reputation for Quality – The university’s programs are becoming recognized among constituents for innovation and relevance.
- The self-study was particularly helpful in assessing the experience of beginning and ending graduate programs, including online offerings. Such an undertaking was ambitious and met with unexpected limitations due to CA not being a member of SARA and making it unrealistic for JPGCU to continue an online MA program that initially had good promise and results.

## Future Development

- Mission Alignment – As enrollment is anticipated to increase and new programs are considered, JPGCU recognizes the risk of mission drift and is working to ensure that does not occur.
- Strategic Planning – The disruption that has taken place in higher education in recent years requires an even greater emphasis on planning for the future. This will involve more attention to an academic master plan.
- Resource Development – Growth brings with it the need for increased infrastructure including support personnel, facilities, scholarships, and student services. To avoid financial distress JPGCU recognizes the necessity of expanding philanthropic outreach to donors and foundations.

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

JPGCU used the comprehensive review as an opportunity to reflect on past progress, assess the current challenges facing the University and higher education, and anticipate appropriate responses to ensure future sustainability and effectiveness. The wider campus community was engaged in conducting the self-study and made good progress in resolving the issues identified in the previous visit. Faculty, administration, and staff confirmed in interviews the value of the experience and acknowledged areas where improvement can be made.

### Commendations

The team commends JPGCU for:

1. The preparation of a thorough report, for prompt response to all requests for additional documentation, and for conducting a well-organized virtual visit with broad community participation.

2. Managing the COVID-19 pandemic challenges in a manner that was sensitive to the health and safety of the campus community while ensuring the student learning experience continued with as few disruptions as possible.
3. Implementing a faculty governance culture that encourages collaboration and engages faculty in key decisions.
4. Appropriately using data in decision-making and effectively managing the teach-out of graduate programs.
5. Its program review process and engagement of faculty in a robust assessment program.
6. Providing students with opportunities to engage in practical learning experiences that are valuable in acquiring life and professional skills.
7. The development of policies, procedures, and handbooks that are effective, thorough, and appropriate for the university.

### Recommendations

The team recommends JPGCU:

1. Develop a strategy and training to address cultural, gender, racial, disability, and ethnic diversity at all levels, including faculty, staff, administration, and trustees, to better prepare students for a multicultural workplace. The team recognized the challenges JPGCU faces with being a deeply committed Catholic institution offering specialized programs. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1)
2. Provide additional professional staff development resources to ensure greater stability of personnel and adjust faculty teaching load to alleviate excessive demands on time. The team observed a significant number of individuals assuming new positions of service and

leadership at JPGCU who may need training and faculty members who are teaching a substantial course load in addition to advising. (CFR 3.1 and 3.3)

3. Clearly articulate the connection between Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), assess ILOs separately from programs, and formalize curricular and co-curricular assessment processes, both direct and indirect, to create an institutional strategy that uses assessment results for continuous improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)
4. Establish a board of trustee approved risk management policy that directs the administration to provide regular reports on the assessment of institutional risks and corresponding mitigation measures. (CFRs 1.7, 3.7)
5. Determine a list of peer institutions for benchmarking key institutional metrics and implement strategies to improve tracking and support of at-risk students, including those identified in disaggregated retention and graduation data. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1)

## APPENDICES

### A.1 CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FOR JPGCU

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour <a href="http://www.jp catholic.edu/catalog">www.jp catholic.edu/catalog</a> Catalog p. 51-52 (Appendix 07)	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Catalog p. 51-52
	Comments: To ease access, please consider putting hyperlinks in the Catalog Table of Contents.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour See policy in Catalog: <a href="http://www.jp catholic.edu/catalog">www.jp catholic.edu/catalog</a> p. 51-52 (Appendix 07) See Academic Program Review Handbook (Appendix 09)	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments is not in the credit hour policy; Program Review Handbook has section for course approval which asks the number credit hours for the course under review.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet <a href="https://jp catholic.edu/academics/schedule/display.php?q=2021Sp">https://jp catholic.edu/academics/schedule/display.php?q=2021Sp</a>	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Credit hours are not listed in the course schedule; however it appears that most courses are 3 units.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i> Not applicable, no online or hybrid courses	How many syllabi were reviewed? <b>n/a, no online/hybrid courses</b>
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)?
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Not applicable, no online or hybrid courses
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the	How many syllabi were reviewed? 2 Forms
	What kinds of courses? Internship and Independent Study
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS
	What discipline(s)? All

prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at          least 1 - 2 from          each degree level.</i> Internship and Independent Study Packets	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The instructions on the forms for approval of an Internship or an Independent Study require the appropriate number of hours.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) <a href="http://www.jpcatholic.edu/catalog">www.jpcatholic.edu/catalog</a> <a href="https://jpcatholic.edu/academics/">https://jpcatholic.edu/academics/</a>	How many programs were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? General Education and Major
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS
	What discipline(s)? Business, Communications Media, Humanities
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Alice Knudsen, Ludmila Praslova  
 Date: March 12, 2021

## A.2 MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FOR JPGCU

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Very thorough information. <a href="https://jpcatholic.edu/admission/cost/UGrad/UG_Tuition.php">https://jpcatholic.edu/admission/cost/UGrad/UG_Tuition.php</a>
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: <a href="https://jpcatholic.edu/alumni/index.php">https://jpcatholic.edu/alumni/index.php</a> Selected employment and placement information.

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Ludmila Praslova  
Date: March 10, 2021

### A.3 STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FOR JPGCU

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? <a href="https://jpcatholic.edu/studentlife/student-handbooks.php">https://jpcatholic.edu/studentlife/student-handbooks.php</a>
	Comments: Student complaints/grievance policy or procedures are located in the Student Handbook which has a link on the website under Student Life. Not as “easily accessible” as it might be. Possibilities: add hyperlinks to the Student Handbook TOC, create a link to the Handbook under Student Life, or create a form and provide a link under “Student Forms.”
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly: Students can file grievances that are either academic or non-academic. There are two grievance filing levels—I (informal) or II (Formal) and a Grievance Hearing (Level III). There is also an appeals process. Procedures for all phases: pre-filing, Level I and Level II and Level III and appeals are spelled out in the Student Handbook beginning on page 41.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO  Comments: Only one student has filed a grievance, according to the institution ALO.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Records of complaints are maintained based on the administrative office in which they may occur.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <b>X YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NO. If so, please describe briefly: Based on the policy, complaints are tracked through the process from level I to level III, by the appropriate administrative office, depending on the nature of the grievance as explained in the Student Handbook.
	Comments: The institution stated that only a single grievance had been filed in 2006.

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Alice Knudsen

Date: March 19, 2021

## A.4 TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FOR JPGCU

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<a href="http://www.jpatholic.edu/catalog">www.jpatholic.edu/catalog</a>	If so, is the policy publicly available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? <b>JPGCU Catalog, Pages 69-72</b>
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Transfer of Credit policy would be easier to access if the Catalog included hyperlinks in the Table of Contents.

**\*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--**

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

**See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.**

Review Completed By: Alice Knudsen, Ludmila Praslova

Date: March 10, 2021