

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To California State University Maritime Academy

March 20 – 22, 2019

Team Roster

Chair: Peter J. Gray, Ph.D.
Director of Academic Assessment Emeritus
US Naval Academy

Assistant Chair: Robert Benedetti, Ph.D.
Adjunct Faculty/Emeritus Professor
Sacramento State University & University of the Pacific

Team Member: Sheri Jones, Ph.D.
Sr. VP University Services & Strategic Planning
Ashford University

Team Member: Lucille Sansing, Ph.D.
Registry Member and Senior Consultant

Team Member: Andrew Lawson, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Science
California State University, Monterey Bay

WSCUC Visit Liaison
Lorraine Williams, PH.D
WSCUC Vice President

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the Institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission (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.....3

- A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant.....3
- B. Description of Team’s Review Process.....4
- C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....6

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....7

- 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.....13
- C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees.....18
- D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation.....19
- E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation.....21
- F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence.....24
- G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment.....28
- H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement.....30

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW.31

APPENDICES

- A. Federal Compliance Forms.....28
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review.....28
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....30
 - 3. Student Complaints Review.....27
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review.....31
- B. Distance Education Review.....32

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

In 1929 the California State Assembly established the California Nautical School in Tiburon, California with programs in maritime navigation and engineering. In 1939, the school changed its name to the California Maritime Academy (aka Cal Maritime or CSUMA). In 1943 CSUMA moved to its present location on a 75-acre waterfront campus in Vallejo, California in Vallejo, California, approximately 30 miles northeast of San Francisco. A defining feature of the institution and the campus is the 500-foot training ship Golden Bear docked on the campus. In 1995 Cal Maritime became the twenty-second member campus of the California State University System.

Cal Maritime's mission is to train, educate, and develop graduates for leadership positions in the global maritime profession with a broad focus on all aspects of maritime affairs and transportation, including areas that do not require licensure. In order to accomplish its mission to the benefit of approximately 1100 students, in six undergraduate majors and one graduate program, Cal Maritime is committed to providing each student with a college education combining intellectual learning, applied technology, leadership development, and global awareness. Furthermore, its purpose is to provide the highest quality licensed officers and shore-side personnel for the merchant marine and national maritime industries, provide continuing education opportunities for those in the transportation and related industries, and be an information and technology resource for the transportation and related industries.

The CSUMA was first accredited by WSCUC in 1977 and again in 2002. A CPR visit was held in March 2009. The CSUMA was granted an extra year to respond to issues raised by the CPR. In both the 2002 and 2009 visits, assessment of student learning was identified as an issue for particular attention. The recent history of Cal Maritime's WSCUC accreditation activity includes a 2011 WSCUC Commission Action Letter that reviewed the Capacity and Preparatory Review (2009), the Educational Effectiveness Report (2010), and the subsequent team visit to campus. In that letter, the Commission endorsed the findings, commendations and recommendations of the team and emphasized the importance of continued attention to: 1) assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; 2) unity and diversity; 3) refinement of the leadership development program; and 4) ongoing funding challenges. These four areas were distilled from twenty-one distinct recommendations from the visiting team. While these conditions were addressed in the 2014

Interim Report of, it was understood that future reviewers from WSCUC would expect growth and development in these particular areas.

B. Description of Team 's Review Process

The Cal Maritime Accreditation Review Team began with the recruitment of members in January 2018. By August 2018 team assignments were determined and the team began preparation for the Accreditation Visit. Once the CSUMA Institutional Report became available on September 20, 2018 and related with online links the team members began reviewing the materials related to their assigned topics guided by the Offsite Review (OSR) Team Worksheet. At the Offsite Review (OSR) on November 28 and 29, 2018, the OSR determined the scope of the Accreditation Visit (AV), identified issues regarding the institutional report, and listed additional materials needed. At the end of the OSR a videoconference was held with CSUMA leaders to identify and discuss Lines of Inquiry, commendations, and requests for materials, as well as group and individual meetings during the Accreditation Visit. A follow up phone call by the team chair was held with CSUMA leaders on December 10, 2018, after the written Lines of Inquiry document had been received. On December 19, 2018, CSUMA began uploading requested documents.

Beginning in January 2019, team members submitted assigned sections of the AV report to the assistant chair with a preliminary draft produced by the chair and assistant chair by mid-February 2019. Subsequently, team members completed the Accreditation Visit Worksheet. A conference call on February 26, 2019 discussed the approach to the accreditation visit including the adequacy of the new materials provided by CSUMA, and areas for further inquiry during the AV.

CSUMA posted several documents in December 2018 in response to the team's OSR Lines of Inquiry request. Additional files were posted in February 2019 including, *The Edwards Leadership Development Program: Program Assessment Findings and Recommendations* (Skyline 2019) and *DRAFT Shared Governance at Cal Maritime: Report and Recommendations* (Reichard 2019). These prompted some specific questions about the institution's growth and development in the areas identified in previous reviews. The AV that took place from March 19-22, 2019, provided the team with an opportunity to seek answers to these questions.

The additional documents provided in response to the OSR Lines of Inquiry were of great assistance in focusing the team's attention during the visit. Also, opportunities to meet with many different members of the Cal Maritime community, individually and in groups, provided the team with a variety of occasions to seek additional information, clarify issues and get answers to pressing questions. Requests to change meeting attendance rosters to separate staff and supervisors and faculty and administrators as well as ad hoc small group and individual interactions gave the team insights into some of the underlying issues faced by Cal Maritime that were raised in the additional documents. The team greatly appreciates the flexibility and accommodation of requests for meeting rearrangements and documents during the visit on the part of the ALO Graham Benton and all of the Cal Maritime community.

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

CSUMA's institutional report accurately portrays an institution that understands and lives its mission and that strives to continuously improve, taking seriously WSCUC standards. The report is well written with a comprehensive table of contents, clearly written sections keyed to the WSC self-study report components, appropriate appendices, and useful cross-reference index of the 2013 Standards, self-study components and page numbers.

The WSCUC Steering Committee met periodically each semester since the 2014 Interim Report to review progress on the commission recommendations and consider institutional strengths and challenges. The accreditation process accelerated during the fall of 2016. The Steering Committee comprised faculty, students, and administrators, including the President's Cabinet; members from the Academic Senate; and invested stakeholders from various offices across campus. A series of retreats provided faculty with opportunities to engage with institutional data and plans as part of developing the Institutional Report.

The Cal Maritime accreditation affirmation process drew on the work done in creating a series of six strategic plans covering many different aspects of the campus. The strategic plans were based on evidence of student learning and focus on institutional integrity. They are intended to serve as driving forces for continuous improvement, although few cases are cited where data were used to make major decisions.

While there is no doubt that the affirmation accreditation process was a learning experience for the campus, the team believes there needs to be additional consideration of how its results are translated into actions. In summary, the Institutional Report demonstrates Cal Maritime's responsiveness to the findings, commendations and recommendations of the previous reviews regarding the importance of continued attention to: 1) assessment; 2) unity and diversity; 3) leadership development program; and 4) funding challenges. However, as noted in component 2 of this report, the institution is in compliance with the Standards but has one or more identifiable issues that may affect its ability to carry out its mission at a high level of quality.

The team's primary tasks during the AV were to verify the information presented in the Institutional Report, to pursue the lines of inquiry previously articulated to the institution, and to determine the extent to which Cal Maritime shows growth and development. The team's recommendations are based on the results of these investigations.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

In 2011, Cal Maritime received its WSCUC Commission action letter which reviewed the Capacity and Preparatory Review (2009), the Educational Effectiveness Report (2010), and the subsequent team visit to campus. In that letter, the Commission endorsed the findings, commendations and recommendations of the team and emphasized the importance of continued attention to: 1) assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; 2) unity and diversity; 3) refinement of the leadership development program; and 4) ongoing state funding challenges. These four areas were distilled from twenty-one distinct recommendations from the visiting team.

In response, Cal Maritime has describes how its widely-accepted mission and vision do, in fact, imbed WSCUC standards. In addition, the institution has demonstrated that it strives for continuous improvement in the recruitment, persistence and placement of graduates as suggested by WSCUC recommendations. Since the last WSCUC visit Cal Maritime has maintained honest and open communication with WSCUC and continued the process of integration into the CSU system.

As directed in the Commission action letter the institution has attempted to make progress in the assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; unity and diversity; leadership development; and funding stability.

The following describe the team's overview of CSUMA's response to previous Commission actions.

1. Assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement

Much of the evidence on student learning and institutional integrity in the institutional self-study drew on the work that was done eight strategic plans that represent a collective effort of many campus constituencies. The strategic plans are governed by six over-arching goals: Academic Excellence, Student Learning, Organizational Efficiency, The Global Maritime Profession, Partnerships, and Campus Community. In response to the long duration and intensity of planning and its continued updating, a feeling of strategic planning fatigue was voiced by some faculty and staff.

Changes occurred during the strategic planning process, for example, a reorganization of the Corp of Cadets structure to reflect students' majors. Other significant changes at Cal Maritime since the last WSCUC review include the creation of three separate schools (Letters and Sciences, Engineering, and Maritime Transportation, Logistics and Management) and the creation of a Master of Science program in Transportation and Engineering Management with areas of specialization in Transportation, Engineering Management, and Humanitarian Disaster Management. The institutional study describes a systematic six-step decision making process that guided these changes.

It was reported during conversations on campus that since there are a small number of staff and faculty at CSUMA and since they wear many hats, some faculty and staff are experiencing "planning fatigue" and are "worn out" by the number and duration of the ongoing planning and revision process. In addition, it was observed that planning sometimes involved deciding how to make an idea work without a discussion of whether the idea was sound to begin with. One person called this, "retrospective transparency".

Also since the last review, a new Office of Institutional Research has been established to provide data for planning and program review including enrollment and retention data, student headcount and demographics, SFR, and FTEF. The head of IR anticipates that recommendations regarding priorities and resource allocation will result from discussions about the data provided to departments, reviewing entities, and senior administrators. An example of the potential use of IR data is

in the annual program reports that academic program leaders are required to submit every fall. IR's intentions are that the reports will document department assessment plans and the assessment of learning outcomes, as well as track program needs and changes. Ideally, annual reports will be used to guide modifications to programs and to identify capacity needs such as additional faculty, staff, or facilities.

Document analysis, website reviews and discussions while on campus provided only limited evidence that IR data have been used in annual program and course reports and that these reports have been used in making such decisions at the departmental and higher levels. Lack of appropriate training and ownership on the part of staff and faculty members may be reasons that annual reports and other assessment documents have had limited impact on decision-making.

The team encourages Cal Maritime to continue providing up-to-date learning outcomes and program reviews for all departments on its website. While the Program Review guidelines and processes are now updated and current, care must be taken to ensure sustainability. Reinforcing departmental commitment to the assessment of student learning is essential. In particular, work should continue on the integration of General Education programming in high-unit majors, especially in light of the CSU Executive Order 1100. Likewise, co-curricular programming would benefit from stronger assessment practices.

The team agrees with the institution's observation that more should be done with "on-boarding" staff with better training, orientations and professional development opportunities related to student learning outcomes assessment and program review. And that there is a continued need for attention to assessment and program review in order to document student achievement at all levels and across campus.

As a result of the AV the team notes that there is a need to enhance and support faculty research and professional development and to clarify RPT criteria and expectations, especially related to student achievement. Course-to-course articulations with other colleges could be made more transparent and the masters' program (offered through Extended Learning) should continue efforts to become more integrated with other university functions.

Institutional documents provided, as well as on campus interviews revealed the need to reconcile the regulatory demands of the US Coast Guard (USCG) licensing standards with the Student Learning Outcomes in the USCG licensed programs.

Students and others observed that the nature of the Coast Guard exams as well as the content and examinations in some academic courses pose threats to academic honesty and integrity in that the same lecture notes and exam items are used repeatedly, year after year. Some students were reported to have taken advantage of these conditions by memorizing answers to the exams. Students not only saw this as a form of “cheating”, but also as unfair in that those students who simply memorize answers may get better grades and, as a result, better opportunities, while students who learned the content may, in the short term be at a disadvantage. Such feelings have a negative impact on campus climate.

2. Unity and diversity

Along with general concerns about unity and the overall campus climate the institutional report indicates that university and academic senate policies require continuing attention. These observations are reinforced by the team’s Lines of Inquiry and the *Shared Governance At Cal Maritime: Report and Recommendations* (Reichard 2019), which resulted from a request by Cal Maritime. A consultant was engaged to review and make recommendations concerning: the structure and function of the Academic Senate, the role of faculty in decision making, faculty administrative interactions, faculty engagement in shared governance, providing a supportive environment for faculty, and particularly junior faculty, procedures and practices for establishing budgets, faculty engagement with the development and delivery of the Edwards Leadership Development Program, and the role of students in shared governance and the distinct roles of the Academic Senate and the Californian Faculty Association. This report concludes with detailed observations and recommendations that cover virtually all aspects of campus climate at CSUMA.

More generally, there seems to be a considerable disconnect between the administration and students, faculty and lower level staff that has resulted in a lack of trust in the administration. These topics are consistent with the areas identified in the last review, the team’s Lines of Inquiry, as well as the AV observations and conclusions. Therefore, it is essential that Cal Maritime demonstrate how subsequent self-reflection relative to the issues raised leads to actions.

Diversity on campus also continues to be a challenge. Many positive steps have been taken, but there needs to be continued devotion of energy and resources to this issue. In particular, the team believe there need to be multiple avenues for students, faculty and staff voices to be heard regarding issues of inclusion, discrimination and harassment. In

particular, it is suggested that plans be put into place for how to immediately and clearly communicate institutional responses to incidents of discrimination and harassment.

At a higher level, it is suggested that plans be made for continuous assessment of the campus climate in the broadest terms. Assessment results should then be used to guide the evolution of formal policies, procedures and programs as well as growth in interpersonal sensitivity to the increasingly diverse Cal Maritime community. In particular, mechanisms need to be established to respond to discrimination and harassment so that the values, norms and expectations are communicated openly and honestly as quickly as is possible and appropriate. Where possible, those in leadership positions must clearly condemn demonstrated instances of discrimination or harassment.

3. Leadership development

Of special concern is the instability and resultant functional failure of the Edwards Leadership Development Program that appears to have decreased unity of the campus and negatively affected campus climate and, subsequently, lowered student satisfaction and success. The team acknowledges that the campus-wide Institutional Report and strategic plans address these. However, both the Reichard report and the recently completed Edwards Leadership Development Program Assessment Findings and Recommendations (Skyline 2019) conclude that at present the Edwards Leadership Development Program and leadership development in general are not functioning as intended at Cal Maritime and that action is needed. In fact, observations such as that the Commandant's Office is broken and that Cadets do not feel well developed as leaders suggest that there is a need to achieve a campus-wide definition of leadership that integrates academic, licensure, commandant, student and student affairs perspectives.

4. Funding stability

The last issue raised in the 2011 Commission action letter was funding. Review of documents provided in response to the Lines of Inquiry as well as conversations during the AV lead the team to conclude that Cal Maritime has made substantial process in diversifying its revenue sources and has been quite successful in bring additional funds to campus. However, the expected sustainability or growth of these multiple sources is not fully apparent. The team recommends Cal Maritime

develop and share an integrated all-source budget projections in fiscal planning going forward. This is especially appropriate as the institution is launching a capital campaign.

Honest and open communication across campus is essential if Cal Maritime is to overcome remaining challenges regarding: 1) assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; 2) unity and diversity; 3) leadership development; and 4) funding stability.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The institutional report evidenced broad-ranging self-reflection and analysis related to the WSCUC standards. Identified strengths and areas where improvement is needed were incorporated into the self-study. The Review Under the Standards form provided a comprehensive overview of the institution's response to the WSCUC Standards. Cal Maritime consistently gave itself high Self-Review ratings. The areas self-identified for improvement centered on student learning outcomes assessment and program review, for example, where it was noted that stronger linkage between evidence of student learning data and retention data is needed, that the quality of assessment varies by department and the more could be done with "closing the loop" between evidence and action. The Review Under the Standards provided a good starting point for discussing plans to address areas needing improvement during the AV. The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) was completed in a reflective and analytical way, with specific information pertaining to the questions in the six column headings.

The institution's Compliance with Federal Standards form is in the appendix.

The team's comments follow regarding each WSCUC Standard.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Cal Maritime, since becoming part of the CSU system, has endorsed the values and objectives of that system and has also articulated its unique mission clearly. Its programs have specific outcomes which are understood throughout the institution and beyond. (1.1, 1.2, 1.5)

As the formation of the Unity Council indicates, the institution takes the challenges of diversity seriously and understands that further progress is necessary as soon as possible, as relates to the faculty, staff, and the student body. The commitment is clear, but results still lag. (1.4)

Cal Maritime has steadily increased the transparency of its operation though sharing disaggregated measures of retention and graduation across campus. It is important that the quality of such data and analysis steadily improve and that its wide distribution continue. (1.7)

The institutional report suggests that the commitment to academic freedom may need reinforcement as some are not clear that it is appropriately valued. (1.3) Through conversations with students the team learned that the rationale of grading policy may not as widely understood. (1.6)

The institution's self-assessment report is the latest in a series of communications which indicate the honesty and commitment to open dialogue which have characterized its interaction with WSCUC. (1.80)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine that the institution is in compliance with Standard 1, but the issues noted above may affect its ability to carry out its mission at a high level of quality.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Cal Maritime has clearly defined all its degree programs and made requirements and goals known to current and prospective students. There are clear road maps to degree completion. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.10) It has adopted the commitment of the CSU system to a defined general education program. Its newly implemented program review process helps to ensure that degree programs deliver what they promise. This review process is supported by a recently formed Office of Institutional Research and a commitment to data analysis that supports academic decision-making. In addition, the institution has a range of co-curricular programs that are integrated into the academic schedule.

While structures are in place to insure educational quality across institutional programs, special attention is required for areas where lapses appear to have occurred. (2.7) For example, greater cooperation appears to be needed in setting

information technology policy and the distribution of resources. The institution's one master's degree program could be better integrated with other university programs and faculty. (2.2b) Articulation agreements with community colleges are not widely understood among student. (2.5, 2.12) The role and function of the teaching and learning center should be clarified.

The assessment process is relatively new and continues to be a work in progress, but one with substantial administrative support. (2.2a) However, assessment data are not always available in a timely fashion and there appear to be communication gaps such that some constituencies do not receive the data in a timely manner. Why transfer students have difficulty completing degrees in two years needs continuing study. (2.5, 2.10) The process of program review has yet to be fully standardized and, therefore, reviews effect programs differently. Co-curricular programs are not yet rigorously assessed. (2.11) Focus on student learning outcomes across the institution have yet to be standardized and measured. (2.6) The institution must continually remain mindful that licensed programs are in compliance with USCG standards. Continued evaluation of the General Education program would help to ensure that all its components contribute to a coordinated whole.

Finally, the support for faculty research and professional development require additional attention in terms of resources and time available for this critical activity. Greater clarity is needed in how research, teaching and service are valued in promotion, tenure, and salary increases. (2.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine that the institution is in compliance with Standard 2, but the issues noted above may affect its ability to carry out its mission at a high level of quality.

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

The institution has provided faculty and staff handbooks to ensure communication of critical procedures is effective. Regular reviews of faculty are conducted to assess their contributions to the institution, yet faculty report a lack of clarity and/or consistency in requirements for research, tenure and promotion. (3.2) Having recognized some confusion regarding program review the institution has invested in faculty development to overcome any stumbling blocks. (3.3) The

faculty is dense with tenured faculty, ensuring continuity. Based on conversation with faculty the team suggests more attention to professional development, research support and institutional resources devoted to assessment. A major challenge that remains is the recruitment of diverse faculty; this challenge has been recognized and is being actively pursued.

While Cal Maritime has emerged from a period of uncertainty concerning state funding, its finances are a complex mixture of tuition, state, contract, grant, and gift resources. The institution should regularly prepare an all-sources revenue and expense budget and future year projections to encourage a comprehensive consideration of these accounts. (3.4, 3.8) Currently the institution's physical and technological infrastructure is adequate, but in constant need of upgrading in response to industry needs and standards. (3.5) Strategic plans have been developed to guide future development.

The governing board of Cal Maritime has been engaged and helpful to the institution's administration within the perimeters of the California State University system. (3.9)

Faculty leadership has evolved over time and is at present in a transition period with the creation of three schools and a reconsideration of the policies and procedures of the Faculty Senate. In particular, the relationship between the faculty and the administration at all levels should be the focus of intense conversation guided by recent outside consultant reports. (3.10)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine that the institution is in compliance with Standard 3, but the issues noted above may affect its ability to carry out its mission at a high level of quality, in particular, the relationship between faculty and administration related to shared governance in its broadest sense.

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

Cal Maritime has put in place quality-assurance processes to collect, analyze, and interpret data; track results over time; use comparative data; and make improvements. (4.1) Comprehensive self-studies are associated with scheduled program reviews. Every fall academic programs submit Annual Program Reports that are concrete, visible, and intended to be

actionable. The institution has recently hired a director of institutional research. Faculty, however, are leading the assessment effort. The assessment process is directly tied to the strategic planning process, which has already resulted in a set of forward-looking plans. (4.2)

As a result of completing a cycle of assessment, program review, and strategic planning, the institution has observed that faculty participants need additional training and that the processes may be too complex and cumbersome. These stumbling blocks appear to have led to errors, omissions, and delays, particularly in program reviews. In addition, the assessment results have not always been analyzed to identify ways of improving student learning (4.3, 4.4, and 4.7) or resulted in other positive changes.

Further, students have not been involved in the assessment and planning process to the extent desired, which requires attention in the future. (4.5, 4.6)

In summary, program review and strategic planning have been implemented, but have not reached their full potential in terms of continuous improvement. The institution is aware of these challenges and is undertaking discussions to make the adjustments needed to gain greater benefits from the process.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine that the institution is in compliance with Standard 4, but faces issues that may affect its ability to carry out its mission at a high level of quality.

Component 3: Degree Programs: The Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degree

Cal Maritime demonstrates intentionality in developing degree programs that are keyed to professions appropriate for their graduates and its mission and vision. CSUMA degrees are linked to licensure requirements and their graduates enjoy high pass rates on licensure exams. The institution uses external advisory councils to keep curricula current with changing professional needs. The recent launch of the Master of Science program in Transportation and Engineering Management and Maritime Emergency Response Boat program and their continuing improvement based on assessment information are examples of the institution's awareness that maritime careers are changing from ship-based activities to logistics and

harbor security. Students leave Cal Maritime with employment opportunities and CSUMA graduates enjoy the highest entry-level salaries among the CSU campuses.

While improvements have been made in both program review and student learning outcomes assessment it is not clear how effective these efforts are in assessing the meaning, quality and integrity of the CSUMA degree and guiding needed improvements. This is especially evident in relation to leadership, which is an essential element of Cal Maritime's mission and identity. Over the years Cal Maritime has attempted to develop and implement meaningful and effective leadership programs in many different areas only to come up short.

Creating a successful leadership initiative must be based a campus-wide consensus around a definition of leadership and a set of structures and programs that integrate academic, licensure, commandant, student and student affairs perspectives. Honest and open communication across campus is essential if Cal Maritime is to overcome remaining challenges regarding leadership development and the impact of program review and student learning outcomes assessment that are fundamental to the integrity of the Cal Maritime degree.

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

The institution demonstrates an ongoing focus on educational quality. Cal Maritime has comprehensive general education program learning outcomes and has provided evidence of learning for the five core competencies. However, based on the CSUMA's reports of initial results, the link between assessment instruments and sources of evidence needs to be strengthened. Educational quality also is measured through external standards including specialized programmatic accreditations (e.g., ABET), licensure examinations and specialized approvals and internal program review standards, such as pass rates. The assessment data have been disaggregated, allowing the institution to identify gaps in learning achievement among various sub-populations.

Rubrics have been established for the core competencies and a cycle for assessing them has been established. The institution appears to be learning from its assessment efforts, both in terms of student learning and in terms of refining its methodology. However, the report indicates that while assessment methods are improving, there are improvements in assessment methods that should be prioritized. The AV observations support this conclusion.

Assessment at the program level has had several issues with methodology, including only single variable scores for the achievement of programmatic outcomes. This leads to the reporting of results that are not actionable. In addition, programs are assessing many separate outcomes related to core competencies, which suggests that assessment efforts and the rubrics need to be more clearly defined.

In addition, there needs to be a systematic process, in upper division courses of assessing students' achievement at graduation that is closely linked with institution-wide learning outcomes. Of special concern is the continued development of faculty expertise in student learning outcomes assessment and program review. That is, there needs to be greater attention to training and planning assessment efforts that help faculty clearly define the outcomes and rubrics, determine appropriate places in the curriculum to assess outcomes, and use assignments that are clearly aligned with the rubric may result in data that are more useful in identifying changes needed to improve student learning.

Educational quality and student learning of graduate programs are related to the definition and assessment of the generic intellectual competencies that are foundational in their field. (CFR 2.2b) Cal Maritime's single masters level graduate program in Transportation and Engineering Management (MSTEM) is designed to be "coherent, aligned, and intentional." Each assignment is aligned with specific course outcomes and these, in turn, are aligned with specific program outcomes. Additionally, many of the courses have gone through an internal quality review on a continuous improvement tack to help ensure that this alignment continues. The curriculum clearly demonstrates a graduate level program. Assessment results are integrated into the new program review process, although the process does not explicitly demonstrate how assessment results have been or can be used to inform curricular decisions. Incorporating such information would help programs focus on closing the loop between assessment data and program practice. (See the Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix.)

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and standards of performance at graduation

Student success and its measures are explicitly linked to Cal Maritime's Strategic Goals. Student success in turn is linked to academic excellence, student learning, global maritime profession, organizational excellence, partnerships, and campus community, which are inherent in its mission and values. More specifically, Cal Maritime defines student success as the fulfillment of the conditions necessary for students to reach their goals. That is, students achieve success by performing

well in courses, completing all coursework in a timely manner, and attaining fulfilling employment after graduation.

Retention or persistence is an indicator of students' continued progress toward graduation, measured at regular intervals.

Cal Maritime's report on Retention and Graduation, prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning provides a detailed analysis for both first-time, full-time freshmen and full-time upper division transfer students including data on student retention and graduation in order to describe the ways students *flow* through their degree programs.

Data are analyzed for all students and then disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, Pell Grant Award status, and major.

The Office of Institutional Research (IR) analyses and summarizes these data and provides public summaries, as well as links to graduation and retention rates dashboards such as the CSU Dashboard from the Chancellor's Office and the WSCUC Graduation Rate Dashboard. IR examines trends and patterns that may help set targets for the improvement of student retention and graduation. It appears that reports, plans, and publications regarding student learning and success and program review are widely disseminated on campus.

Disaggregated data are examined in order to set goals for increasing levels of learning, retention and graduation rates. Faculty retreats have been held to discuss retention and graduation data, learning outcomes results and engagement (i.e., National Survey of Student Engagement, NSEE findings). The goal is to use such evidence to diagnose weaknesses and raise benchmarks through a process of continuous improvement. For example, data show that there have been changes in the diversity of the Cal Maritime's entering students: the proportion of first-time freshmen went from 60% of new incoming students in fall 2012 to 76% in fall 2017. Students who self-identify as females has increased from 13% in fall 2012 to 18% in fall 2017. In fall 2012, 58% of first-time freshmen identified themselves as white, while in fall 2017, 48% self-identified as white. The groups that have grown the most at Cal Maritime are Hispanic/Latino and those who identified themselves as having two or more races/ethnicities. Cal Maritime has carefully increased headcounts and FTES over the last five years. Enrollment increases have occurred primarily in non-impacted program (i.e., those that do not require sea time), including the BA programs in Global Studies and Maritime Affairs and the BS program in Business Administration.

Of course, enrollment is just the starting point for any discussion of retention and graduation. As the Institutional report notes, a key indicator of student success is retention of students in their first and second year. In this respect, Cal

Maritime has shown considerable success. The first year retention of first-time full-time freshman has ranged from 75% to 85%, and second year retention has ranged from 65% to 80%. In addition, six and eight year graduation rates have been around 60% over the last 5 years.

One area of concern is the fluctuation in retention over time, especially the drop in second year retention, from 80% to 72% over the last 4 years. In addition, the graduation rate gap at Cal Maritime varies widely among student sub-populations (e.g., females and African American, Latino, and Native American ethnicities). Cal Maritime has expressed a commitment to eliminate any graduation gaps by focusing on enhanced advising, tutoring and counseling services for students and improved course scheduling to ensure all students are able to take classes when needed. Cal Maritime staff and faculty members should dig deeper into why there are differences in performance and persistence at the sub-population level so that differentiated interventions can be applied as appropriate to each group.

The Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR) is more reflective of student success than the Unit Redemption Rate. However, the standard Graduate Rate is most useful, especially if it is extended to include eight years, which is more appropriate for Cal Maritime students given the structure of the curriculum and the need to spend time at sea for some majors. Other direct indicators of success that are especially relevant to Cal Maritime are job placement percentage and earnings after college, as well as such indirect measurements as student engagement (NSSE) and alumni satisfaction.

Call Maritime is attempting to enhance student success through curricular redesign; student engagement; improvement of student services; diversity recruitment, retention, and programming; and co-curricular programming.

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

It is clear Cal Maritime has taken seriously the significance of institutional data collection and the role it plays in quality assurance and improvement. Its Office of Institutional Research is new, but its existence is a step forward; now the institution must provide the ongoing training and resources necessary for the collection, review and analysis of data consistently and creatively by faculty and administrators across campus. The institution benefits from the availability of comparative data from its sister CSU campuses and from other maritime academies nationally. It is encouraged to make regular use of these benchmarks.

Cal Maritime has structured a program review process and conducted reviews across its programs. In every case, the faculty has been engaged in this process and often external reviewers have been recruited. The process has been assisted by the creation of a Program Review guide that has been revised over time in response to feedback that the process was overly complex.

The institution suggests, and the team agrees, that additional training of faculty and possibly the simplification of procedures would improve the way program review is delivered. In addition, it appears that students have not been adequately involved with the program review process and clearly need to participate more fully. Furthermore, the articulation between program review and the annual assessment reports due from each department needs to be strengthened so that they complement each other and are actionable.

As reported in the institution's report, the emphasis appears to have been mostly on assuring that programs are generally operating as anticipated rather than on identifying areas that could improve and matching them with solutions. It should be made clear that program review is not primarily a "stress test" to determine whether a program should be maintained, but an opportunity to find ways that even excellent programs can improve.

The Institutional report suggests that there are programs where reviews need to be particularly sensitive going forward and the results incorporated into an assessment driven continuous improvement process. For example, the leadership program requires continued attention to internal coordination and focus. In addition, the cumulative impact of the components of the general education program would benefit from further exploration. The success of student services in supporting diversity initiatives also requires continuing study, as does a continuing program by program analysis of retention and graduation data to reveal which students succeed and why.

The implicit definition of student success is persistence to graduation, post-graduation employment, certification, and satisfaction as registered on surveys. However, the extent to which students learn during their matriculation is not fully explored. Future analysis would do well to include measures of learning, regarding general education as well as technical proficiency, at key points in time during a student's tenure at Cal Maritime. This would help to more clearly define what students learn and when they learn it during their enrollment.

The assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement were focus areas during the last comprehensive review and in the 2014 interim report. Based on the self-study and the AV CSUMA has made progress in these areas, but also recognizes that they require continuous attention and improvement. Institutional learning outcomes align well with both the WSCUC core competencies and a subset of the general education program outcomes. CSUMA has established a framework and infrastructure for assessment including the Institution-Wide Assessment Council (IWAC), as well as a system for annual assessment at the program level. These are intended to feed into a periodic program review cycle and a four-year assessment cycle for institutional learning outcomes.

Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) were first developed in 2008 by a special campus-wide committee in cooperation with the Academic Senate. In 2009 CSUMA established a framework and infrastructure for assessment including the Institution-Wide Assessment Council (IWAC). The IWAC was tasked with “promulgating and sustaining the assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes”. IWAC focuses on the assessment of institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), as well as a system for annual assessment at the program level.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) embody discipline-specific knowledge. Each degree-granting program has a set of PLOs that are expected to align with both the General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) and the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) including the Core Competencies. Over time, both the outcomes and the processes used to measure them, have evolved and matured through an iterative process. At the start there were twenty-two separate learning outcomes, many of which were very difficult to assess. Subsequently the ILOs were refined with some removed and others combined.

In a further effort to streamline assessment efforts, IWAC uses the assessment of those ILOs to serve as evidence of meeting the general education learning outcomes. Some, while not all, of these Core Competencies are also measured at the mastery level outside of the GE program via capstone courses in the disciplines. This leaves several areas of the General Education program that are not directly assessed. The institution should consider ways in which it could evaluate the general education program as a whole.

Data from Course Level Outcomes (CLOs), gathered in classrooms and laboratories are summarized and aggregated to document the accomplishment of PLOs, GELOs and, where appropriate, ILOs. The responsibility for assessing PLOs rests in

the academic departments and the chair is ultimately responsible for ensuring proper alignment, submission, and analysis of evidence of student success. Components 4 and 6 of the CSUMA Institutional Report elaborate on how these outcomes are assessed, what evidence has been collected, and what was done with this evidence to improve learning.

The necessary relationship between the collection and analysis of assessment data and decision-making for quality assurance and improvement is recognized throughout the Institutional report. Decision-making is to be evidence based, planning is to be data driven; budgets are to be constructed in response to assessments. New programs, for example, are to be based on careful analysis of trends in maritime professions. However, examples are sparse and where noted, minor in scope. It seems that while data are incorporated into higher level decisions and planning documents, such analyses have yet to play determinative roles at the departmental level. Since at present the academic deans have no role in reviewing student learning outcomes assessment findings, the institution might consider requiring programs to include such data in their annual reports.

Although it is clear that there has been significant progress in the area of assessing student learning, a focus on professional development for faculty in the area of assessment may improve the efficacy of the assessment efforts and result in assessment work that enhances the quality of the courses, programs, and the institution.

The team also suggests that the simplification of procedures may improve the way student learning outcomes assessment is conducted and the results used for quality assurance and improvement. The articulation between classroom assessment and annual faculty reviews and program reviews needs to be strengthened so that they complement each other and their findings are actionable.

Similarly, as with program review, it seems that students have not been adequately involved with the assessment process. They should be engaged to the extent possible in both the collection and interpretation of results and in plans for improvement.

In conclusion, there is a plethora of program review and student learning outcomes assessment data relevant to quality assurance and improvement at CSUMA. And, it seems that while some data are incorporated into higher level decisions and planning documents (e.g., IR data), local data have yet to play determinative roles at the departmental and individual

course level improvements. Therefore, CAM is encouraged to continue to build on the progress that has been made in assessment and program review by focusing on faculty development, deliberate planning of assessment methods and systematic use of finding for improvement at all levels and all areas of the institution.

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

Cal Maritime has addressed challenges regarding state funding over the past ten years, which was marked by dramatic cuts and then a more recent steady increase. At the same time, there was an increase in enrollment and a bigger increase in FTE's due to the nature of programs that require more than the minimum number of credits to graduate with a bachelor's degree. This is partly due to the nature of engineering programs and related need for time spent at sea for licensure programs. These anomalies come with no added tuition revenue, but with added expenses of teaching. The institution recognizes that planning for levels of enrollment that are sustainable for these programs is critical and has acted accordingly. For example, enrollment growth plans are largely focused on new programs and non-impacted programs (i.e., those that do not require sea time) to balance out the programs that are impacted and most costly to operate.

Cal Maritime needs to maintain a continued balance between plans and visions for growth and financial support and sustainability into the future. Rigorous planning and budgeting, as well as continuing to formally explore other funding resources appear to be at the forefront of Cal Maritime's focus. To that end, a comprehensive strategic plan has been developed and is being implemented to ensure that the institution plans in accordance with resources, and allocates resources properly to ensure plans come to fruition. The institution has undertaken efforts over the past several years to formalize the budget process and allocation of funds. In addition, it has begun fund-raising efforts intended to offset future cuts in state funding or failure of state funding to meet the institution's needs and aspirations.

Through interviews while on campus, the team gained an understanding of all sources feeding into the budget, but suggests that the University consider generating an "all sources" budget that provides a view of all funding sources at a more granular level than the budgets provided for review by the team. That is, while CMA maintains operating budgets detailing the expenditure of state funds and advancement reports showing the

expenditure of private funding, it could assist the institution in future planning to integrate these documents so that the overall flow of resources becomes fully apparent and the degree to which priorities are being supported by **all sources** is clear.

Cal Maritime is initiating a feasibility study through a consulting firm concerning a \$50 million, 8-year campaign that is projected to launch in July of 2019. The stated vision contained in the California Maritime Academy Foundation (CSUMAF) 2016-2022 Strategic Plan is to steward \$21 million in endowment to assist CSUMA in the furtherance of its 2016 -2021 Strategic Plan and long range 2029 Vision. However, CSU Philanthropic Productivity Summary shows a decrease in philanthropic revenue between 2015/16 and 2016/17, with increases across all areas year-over-year from 2016/17 to 2017/18.

Cal Maritime provided ample evidence of how it plans to maintain financial stability and secure appropriate resources to support both short and long-term plans outside of state appropriations. While trends are up, Cal Maritime and its CSUMAF will need to be resolute in their focus over the long-term to achieve the strategic vision.

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The work of creating this self-study including the act of measuring the institution against a common set of core commitments, standards, and criteria for review has helped Cal Maritime recognize strengths and identify challenges by situating practices within a broader evaluative framework of quality higher education. Given the most recent studies on the campus climate (Reichard 2019) and leadership development (Skyline 2019) it seems that the institutional report overstated strengths and understated challenges in relation to the four area identified in previous reviews, namely, 1) assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; 2) unity and diversity; 3) refinement of the leadership development program; and 4) ongoing funding challenges. In addition, the self-study conclusions were quite generic and did not indicate plans for improvement despite the fact that both campus climate and leadership development were undergoing in-depth review by outside consultants (Reichard and Skyline) at the request of the institution when the report was written.

This situation suggests that Cal Maritime is still struggling to move from a maritime training institute to a university as is evident from both faculty and students, which may underlie other issues. WSCUC has identified this problem over a period of several years. It is now time to see results across the board.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the last WSCUC visit Cal Maritime has maintained honest and open communication with WSCUC and continued the process of integration into the CSU system. As directed in the 2014 Commission Letter the institution has worked to make progress in assessment, unity and diversity, leadership development, and funding and to balance the emphasis on intellectual learning, applied technology, leadership, and global awareness. However, Cal Maritime will need to redouble its effort to overcome remaining challenges regarding: 1) assessment of student learning, program review, and student achievement; 2) unity and diversity; 3) refinement of the leadership development program; and 4) ongoing funding challenges.

The team commends Cal Maritime for:

- the quality of its self-study and the openness with which the institution shared information that recognizes its strengths and identifies its challenges
- its strong mission, vision, and strategic plans that align with WSCUC standards
- the work done to evolve the program review procedure and the institution wide learning outcomes assessment process
- the steps Cal Maritime has taken to insure financial viability
- the external accolades and awards, completion rates, internship opportunities, industry grants, and career attainments of graduates that Cal Maritime has achieved.

Recommendations

Cal Maritime should:

- Review and revise communication strategies to
 - Improve internal communication horizontally and vertically,
 - Strengthen shared governance, and
 - Ensure faculty and student inclusion in decision making

in order to build a culture of trust in the administration.

- Work to achieve a campus-wide consensus on a definition of leadership that integrates academic, licensure, commandant, student and student affairs perspectives.
- Continue to build on the progress that has been made in assessment and program review by focusing on faculty development and deliberate planning of assessment methods.
- Assess the current status of unity and diversity on campus using an objective method, for example, a confidential campus climate survey, as the basis for creating a clear set of goals and measures of achievement for the programs and services provided.

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? YES
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? See below
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>https://www.csum.edu/web/right-to-know/student-complaint-form https://www.csum.edu/web/right-to-know</p> <p>The Your Right To Know page contains the student complaint form, and when completed online, it is sent to compliance@csum.edu.</p> <p>https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=37520c83-4aa0-42b5-9c92-a440b402f65a&groupId=4036400&filename=Student%20Originated%20Request%20for%20Change%20of%20Grade-08-31-16.pdf</p> <p>http://www.calstate.edu/eo/eo-1097-rev-6-23-15-attachment-a.pdf</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? YES
	If so, please describe briefly: See below, and Component 2
	<p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? YES</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Processes for handling student complaints vary depending on the type of complaint. For general complaints, students can access the "Student Complaints" link from the main webpage or by typing "student complaints" directly into the search box, where they will be advised as follows: "Students are always encouraged to resolve complaints or grievances at the appropriate level of dispute, as outlined in the Student Handbook. Additionally, students may submit written complaints through the linked form which is then directed to the appropriate university official(s) for investigation. Complaints may be submitted anonymously. This form is not intended for Title IX complaints or other conduct-related issues. Students are invited to go to the Title IX website for the student conduct incident reporting form. There is also the university Ombuds program: https://www.csum.edu/web/about/ombuds</p>
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? YES
	If so, where? Records of Student Complaints are held in the Human Resources Office
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? YES</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>Records are maintained by the Human Resources Offices. These are processed as they come in, and are tracked and monitored by HR until the complaint is resolved. For the Ombuds program, all issues are followed through until resolution is reached. STATUS: 12 cases have been brought and successfully resolved using the Ombuds Program.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The institution's student complaint processes are easily accessible on its website and appear robust. Student Handbook, Title IX information, Student Ombudsman information are all available on the institution's website.</p>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Lucile Sansing, Sheri Jones

Date: March 20-22, 2019

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? YES
	Where is the policy located? http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2011-14.pdf
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>For all CSU degree programs and courses bearing academic credit, the “credit hour” is defined as “the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than: 1. one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or 2. at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”</p>
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? YES
	<p>Program Review. https://www.csum.edu/web/student-success/home/evidence-of-student-learning/program-review</p> <p>Curriculum Committee Request Forms. https://www.csum.edu/web/academic-senate-community/academic-senate-home/curriculum-committee</p> <p>“Technology -Assisted Modes of Instruction” policy which requires any course offered in a new modality be approved by the campus Curriculum Committee through submission of a Course Modality Request Form which asks that learning outcomes for the course be tied to the unit load. https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=b3476271-ba4a-44a0-a814-19413f40bbf6&groupId=3965808</p>
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	<p>Comments:</p> <p>While there is a policy in place, no evidence was reviewed that proves periodic review of courses. A search through several recent program reviews indicted no evidence that periodic reviews of credit hours is taking place in the program review process. There is a check-box on the Curriculum Request Form used only when such a request is being made, indicating that there is “seat-time equivalency” but no indication of how the course is evaluated to meet that standard.</p> <p>Program reviews are available on the CSU Maritime website. Most reviews on this site include a careful analysis of program content and length although there was no mention of credit hour assignments.</p>
	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1-2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? CMA does not have such courses for its undergraduates, Only as part of its sole MS program.
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online
	What degree level(s)? MS
	What discipline(s)? Transportation and Engineering Management
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? x YES

	Comments: Please see Distance Education Review Form for details
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1-2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? BA/ BS
	Global Studies and Maritime Affairs, B.A. Business Administration, B.S. Facilities Engineering Technology, B.S. Marine Engineering Technology with Third Assistant Engineer's/OICEW License, B.S. Marine Transportation with Third Mate's/IOCNW License, B.S. Mechanical Engineering, B.S. Mechanical Engineering with Third Assistant Engineer's License option, B.S.
	For Online MS program in Transportation and Engineering Management see Distance Education Review Form
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES
	Comments: External accreditation agencies so testify
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? All eight Bachelor's programs listed in catalog plus MS program
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities Engineering Technology, B.S. • Marine Engineering Technology with Third Assistant Engineer's/OICEW License, B.S. • Marine Transportation with Third Mate's/IOCNW License, B.S. • Mechanical Engineering, B.S. • Mechanical Engineering with Third Assistant Engineer's License option, B.S. • Global Studies and Maritime Affairs • Transportation and Engineering Management, MS-, • Business Administration, B.S
	What degree level(s)? BA, BS,, MA
	What discipline(s)? See Above
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? x YES
	Comments: Materials are clear and detailed.

Review Completed By: Lucile Sansing, Sheri Jones

Date: March 20-22, 2019

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? YES</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>https://www.csum.edu/web/admissions/i-want-to-apply https://www.csum.edu/web/about/explore</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? YES</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? YES</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Marketing and Recruitment policies and strategies reside with the Admissions Department. The weblink "Explore Cal Maritime" provides prospective students with information pertaining to areas of study, co-curricular activities, the Corps of Cadets, and residence life. There is a direct link from this page to the <u>Institutional Research</u> page, which provides information on typical length of time to degree in the form of graduation and retention rates. Also, information on average annual cost and the graduate rate are also available on the College Score Card link.</p> <p>https://www.csum.edu/web/financial-aid/cost-of-attendance https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/school/?111188-California-Maritime-Academy</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? YES</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? YES</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The website provides robust, clear and compelling information regarding admission requirements and the value of a Cal Maritime degree. Information is available on time to graduation, retention rates, job placement information after graduation</p> <p>Information on average annual cost and salary after graduation are on the admissions page as well as the College Score Card link. https://collegescorecard.ed.gov/school/?111188-California-Maritime-Academy</p>

*§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: Lucile Sansing, Sheri Jones
 Date: March 20-22, 2019

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Is the policy publically available? <input type="checkbox"/> YES If so, where? https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=ccdd121d-73bd-4d34-afc4-26a84879120e&groupId=3965808
	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 type="checkbox"/> YES
	Comments: Additionally, the Office of the Registrar, with the Admissions Office and Department Chairs and Professional Advisors, work with transfer students to articulate credit and plan curriculum maps.

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

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's

Transfer of Credit Policy. Review Completed By: Lucile Sansing,

Sheri Jones

Date: March 20-22, 2019

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: California State University Maritime
Academy (CSUMA) Type of Visit: Re-accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Peter Gray
Date/s of review: March 20-22, 2019

Programs and courses reviewed

Graduate Program (MS) in Transportation and Engineering Management
(MSTEM)

Background Information

The California State University Maritime Academy launched its first (and only) graduate degree program

- a Master of Science in Transportation and Engineering Management on September 4, 2011. MSTEM is a 10-course master's degree program (30 credit hours) offered completely online with accepted students proceeding through the learning process as a cohort. Upon completion of five core courses in business and management fundamentals, students take four courses in one of three concentrations, Engineering Management, Transportation, or Humanitarian Disaster Management. Finally, students complete a Capstone course designed to help them demonstrate their learning through an extensive project in their work setting.

The inaugural class graduated in the spring of 2013. As of the middle of the spring semester, 2016

- b. The total students currently enrolled: 63 students.
- c. Total graduated as of summer 2015: 53
- d. Percentage graduating in 3 years or less: 85%
- e. Total students admitted in the first 5 years: 120

Since then, Cohorts 2 and 3 have graduated, with Cohort 4 members on track to be awarded their degrees in spring 2016. Cohort 6 began classes on August 31, 2016. As of June 2017, the MSTEM program has a 3 year (150% of minimum time) graduation rate of 85%. Applications for fall 2017's, Cohort 7 are now being accepted.

For the first six cohorts, the size of the cohort was established at 20 students in all but one year. That year the cohort size was expanded to 40 but only 32 enrolled. Currently the enrollment is at 26.

Cohort	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	Cohort 5	Cohort 6
Start Date	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016
Applications	23	23	23	36	30	32
Acc'd/Admd	20	22	18	32	24	26
Acc'd/Defer	2	0	2	1	2	2
Acc'd/Dec'd	1*	1*	3*	1*	4*	3*

*why declined admission Financial – 5, Medical – 3, Other school/major/Cadet program – 3, Work (shipping) schedule – 1, No response - 1

The demand for the program is such that with some additional outreach effort, two cohorts of 20 could be in place in the next few years. An important finding of the program review is that there is an imbalance in the class sizes. The core curriculum classes have between 23 and 26 students in each class while the specialty track courses range in size for 2 or 3 students to 12-14 students once the cohort splits into the three areas of concentration.

All distance learning courses are governed by the Cal Maritime Academic Senate “Technology-Assisted Modes of Instruction” policy which requires any course offered in a new modality be approved by the campus Curriculum Committee through submission of a Course Modality Request Form which asks that learning outcomes for the course be tied to the program outcomes.

The program is totally on-line. The MSTEM program provides texts for all students as part of the course fees. If a student needs to upgrade computer equipment, financial aid is available for that. The Cal Maritime IT help desk provides support for the students in the program if there are issues with email, computer access, and connections to the learning management system. The academic computing coordinator also supports the graduate program, faculty, and students.

Nature of the review

MS in Transportation and Engineering Management (MSTEM) document review and on-site interviews during accreditation visit.

Material examined

1. Website for the Cal Maritime Graduate Program (MS) in Transportation and Engineering Management (MSTEM).
2. Program curriculum and course syllabi
3. Program Review, submitted 12 June 2017.
4. Documents describing student learning outcomes, quality assurance procedures, evaluation results and subsequent changes.

Persons/committees interviewed

1. Instructors from the International Business and Logistics program in the ABS School of Maritime Policy and Management, and the Departments of Engineering Technology and Marine Transportation at Cal Maritime, as well as subject area experts from across the industry.
2. Veronica Boe is the Director of Extension Services with fiscal oversight of graduate studies; Graham Benton provides academic oversight of the program
3. Extended Learning Advisory Board
4. The team of faculty and the external consultant tasked with examining the need for and value of external accreditation.
5. Current and former students and employers

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required
<p>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p> <p>MS in Transportation and Engineering Management (MSTEM)</p>	<p>All distance learning courses are governed by the Cal Maritime Academic Senate “Technology-Assisted Modes of Instruction” policy which requires any course offered in a new modality be approved by the campus Curriculum Committee through submission of a Course Modality Request Form which asks that learning outcomes for the course be tied to the Program outcomes.</p> <p>A graduate degree from Cal Maritime helps those already working in shipping, engineering, logistics, or humanitarian support to gain experience to further their career to a managerial level.</p> <p>MSTEM program reside in the Extended Learning Department of the Academic Affairs Division. The Department is headed by Director Veronica Boe. It is the only degree program administered by the Extended Learning Department.</p> <p>The Office of Graduate Studies administers the policies and procedures established by the California Maritime Academy and the California State University.</p> <p>The graduate program follows the undergraduate</p>	<p>Response to Inst. Rpt: the masters’ program (offered through Extended Learning) could be better integrated with other university functions.</p>

	<p>procedures on academic integrity.</p> <p>It was significantly shaped by what business and industry advisors saw as essential skills for professionals in the transportation management and engineering management fields.</p> <p>Corporate leaders, industry groups, port authorities and government agencies articulate the need for professionals who have an awareness of global issues, understand the technical aspects of transportation and engineering, and possess advanced leadership and management skills.</p> <p>Cal Maritime worked closely with these groups to develop the first completely online advanced degree that encompasses management within a transportation and engineering context.</p> <p>There is an Extended Learning Advisory Board for courses and programs offered by the Extended Learning division. This Board was instrumental in the development of the graduate program and follows its progress with keen interest, offering input and guidance on desired directions and outcomes for graduates of that program.</p> <p>This feedback loop thus allows Cal Maritime to introduce new programming or educational developments to industry, and the board</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>members can provide information from industry to our educational leaders on desired skills and learning outcomes.</p>	
<p>Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>The MSTEM program is informed by the Cal Maritime institutional student learning outcomes. Consistent with the mission of the California State University, Maritime Academy to provide a college education combining intellectual learning, applied technology, leadership development, and global awareness, as with other programs graduate students will develop competence in ten areas.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution? Students are encouraged to take advantage of campus resources if they are local, and to take part in campus events such as world-side 4th Thursday chapters (some of which are headed up by MSTEM students/alums), career fairs, homecoming, the Gala, and athletic events at home and on other campuses. The alumni Board President is a program graduate, as is another representative on the Board. Distance student achievements are celebrated in campus publications and social media, and they lead the student procession at Commencement. A traditional celebratory dinner the evening before Commencement brings the candidates, their families, their faculty, and university administration and alumni groups together. It has been successful enough that the campus is now planning similar receptions for the campus-based undergraduate degree candidates.</p>
<p>Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the</p>	<p>Since 2014-2015, Cal Maritime has participated in the CSU QALT program. This program is designed to improve on-line courses and hybrid courses. The focus of QALT is</p>	<p>Is the technology adequately supported? A full-time Academic Technologies Manager supports the students, faculty, and technologies themselves as</p>

technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?

on ease of use for students, with course design and delivery implementing best practices in delivering a quality online education. (Is the on-line course presented in a manner that is easy for the students to find materials and understand assignments?)

As part of the MSTEM's participation:

- Four faculty members have been trained in the QALT process.
- Three faculty members are trained in peer review of on-line courses.
- One faculty member has been certified as a master peer reviewer.
- Three of the MSTEM course have completed peer review and the instructors have modified their course following the peer review recommendations.
- The plan is to continue reviewing at least four courses a year, starting in the summer of 2017, until all MSTEM course have undergone QALT peer review.

The Dean reviews the syllabus for each course to ensure that student outcomes are discussed and that the course meets the QALT standards.

It is expected that the online graduate student will fully participate in the various facets specific to a distance learning program, such as reading and working extensively on his or her own and using the Internet to

well as conducting orientation and training activities. He also scouts out new, appropriate technologies and familiarizes faculty with them. A fully staffed IT department supports the integration of the LMS with campus systems. Students go through a two-week orientation program in their first class to familiarize them with the technologies, as well as with program expectations.

Are there back-ups? Back-ups occur on a daily schedule system-wide.

	<p>communicate about his or her learning. Discussion forums, papers, presentations, and exams are used to evaluate student progress. Students are also required to participate in web conferences, chat forums, and other group activities on the Internet. It is the student's responsibility to become able to use these tools effectively.</p>	
<p>Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>Since the program is cohort-based, the students foster peer relationships that they take with them beyond the school. They build a professional network and support group that spans the globe.</p> <p>The Graduate Program website features tutorials and written instruction in using the features of the internet course delivery used for this program.</p> <p>Students also have access to online advising, counseling, Library, academic support, IT personnel and other services for support and guidance.</p>	<p>Student Support Services</p> <p>What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? Students are surveyed after each semester and at the program end to gather feedback on how well the provided services met their needs.</p> <p>The following areas received the ratings listed after each:</p> <p>Business Office Support: Outstanding 17, Very Good 11, Satisfactory 2;</p> <p>Program Office Support (includes advisement, counseling, academic support) : Outstanding 38, Very Good, 6;</p> <p>IT Support: Outstanding 20, Very Good 13, Satisfactory 9;</p> <p>Library Services Support: Outstanding 21, Very Good 9, Satisfactory 8</p> <p>There were no scores below Satisfactory from</p>

<p>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>All of the MSTEM faculty are either adjuncts or full time faculty in other Cal Maritime programs, one adjunct faculty member was been selected to lead the program review effort.</p> <p>Since 2015, Cal Maritime has been awarded and participated in the CSU program QLT: Quality Assurance for Blended and Online Courses. This program was developed to assist faculty, faculty development leaders, and instructional designers to more effectively design and deliver online, blended, and flipped courses. Especially useful for the graduate program, many of our faculty have completed the module in “Teaching Effectively Online” and have received Peer-Review Certification. QLT has been very valuable not only in helping design our policy on Technology-Assisted Instruction but also in making sure the assessment of student learning is clearly embedded in these courses.</p>	
<p>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>All distance learning courses are governed by the Cal Maritime Academic Senate “Technology-Assisted Modes of Instruction” policy which requires any course offered in a new modality be approved by the campus Curriculum Committee through submission of a Course Modality Request Form which asks that learning outcomes for the</p>	<p>credit hour report</p> <p>“for all CSU degree programs and courses bearing academic credit, the “credit hour” is defined as “the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:</p>

	<p>course be tied to the unit load.</p> <p>The entire program is designed to be “coherent, aligned, and intentional.”</p> <p>Each assignment is aligned with specific course outcomes and these, in turn, are aligned with specific program outcomes. Additionally, many of the courses have gone through an internal quality review on a continuous improvement tack to help ensure that this alignment continues.</p> <p>The curriculum clearly demonstrates a graduate level program.</p> <p>A comparison was made with other programs in Transportation, Engineering, and Humanitarian Management. An effort was made to look at programs at similar academic institutes. No other maritime university in the United States has programs in engineering management or humanitarian management.</p>	<p>1. one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or</p> <p>2. at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”</p>
<p>Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>As of June 2017, the MSTEM program has a 3 year (150% of minimum time) graduation rate of 85%</p> <p>No other maritime university in the United States has programs in engineering management or humanitarian management.</p>	<p>The review found that in the first year of the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely completion of the capstone projects was a problem. A number of students fell behind the projected time line for completion. • The capstone projects were not well written and many students struggled with writing using APA format. • The course mentors were not the appropriate

		<p>individuals to monitor these problems.</p> <p>To correct these problems, the Dean assumed responsibility for the capstone course. Mentors were assigned to each student with the focus of the mentors on the quality of the capstone. An editor was assigned to monitor all of the capstone to ensure compliance with APA format. Time-lines and a series of deliverables throughout the capstone semester were developed.</p> <p>The results of these changes to the capstone were far-reaching. The quality of the capstones dramatically improved. The percentage of students completing on time increased.</p>
<p>Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>Students in this program will meet educational outcomes in three areas: Project Leadership Global Context Management Components The MSTEM has an assessment manual. It was developed in May 2016 and has been reviewed by faculty and administration associated with the program. This manual includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution Wide Learning Outcomes • Program Student Learning Outcomes • Program Student Learning Outcomes Evaluation Process • Assessment System • Course Outcome Assessment and Linkage to Program Student Learning Outcomes 	<p>The student learning outcomes have not been reviewed since the program started in 2010. The initial review was to be held during a summer faculty meeting in the summer of 2017.</p> <p>The current assessment of student learning is in the process of changing.</p> <p>In the spring of 2016, an Assessment Manual was developed for the MSTEM program (program review appendix)</p> <p>In the future, the assessment will be a multi-step process.</p> <p>The graduate program maintains assessment documents for each class and after each class; faculty identify ways that the class</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Improvement 	<p>can be improved the next time that it's taught.</p> <p>Additionally, the graduate program is participating in a quality assurance initiative sponsored by the Chancellor's office which has developed a rubric identifying best practices in online course design and delivery, intended to evaluate online courses through a peer review process and implement effective tools and methods signifying excellence in online teaching and learning. Half of the program's 18 courses have been evaluated to date.</p>
<p>Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?</p>	<p>The program is totally on-line. The MSTEM program provides texts for all students as part of the course fees. If a student needs to upgrade computer equipment, financial aid is available for that.</p> <p>The Cal Maritime IT help desk provides support for the students in the program if there are issues with email, computer access, and connections to the learning management system. The academic technology manager also supports the graduate program, faculty, and students.</p>	<p>Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? No; all faculty are hired by Cal Maritime and design, develop, deliver, and teach their own courses, with the approval of Cal Maritime's Curriculum Committee.</p>
<p>Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>Periodic review of the MSTEM is conducted by the Extended Learning Advisory Board. This board is made up of representatives of the maritime industry, faculty of Cal Maritime, state</p>	<p>One fundamental way to define quality is to first measure how students are meeting and/or exceeding the levels of understanding appropriate to their degree, and this is accomplished through the calibration of</p>

	<p>government, and Cal Maritime administrators.</p> <p>At least four courses a year are reviewed for compliance with the QLT rubric’s quality standards, starting in 2015 when the standards were introduced, until all MSTEM courses have undergone QALT peer review.</p> <p>A formal Program Review was conducted in June 2017 (following the WASC “Resource Guide for “Good Practices” on Academic Program Review)</p> <p>Discussions are underway for an academic year 2018/19 action plan to explore options, evaluate the program against accrediting requirements, and start the process of applying.</p> <p>The Quality Assurance for Blended and Online Courses is another program funded by the CSU which, when run in parallel with the processes outlined in the recently-approved Academic Senate policy on Technology-Assisted Modes of Instruction, creates a mechanism for ensuring the creation of more online course offerings that conform to the same rigor and standards of face-to-face courses.</p> <p>The graduate program is participating the quality assurance initiative sponsored by the Chancellor’s office which has developed a rubric</p>	<p>learning outcomes, that is, an outcome must be accompanied by specific benchmarks ... for the graduate program, and the use of authenticated rubrics (such as those from the AAC&U’s LEAP). Ultimately, evidence should be used to diagnose weaknesses and raise benchmarks through continuous improvement.</p> <p>The current continuous improvement process involves the individual faculty evaluating their own courses and making changes as needed. All the courses have been modified by the faculty since the beginning of the program.</p> <p>The most noticeable improvement was to the capstone course. After the first year, it became apparent that there were a number of problems with the capstone course. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely completion of the capstone projects was a problem. A number of students fell behind the projected time line for completion. • The capstone projects were not well written and many students struggled with writing using APA format. • The course mentors were not the appropriate individuals to monitor these problems. <p>To correct these problems, the Dean assumed</p>
--	--	--

	<p>identifying best practices in online course design and delivery, intended to evaluate online courses through a peer review process and implement effective tools and methods signifying excellence in online teaching and learning. Half of the program's 18 courses have been evaluated to date.</p> <p>The current continuous improvement process involves the individual faculty evaluating their own courses and in collaboration with a team of peer reviewers and making changes as needed. All the courses have been modified by the faculty since the beginning of the program. The most noticeable improvement was to the capstone course.</p> <p>After the first year, it became apparent that there were a number of problems with the capstone course.</p>	<p>responsibility for the capstone course. Mentors were assigned to each student with the focus of the mentors on the quality of the capstone. An editor was assigned to monitor all of the capstone to ensure compliance with APA format. Time-lines and a series of deliverables throughout the capstone semester were developed.</p> <p>The results of these changes to the capstone were far-reaching. The quality of the capstones dramatically improved. The percentage of students completing on time increased. A number of capstone papers have been published.</p>
--	---	--