

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 3

For Institutions Seeking Initial Accreditation

To Coleman University

October 28-30, 2015

Team Roster

Thomas Stewart, Team Chair
President
Patten University

Susan M. Clapper, Team Assistant Chair
Executive Assistant to the Vice President
Dominican University of California

J. Aaron Christopher, Team Member
Vice President for Administration and Finance
Northeastern State University

Cathy Corcoran, Team Member
Vice President of Accreditation Compliance
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Academy of Art University

Jeremy Morales, Team Member
Manager of Academic Planning and Support
West Coast University

Christopher Oberg, Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective judgment for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. If the institution is granted candidacy or initial accreditation by the Commission, this report and the Commission action letter will be 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 Visit.....	3
B. The Institution’s Seeking Accreditation Visit Report.....	4
C. Response to Issues Raised in Past Committee Letters.....	6
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC’S STANDARDS.....	11
Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.....	13
Institutional Purposes.....	13
Integrity and Transparency.....	14
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions.....	17
Teaching and Learning.....	17
Scholarship and Creative Activity.....	20
Student Learning and Success.....	20
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability.....	21
Faculty and Staff.....	21
Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources.....	22
Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes.....	24
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement.....	26
Quality Assurance Processes.....	26
Institutional Learning and Improvement.....	27
Preparation for Reaffirmation under the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation.....	30
Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.....	31
SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
Key Findings.....	33
Commendations.....	34
Recommendations.....	35
APPENDICES.....	36

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

Coleman University (Coleman) is a private, nonprofit institution of higher education situated on an 85,000 square foot campus in the Kearny Mesa area of San Diego, California. Coleman was founded in 1963 as a vocational institution in response to the growing career opportunities that electronic data processing had in the industry, business, government, and education sectors. During the 1970s, Coleman added associate and bachelor degrees programs and in 1982, its first master's degree program. Coleman currently offers four associate, three bachelor, and three master's degree programs, one of which is also delivered online (Master of Business Administration). As of fall 2015, Coleman enrolls 438 students (421 FTE) of which 35% are day and 65% are evening students. Coleman employs 62 staff and 84 faculty members (19 full-time, 65 part-time). Undergraduate students account for 87 percent of its enrollment; 13 percent are graduate students. The mission of Coleman University is to “*deliver relevant education that prepares individuals for technology-focused careers, while providing an environment where they may develop to their full potential.*”

In 1967, the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS) initially accredited Coleman, and in 2014, the institution received continued accreditation through December 2020. The California Bureau of Postsecondary Education (BPPE) also approves Coleman to operate as an accredited institution of higher education. None of its programs are accredited by programmatic or specialized accrediting agencies.

In June 2009, Coleman submitted its application for Eligibility to the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), and in August 2009, Coleman was granted Eligibility for a period of four years through fall 2013. A Capacity and Preparatory Review

(CPR) visit was conducted in March 2011, followed by an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in March 2013, after which the Commission granted Candidacy status for four years and scheduled a CPR for initial accreditation in fall 2016 and an EER in spring 2018. As part of the transition in the WSCUC accreditation review process, and with the institution's input, in September 2014, the scheduled CPR and EER visits were replaced with the Seeking Accreditation Visit 3 (SAV) for fall 2015. In June 2015, Coleman submitted a substantive change review for an MS in Systems Engineering; however, the proposal was not accepted by WSCUC, and the institution was asked to resubmit at a future date.

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit Report

The self-study report was drafted by the "WSCUC Steering Committee," which included the interim president, the vice president of institutional effectiveness (and the accreditation liaison officer), and the vice president of academics. The team found that the report was organized around the Standards, the Criteria for Review (CFR), and the attachments were clearly labeled. The team reviewed the report and the supporting documents prior to the visit, followed by a team conference call to develop a number of questions and lines of inquiry to extend the review further. While the institution's Seeking Accreditation Institutional Report provided the foundation for the campus visit, the onsite interviews and discussions with a cross section of key stakeholders provided the additional information needed to answer outstanding questions and inform the team's findings. The team requested additional documents be made available in the team room that included the proprietary financial reports, the Coleman University Bylaws, disaggregated enrollment data, the most recent ACICS accreditation materials, leadership curriculum vitae and resumes, and faculty employment pool information.

Various stakeholders participated in the discussions and data analyses as part of the review process. Areas that received in-depth inquiries included: faculty diversity, teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, student learning and success, faculty and staff, and quality assurance processes. Discussions and data review for the aforementioned areas included the vice president of academics, deans, faculty, staff, and students. Discussions and data review of fiscal, physical and information resources, organization structures and governance were conducted at the administration level. Except for students, all key stakeholders interviewed indicated that they either had a part in drafting or reviewing parts of the report. In general, most stakeholders indicated widespread knowledge of the report.

Finally, Coleman appeared to embrace the review process in the context of self-assessment, reflection, and improved effectiveness. For each of the Standard narrative sections, the report included a synthesis and reflection section that included two or three of the most important issues emphasized under that Standard, areas of strength, and areas that may need to be addressed or improved in the near future. Areas of strength included a comprehensive information system and a single system for student activity, interaction, and measurement through a learning management system (LMS). For areas of improvement, a detailed, thoughtful, and thorough list was provided in the institution's "Conclusion: Reflections and Plans for Improvement" section—including the ongoing assessment of the five major issues identified in the Commission Action Letter (July 2013). The inquiry process allowed Coleman to investigate its questions, to determine approaches to answering them, and to collect and use evidence to support their final conclusions of substantial compliance with the Standards.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Past Committee Letters

Commission Action Letter Recommendation 1

Faculty. It is essential that the University continue to strengthen its faculty hiring and retention policies and its practices related to faculty qualifications and academic experience. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)

Coleman reported that it continues to make concerted efforts to hire faculty members with a diverse background of education and experience and increase both the number of faculty who hold higher-level degrees and the number of faculty whose degrees are earned from other institutions. As of June 2015, 14% of Coleman University faculty members held a doctorate degree, 56% held a master's degree, and 30% held a bachelor's degree (compared to 8%, 57%, and 35% respectively from July 2012). Additionally, as of June 2015, 81% of Coleman University faculty members earned a degree outside of Coleman (compared to 68% in July 2012). However, the growth in faculty holding doctorate degrees is occurring within the adjunct faculty pool. Coleman is encouraged to evaluate its faculty model to ensure that it employs the appropriate number of doctorate-prepared faculty to support its program offerings.

To address faculty retention, new faculty must now complete a new-faculty training program and all faculty are responsible for self-identifying in-service and professional development opportunities for which the institution makes funds available. During the visit, the team found that communications regarding the faculty development resources were not always clear or deliberate with the academics unit. Coleman is encouraged to formalize the process for faculty development opportunities from the vice president for academics to the deans and to the program faculty. Additionally, while the Board of Trustees (board) has made "Attract, develop

and retain excellent faculty and staff” its first strategic goal for the institution, linking funding to that strategic goal may require further development.

Commission Action Letter Recommendation 2

Planning. The University's strategic and academic planning processes need to be documented, widely communicated, and aligned with the University vision. This process must also be informed by clear timelines for meeting goals and multiple data points across the institution that can indicate progress. Each organization and individual on campus should embrace the plan. (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)

The report noted that following the 2013 EER visit; the board developed a long-term strategic plan, *Coleman @ 60* that established six strategic goals:

1. Attract, develop and retain excellent faculty and staff
2. Delivery quality education programs
3. Create an exciting learning environment
4. Foster a student-centered culture
5. Stimulate growth and change to achieve the Vision
6. Achieve optimum enrollment

As part of the visit, Coleman evidenced that its academic and administrative departments have aligned their planning processes and goals to the *Coleman @ 60* strategic plan, and all academic programs are aligning their curricula to the strategic plan’s vision statement. *Coleman @ 60* also contains Key Success Indicators that the Board of Trustees is using as a dashboard to measure progress toward its strategic goals. The report included the three indicators (financial,

enrollment, and institutional effectiveness) and multiple criteria for all three. The team was encouraged that of the past five Commission recommendations, the one regarding strategic planning was probably the most developed and participated in across the institution—from the board through faculty and staff levels. The team’s concern, however, rests with the number of multiple criteria and the sustainability and bandwidth for the institution to monitor, track, and close the loop in the planning process.

Commission Action Letter Recommendation 3

Academic Governance. The University must continue to significantly develop and enhance the role of faculty in exercising academic leadership to ensure academic quality and student success. (CFRs 3.4, 3.11, 4.7)

The report indicated that in order to more fully engage both full-time and adjunct faculty in governance activities so that they can contribute more direct leadership and influence on important academic matters, the administration replaced the one Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) with several faculty committees. All full-time faculty are required to serve on at least one committee; adjunct faculty and staff members are encouraged, but are not required to participate on a committee. The team found that consensus was lacking across Coleman regarding the committee restructure, and what was commended as part of the last accreditation review (one FAC) was dismantled and replaced with four smaller committees. Of the past five Commission recommendations, the team found that the faculty role in exercising academic leadership to ensure academic quality and student success appears to have stagnated if not regressed in its development.

Commission Action Letter Recommendation 4

Diversity. It is essential that the university develop significant plans and goals related to diversity, especially with women and ethnic minorities. (CFR 1.5)

The report indicated that the Diversity Committee has established a diversity mission, as well as goals, outcomes, and a strategic plan that recognize the importance of goals and plans related to diversity and especially female and ethnic minorities. The team met with the Diversity Committee and was encouraged with its grass roots-level work and collegial spirit. The team found the committee's commitment to diversity to be one of the most positive attributes of Coleman. The team recognized that within the technical sector that Coleman serves, the pool is skewed with a high male population. While Coleman is to be commended for its staff diversity make-up, the team encourages the institution to make strategic and deliberate efforts to mirror that success in the faculty and student populations. Data regarding gender and ethnic identity demographics, indicated an overall decline in faculty numbers from July 2012 to June 2015 (133 to 84); a slight decline in the ethnic minority faculty composition (33% in July 2012; 31% in June 2015); and a sharper decline in gender composition during the same time period (female: 26% to 19% versus male: 74% to 81%). As a representation of the overall reduced number of faculty, from July 2012 to June 2015, male faculty were 31% less in number within their own group (98 to 68) and female faculty were 54% less in number of within their own group (35 to 16).

Commission Action Letter Recommendation 5

Educational Effectiveness. Although Coleman University has made significant strides in this area, assessment programs must be faculty-driven University-wide strategies that include

accepted best practices such as articulated outcomes, curriculum mapping, assessment of authentic student work products, and use of rubrics, as well as explicit plans for analysis, interpretation, and use of findings for improvement. Well-developed program review processes and a review of co-curricular programs will also be essential. These processes will enable the University to better track its student data to determine needed changes in both teaching and learning. Beyond establishing processes, it will be essential at the time of the next review for Coleman University to provide data that document the level of actual student learning. (CFRs 2.1, 2.4, 2.7, 2.11)

The report evidenced that all programs revised their course learning outcomes and mapped them to the program and institutional learning outcomes. On site, the team found that core competencies are embedded in the institutional learning outcomes and are assessed annually by the general education program. The institution has recently revised its assessment infrastructure and is working to update its methodology for collecting student-learning data. The Commission letter indicated that it was essential for Coleman to be able to document the level of actual student learning by the next visit, and the team found that while the institution has revised its assessment processes, those processes are in the early stages of development. The team encourages Coleman to more fully implement the initial work started.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC'S STANDARDS

Organizing the Team Report on Compliance with WSCUC Standards

The purpose of this section is to explain the process the Visiting Team used to determine whether the institution has come into *substantial* compliance with each of the four Standards, which includes a thoughtful review of each of the CFRs identified in the team report and Commission action letter from the prior Seeking Accreditation Visit.

It should be noted that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards. The Commission relies, however, on the discernment of peer reviewers as they exercise their collective judgment regarding an institution's non-compliance, minimal compliance or substantial compliance with the Standards. The team report is designed to provide clear evidence and analysis to support findings of non-, minimal, or substantial compliance for each of the Standards. Both the team report and the Confidential Team Recommendation form inform the Commission's deliberations in making a final decision.

In order to help the institution and team determine *minimal* or *substantial* compliance, the following definitions are provided in "Appendix B: Guide for Determining *Minimal* or *Substantial* Compliance" in the *How to Become Accredited Procedures Manual*. The reader should note the following definitions of minimal and substantial compliance:

Minimal Compliance:

- Evidence of understanding the principles or intentions of each Standard at a sufficient level to support continued development

- Elementary or initial development and implementation of structures, processes, and forms that operationalize the CFRs
- Understanding of concepts held by key leaders but less well understood at all levels of the organization

Substantial Compliance:

- The core concept or intent of the Standard is understood and articulated clearly as it applies to relevant operations
- Thorough and widespread implementation of structures, processes, and forms that operationalize the CFRs
- Understanding of concepts is held at multiple relevant organizational levels

The team, and later validated by the Commission, makes a holistic determination of compliance with each Standard (by evaluating each subsection of the Standard) rather than by each CFR. For example, an institution may not be in *substantial* compliance with one or more CFRs under a particular Standard, but the visiting team and the Commission may determine that the overall Standard has been met at a *substantial* level. However, the Commission also recognizes that some CFRs carry more weight than others such as those dealing with financial capacity, governance, and educational effectiveness.

In writing this report, the team was charged with the following:

- Identifying and briefly describing the Standard.
- Describing the evidence reviewed in addressing the Standard.
- Evaluating the appropriateness, quality, and effectiveness of the evidence and methods used to undertake the inquiry.
- Verifying and assessing the institution's analysis and conclusions about the Standard.

- Evaluating the level of self-reflection by the institution.
- Stating the team findings, level of compliance and recommendations about the Standard.
- Identifying good practices.

Presenting Issues, Analyzing Evidence and Formulating Conclusions

Where possible, the issues identified by the team in this report include an analysis with the following elements:

- Statement of the issue;
- Description of the evidence the team reviewed in evaluating this matter;
- Analysis of the evidence, i.e., what does the evidence show about this issue or what did the institution conclude from this evidence; and
- The team's conclusions and recommendations flowing from the analysis of the evidence.

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

The institution has published a clearly defined statement of purpose to prepare students for technology-focused careers that is evidenced throughout the curriculum and extracurricular activities. This purpose clearly falls within a recognized academic area and contributes to the public good by helping to meet the high demand for technology-related careers both locally and nationally. (CFR 1.1)

The institution publishes institutional learning objectives (ILOs) in the university's catalog and on its website. The institution recently approved new ILO's that are aligned with the university's mission and are linked to the Programmatic Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for each major area of study. These outcomes are measured and evaluated as part of the Coleman Effectiveness Plan (IEP). Retention and graduation, job placement rates and average salary

information is collected and made available to students. The institution also maintains connections and reaches out to area employers to ensure satisfaction with graduates and to inform program development. See additional detailed discussion of the institution's assessment plan as part of Standard 2. (CFR 1.2)

Integrity and Transparency

Coleman has demonstrated its commitment to academic freedom by adopting the 1940 Statement of Academic Freedom promulgated by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. Discussions with faculty indicated that the institution protects their ability to research and publish in areas of their choosing and they have the freedom to exercise their professional judgment in choosing pedagogy in the classroom. Faculty are involved in the curriculum development process. The institution provides up to \$250 per year per full-time faculty member to support their professional development through research and publication. The institution has published a statement of academic freedom in its Catalog (page 15) that applies to faculty and students. Per discussion with the vice president of academics, Coleman will be updating their upcoming catalog to extend this policy to include staff also. (CFR 1.3)

The previous site visit team and Commission letter highlighted the institution's diversity policies and practices. Since that time, the board and administration have made diversity a priority at all levels of the institution, and those efforts were noted in the report and reviewed during the site visit, particularly as they pertained to students, staff, and faculty. The university has a broad diversity policy articulated in the Catalog (page 15) and has created a diversity committee comprised of a cross section of staff who are charged with exploring and recommending activities and actions to improve diversity on campus. The committee recently

focused on improving the participation of young women in STEM disciplines through involvement with the Girl Scouts, the Geek Girl organization, and other community groups.

(CFR 1.4)

Coleman has created a Veteran Center to support its growing veteran population, and it appears to be sensitive to the unique needs of combat veterans by creating a “silence room” for testing students with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) challenges. The university community recognizes diversity month each October by hosting workshops about various ethnic and cultural groups. Funding has also been provided to support workshops about PTSD, domestic violence, and other topics of interest to a diverse campus community. (CFR 1.4)

While improvements have been made in the areas of diversity pertaining to students and staff, the institution continues to struggle with attracting women and minorities with terminal degrees to full-time faculty positions. This issue is not unique to Coleman and the issues experienced at the institution are symptomatic of the national shortage of qualified individuals from diverse backgrounds in technology related fields. However, the institution must remain vigilant about recruiting women and terminal degree holding faculty. For example, the Diversity Committee is disproportionately comprised of staff and non-faculty, and the university-wide diversity efforts appear to be disjointed and lacking a centrally coordinated strategy. For this reason, the team recommends the institution continue to focus on diversity and commit the funding and other resources necessary to demonstrate progress. (CFR 1.4)

Coleman is an independent, non-profit institution whose primary purpose is education. The board is self-electing and no interference by outside political, religious, corporate, or other bodies is evident. The institution has completed the transition from a founder-centric board to one that is independent where each member is actively involved in the governance of the

institution. Coleman has recently discontinued its involvement with a charter high school and is in the process of selling the related real estate from that venture. As such, the institution is now wholly focused on higher education. (CFR 1.5)

Coleman accurately represents its Institutional Learning Objectives, programs, support services, graduation rates, time to complete data, and program costs to students and the public through its website, www.coleman.edu. The institution treats students fairly and equitably and has established and published policies and procedures for addressing student grievances and grade disputes in the Catalog. (CFR 1.6) The institution's 3-year cohort student loan default rate recently fell from about 16% to 11.1% as a result of increased focus on financial literacy and debtor counseling. (CFR 1.6)

The university operates with integrity through the employment of an experienced chief financial officer and financial aid director. Enrollment and financial information are reviewed on a regular basis and reports are automatically generated and reviewed on a dashboard available to management and board members. The university properly and promptly responded to unethical activity by an employee in a previous fiscal year and has taken appropriate actions to improve internal controls in that area. The most recently available audited financials as of June 30, 2014, reflected an unmodified opinion on the financial statement audit with four unresolved issues on the A-133 Compliance audit. Per discussion with the board and senior administration, they believe each of those issues have now been corrected through personnel and policy changes and both audits as of June 30, 2015, will reflect no significant findings. (CFR 1.7)

Throughout the accreditation seeking process, the institution has been responsive, open, honest and timely in its communication with the Commission. The board of trustees was particularly informed and forthcoming in their meeting with the site team. The entire Coleman

community has been involved with and is committed to achieving WSCUC standards as was evident in meetings with faculty, staff, administrators, trustees and students. (CFR 1.8)

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

Coleman offers associate, bachelor, and master's degree programs in the information technology field in alignment with its mission statement. The catalog provides detailed information regarding each program's requirements and student learning outcomes. These degree requirements align with the expectations of the profession and its current accreditation body. While the university has a sufficient number of faculty to support its educational programs, a more detailed discussion regarding qualifications, including where faculty members received their degrees, is provided under Standard 3. The university has made the diversification of its faculty body its number one strategic goal. (CFR 2.1)

Admissions and graduation requirements are clearly stated in the university's catalog. In interviews with students, they confirmed that they receive information regarding their program of study. Each program has a clearly stated set of program learning outcomes that are connected to the institutional learning outcomes as documented within curriculum maps. Each program is designed, using lecture and applied learning, to prepare graduates for positions within the information technology sector. (CFR 2.2)

The Institution offers four associate and three bachelor's degree programs. All undergraduates are required to complete general education requirements. At the associate and bachelor's degree-levels, there are clear sets of general education learning outcomes that provide the framework for course requirements. The WSCUC Core Competencies have been mapped to general education learning outcome requirements. General education program outcomes include

the following requirements: communication, critical thinking, information literacy, quantitative literacy, and ethical decision-making. In addition to the requirements previously noted, in order to earn a bachelor's degree, graduates must demonstrate leadership competency. Undergraduate programs utilize an inverted curriculum design allowing students to complete core coursework before general education coursework. In interviews with students and faculty, it was noted that students feel prepared to start core course before completing general education requirements. By completing core classes earlier in their academic career, students are able to work in their field of choice while finishing general education requirements. (CFR 2.2a)

The university offers three graduate degree programs, a Master of Business Administration (one online and one face-to-face), and a Master of Information Systems Management. Each of these programs has clear admissions and curriculum requirements. As part of the degrees, students complete a thesis which requires research and literature review. However, the focus of these programs is to provide graduates with skills to become leaders in their professional field. (CFR 2.2b)

Since the previous site visit, faculty have revised curriculum maps that show the relationship between institutional learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and course requirements. As part of each syllabus, course-learning outcomes are outlined as well as specific assignments. The number of programmatic learning outcomes ranges from approximately four to six, with the exception of general education that has 16 outcomes. (CFR 2.3)

As noted in the 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook, faculty have “clear responsibility and authority in the academic affairs of the institution.” As part of this, faculty are responsible for developing courses, curricula, selecting materials, and assessment. In order to facilitate university-wide engagement, the institution has developed faculty committees with oversight

over program curriculum. However, during interviews with faculty it was noted that they have limited input beyond the programmatic level. (CFR 2.4)

Since the previous visit, the faculty have implemented three new instructional strategies to improve student engagement in the learning process. The first is a new Learning Management System (LMS) to support all course offerings. Secondly, faculty across various programs are in the process of “flipping the classroom”, allowing for more time to be spent on active learning and hands-on learning experiences. Students noted that they feel that the curriculum is challenging and prepares them well for future employment. This was confirmed by reviewing employment data for the recent graduating cohort that had a placement rate of 83% within six months of graduation and earnings on average \$53,000 per year. (CFR 2.5)

The third new strategy includes the evaluation of various assessment systems. After testing a competency-based system for course learning outcomes data, Coleman is now using a key assignment model to gather program learning outcome data. This has been documented within the Assessment Handbook utilized by academic programs and co-curricular departments. This model is designed to be the primary driver for data used during annual assessments and program reviews. As part of the implementation process, faculty continue to develop key assignments that are mapped to program learning outcomes. In addition, as a result of attending the WSCUC Assessment Learning Academy, members of the Assessment Committee have been working to develop common assessment and curriculum forms. Finally, it should be noted that previous annual academic and program reviews showed that graduates achieve learning outcomes and the institution has clear benchmarks. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity

By its charter and mission, Coleman is a teaching institution—meaning that student learning is its key goal. To that end, creative activities are focused on pedagogical improvement and understanding the information technology industry's needs. While the 2015-2016 Faculty Handbook notes that faculty members are provided with a reduced course load when involved with research, scholarship, continuous education, or projects related to the content of their professional field, when asked in faculty interviews, few faculty indicated that they have received approval to take part in these types of opportunities. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

Student Learning and Success

The institution regularly gathers and analyzes data. These data are utilized as part of the Coleman Effectiveness Plan (CEP) and learning outcomes review. Many of the key data points, within the CEP, have clear benchmarks for levels of student success. However, very little disaggregated demographic data were offered as evidence. (CFR 2.10) Additional information regarding peer or external benchmarking would be useful in evaluating levels of student learning attainment.

Coleman offers students the opportunity to engage in a number of co-curricular activities. These activities are designed to support student growth as professionals within the information technology field. The university also sponsors on-campus organizations that promote specific professional interests of the student body. Furthermore, some students are afforded the opportunity to attend regional conferences designed to provide them an understanding of current trends in the profession. (CFR 2.11)

As part of the admissions process, students are oriented to the requirements of their academic program. This includes a review of course, tuition, and other requirements. In addition,

these requirements are documented within the university catalog and appropriate handbooks.

Students confirmed in interviews that they feel they received clear information regarding academic and non-academic elements of their program. (CFR 2.12)

Coleman provides students with appropriate student services, including career guidance, financial aid, tutoring, and library support. These services are regularly evaluated, utilizing the process outlined in the University-Wide Assessment Handbook, in order to evaluate their effectiveness. (CFR 2.13)

The university's transfer credit policies are clearly outlined in the catalog. The faculty delegate, within specific guidelines of authority to the Register's Office, the evaluation of student requests for transfer credit. Program administrators and faculty evaluate credit as needed when the request falls outside the normal guidelines. (CFR 2.14)

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

Faculty and Staff

The institution has sufficient faculty and staff for a university of its size. The institution currently employs 84 faculty members of which 19 are full-time and 65 are adjunct. The faculty to student ratio is currently 12.5 to 1. The list of faculty by college is conveniently located in the institution's catalog. Since the EER visit, the institution has made a concentrated effort to diversify, train and retain faculty and staff. As noted under Standard 1, the institution has made noticeable progress diversifying the staff but has struggled with recruiting female faculty. (CFR 3.1)

Coleman provided a detailed overview of the faculty demographics and qualifications. The faculty are 6% African-American, 6% Asian, 2% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 5% Hispanic,

and 68% White. The faculty is 19% female and 81% male. Of the institution's faculty, 14% hold doctoral degrees, 56% hold master's degrees, 30% hold bachelor's degrees and 81% have earned their degree from another university. The faculty and staff provide the capacity necessary to not only serve the 438 students currently enrolled, but also the increased enrollment that the institution anticipates over the next year or so. (CFR 3.1)

The recent past president passed away in May 2015, and the board chair immediately stepped down and assumed the role of interim president—providing continuity and stability. During the site visit, the visiting team was informed by the board that the interim president was offered and accepted the permanent role as president. This appointment helps to provide the university continuity and stability at the president/CEO level.

There appears to be a strong a commitment to hiring faculty and staff who support the university's mission, as well as providing them the professional development, training and feedback to increase productivity and retention. The institution provided evidence suggesting all faculty and staff have the required education, experience and other qualifications necessary to provide its students a rigorous and rewarding post secondary education. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

The team reviewed the last two audited financial statements that were accompanied by unmodified reports from an independent certified public accountant for the fiscal years ended (FYE) June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014. High-level unaudited financial information was provided by the administration as of FYE 2015. The institution has had reductions in net assets (net income) in each of the prior two audited fiscal years presented. The majority of the losses in 2014 were related to one-time expenses and costs associated with exiting the high school operation and its related real estate. Financially, 2015 was a better year for Coleman, with a

significant improvement in the collection of outstanding accounts receivable (A/R) (reduction of 47%)—however, the institution used significant reserves to fund operations reducing their investments from over 10% of revenue in 2014 to just 3.6% at FYE 2015. The institution provided an appraisal and letter of intent from a buyer to purchase real estate no longer being used by the institution in early 2016. Upon closing of that transaction, significant equity will be available to the institution to restore its cash reserves above 10% of annual revenue. (CFR 3.4)

The institution has experienced a significant decline in enrollment during the last three years, falling from 833 in fall 2013 to 606 in fall 2014 and 438 presently. As greater than 95% of the institution's revenues are derived from tuition, this has been the primary driver of reductions in net assets in prior years. The board and administration believe that recent changes in staffing levels, cost reductions and other fiscal management measures such as improved A/R collections have resulted in the institution presently operating above break-even for the current fiscal year. Recently, the institution has expanded testing services on its campus and begun soliciting monetary and in-kind donations to support its educational programs. (CFR 3.4)

Coleman should seek to stabilize enrollment declines and expand revenue diversification initiatives to provide predictable revenues to support operations. Continued sound budgeting and management practices should be used to create positive growth in net assets each fiscal year to replenish the depleted reserves back above 10% of annual revenue. (CFR 3.4)

The institution has consistently demonstrated progress in the areas of information and technology resources. For example, all students now have access to a digital library. Also, the university has made noteworthy investments in information and learning management systems. The university maintains a beautiful campus, and it has the capacity to serve 1,800 students at the

current location. During the site visit, the students, faculty and staff reported being very pleased with the facilities and other resources. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

The board and senior leadership have demonstrated a commitment to implementing best practices associated with their roles and responsibilities. For examples, the board has adopted a Policy Governance Manual, and it has completed three annual self-evaluation surveys. The findings from the surveys, covering 2012 through 2014, strongly suggest the board has progressively increased its involvement, oversight, accountability, and independence over the last three years. Overall, the board rated itself higher in every category in 2014 compared to 2012 and 2013. (CFR 3.6)

The institution noted in its report that it had formed a Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) but later replaced it with a series of Faculty Governance Committees (FGC). The visiting team was prepared to solicit faculty feedback about the effectiveness of the former FAC as well as the new formed FGC. During the site visit, the visiting team was presented with conflicting reasons as to why the FAC was replaced by a new committee structure. More importantly, the faculty expressed a strong interest in having an organized body, but there was concern that the senior administration may not be committed to providing them a meaningful role in the shared governance process.

Based on the organizational charts and other documents provided, it appears the institution has effective decision-making structures and processes in place, and there are efforts underway to build and sustain the institution's capacity to achieve education effectiveness. However, several stakeholder groups, particularly the faculty, expressed concerns about timely and effective communication in regards to meetings and other attempts to solicit faculty input.

For example, several faculty reported that they often receive invitations to meetings with little advanced notice, no clearly stated purpose for the meeting, and no follow-up information about the meeting is made available part-time faculty who cannot attend the meetings. (CFR 3.7)

The institution is governed by a seven person independent board of trustees that includes the interim (now permanent) president/chief executive officer (CEO). The board has been transformed over the last few years from a “fierce founder driven body” to a governing body with a majority of independent members. The board has done an exceptional job of supporting the university after the tragic loss of the former president in May 2015. The board is responsible for advancing the vision and mission of the university, and the members appear to be completely united in that regard. Board members are expected to serve three-year terms, and the institution has done a good job of retaining its most talented and committed members. At the top of the list of noteworthy accomplishment, the board was instrumental in leading the strategic planning process that began in 2014 and culminated in March 2015 with the “Coleman @ 60” strategic plan. (CFR 3.9)

As a result of the WSCUC seeking accreditation process, the institution has made a fundamental shift from being a trade school that did not emphasize general education to a university focused upon becoming a regionally accredited institution that offers a rigorous set of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. However, based on several conversations with key stakeholder groups, including credible feedback provided via confidential emails, the senior administration is not providing faculty and deans viable opportunities to be more involved in the academic leadership of the institution, nor are faculty and deans receiving adequate support and guidance they need to effectively assume more demanding roles and responsibilities. Several individuals reported frustration and discomfort with efforts to stifle their involvement in matters

consistent with their new or modified roles. The team chair discussed this matter informally with the university's interim president, and the institution is prepared to make the changes necessary to resolve this issue. (CFR 3.10)

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

Quality Assurance Processes

The 2013 EER visiting team and WSCUC Commission letter recommended that Coleman's strategic and academic plans needed to be documented and aligned with the vision of the university, and they needed to be clearly informed by multiple data points across the institution and "should be embraced by each organization and individual on campus." Subsequently, the Coleman Board of Trustees developed *Coleman @ 60*, a long-term strategic plan with six strategic goals. As part of the process, each department developed a three-year plan in alignment with *Coleman @ 60*. (CFRs 4.1, 4.5)

Quality assurance processes in place include the cyclical planning process of semi-annual review of strategic priorities detailed under CFR 4.6 below. Curricular quality is assessed as part of the program review cycle and at the faculty and dean levels through the use of standardized forms and templates. Faculty quality is assessed through classroom visits by deans and student course surveys. These processes inform the academic three-year academic plan which is aligned with *Coleman @ 60*. (CFR 4.1)

Honoring its commitment to "gathering data to improve the institution" as highlighted in the 2013 EER team report, Coleman has implemented a new comprehensive information system, Campus Café, to gather and disseminate data that are widely shared, easily accessed, and utilized in planning and decision-making. Documentation to support this endeavor was provided in the

Annual Planning Activities appendix. During the visit, staff expressed satisfaction with the new modern system and acknowledged the capacity to use the system more effectively. In addition to data on key factors such as finances, career placement, student demographics, retention and alumni satisfaction, Campus Café houses data used to generate the Coleman Effectiveness Plan (CEP) and other analytical reports for operational and strategic decision-making, and this information is readily accessible to all employees and the board. Staff described the democratization of data sets available on the dashboard as a key improvement. Coleman has a database committee to define data and how they are used, and a survey committee. Further education and training will allow the institutional research function to capitalize on the full potential of the system. (CFR 4.2)

Institutional Learning and Improvement

Coleman has specific assessment, program review, and annual planning processes in place in order to gather data and evidence on teaching and learning and the campus environment with which to make institutional improvements. The program review, external review and final recommendations report for the career services department, were provided as sample documents. Coleman has in place a committee for co-curricular assessment to analyze how effectively programs and services are helping students succeed. Admissions and student services determine the importance of touch points for students, and student persistence rates appear to have improved as a result. Seven learning outcomes for the First Year Experience Program have been identified and will be measured by student surveys and focus groups to assess if the outcomes were achieved. Data are utilized to inform the program review process and Coleman @ 60. The operating management group utilizes key indicators of institutional results from these activities in the effective management of the institution (CFR 4.3).

Faculty participate in professional development and in-service activities for ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning as well as through assessment activities, the CEP and the annual planning process. Faculty conduct grading through the use of rubrics, and deans conduct an informal review of grades at the end of each term to determine effectiveness of the grading system. Corrective action as needed is taken with the support of the vice president of academics. (CFR 4.4)

Coleman's stated commitment to faculty governance includes the policy "that the faculty has clear responsibilities and authority in the academic affairs of the institution." This is demonstrated through the development and maintenance of educational programs, course material, equipment and educational resources selection, evaluation and revision of the curriculum, assessment of student learning outcomes and planning for and evaluating institutional effectiveness. The faculty reported engaging industry experts to stay abreast of changing needs and, from time-to-time, include them in curriculum development for software and to ensure the right learning outcomes are being measured. (CFRs 4.4, 4.5)

Through various assessment, program review and strategic planning activities, Coleman engages appropriate stakeholders including employers, alumni, students, faculty, administrators and campus leadership to ensure alignment of educational programs in institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

The CEP, created in February 2014, is a requirement for its institutional accreditor, ACICS, and includes a process to track and document student retention, placement, learning outcomes, and satisfaction, as well as graduate satisfaction, cohort default rates and employer satisfaction. It is the stated intention of Coleman to continue to utilize the CEP as a semiannual process of data review after it achieves WSCUC accreditation, as it is the foundation for the

Coleman @ 60 institutional effectiveness indicators and garners suggestions for improvement from all staff and faculty members working in interdepartmental teams, the results of which are reviewed by the president and the board. (CFRs 4.5, 4.6)

The institution's strategic plan, *Coleman @ 60*, was developed by the board and includes new vision and mission statements. Workshops with faculty and staff were conducted to define necessary programs and activities to achieve strategic goals. All faculty and staff are invited to participate in annual planning activities at Coleman which consist of three phases: midterm review of the previous year's annual plan projects, a March Campus Effectiveness Review, and formulation of strategies to implement long-range strategic goals articulated by the board in *Coleman @ 60*. Staff articulated their appreciation for the opportunities to participate in committees and assessment activities that are transparent and have resulted in cross-departmental collaboration, more accountability and improved communication.

Coleman @ 60 was completed in early 2015 and received final approval from the board in March 2015. It is aligned with academic and non-academic department three-year strategic plans that maintain curricula in tune with Coleman's stated vision that "Coleman University is an institution of higher learning with programs that strive to prepare its graduates for technology-focused careers." Supporting documents of annual planning activities and departmental strategic alignments were provided by the institution as supporting appendices to the report. (CFR 4.6)

Coleman's planning processes detailed above (CFR 4.6) included key constituents from across the institution to assess the current climate in education as it relates to the mission and objectives of the institution with regard to program offerings and structural and financial realities. The board and campus leadership are charged with staying abreast of changes in higher education by attending conferences and remaining informed of potential impacts on Coleman

with regard to new programs and planning decisions. The board and campus leadership are aware that current trends in student enrollment need focused attention and strategies for improvement. (CFR 4.7)

Other Changes or Issues Confronting the University

With the presidential appointment confirmed by the board during the site visit, and the plans for enrollment growth detailed by administration and the board to the team, there are no other changes or issues facing the institution that have not already been addressed or planned for by Coleman.

Preparation for Reaffirmation under the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation

As noted in Section I of the team report, as part of the transition in the WSCUC accreditation review process, and with the institution's input, in September 2014 the previously scheduled fall 2016 CPR and spring 2018 EER visits were replaced with the Seeking Accreditation Visit 3 (SAV) for fall 2016. As such, Coleman is currently in Candidacy status, and the intention of this section for reaffirmation preparation does not align with those institutions that are already accredited. For each of the three areas, Coleman's report asked the team to "not focus on the content of these areas but on the processes that will be used." This statement perhaps reflects the growth that Coleman will still need to make as it moves towards being a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees

Coleman's mission statement aligns with its degree offerings in a clear and distinct way. The institution has a specific student audience, a population that often comes to Coleman with a variety of prior learning experiences. Learning outcomes are aligned to the institution's mission at every level and the curriculum is designed to support the learning outcomes.

Educational Quality: Core Competencies and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Coleman has included each of WSCUC's five core competencies into its ILOs. On site, the team found however, that faculty were not part of nor had input into the development of the ILOs. While these core competencies have been integrated into the curriculum at the course and program levels, it will be important going forward to include faculty in the larger educational quality process. With the foundation set, Coleman should soon be able to demonstrate the achievements of its graduates in each of the five core competency areas. Lastly, Coleman graduates not only exhibit the institution's articulated expectations and proficiencies for all its students, but they also demonstrate high career placement rates and earnings potential.

Sustainability: Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Coleman recognizes that it needs to remain flexible in academic and technological environments that are often in a state of flux. Coleman has demonstrated that it is equipped and ready to do so. As part of an unexpected leadership situation, the institution has successfully come through it with the support of an informed and vested board. With the institution's CEO leadership stabilized, Coleman has the potential to engage all of its stakeholders in the growth and maturation process to further build on its past and current successes. However, as the institution is dependent upon increasing its enrollments, it will be crucial to meet those targets for its long-term sustainability.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Coleman completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) form as part of its report. As discussed under Standards 2 and 4, the institution has recently revised its assessment infrastructure and is working to implement its updated methodology for collecting student-learning data. In addition, institutional, program, and course learning outcomes have

been revised in order to improve linkage. Currently, the institution relies on indirect methods of learning, retention and graduation rates, and job placements to measure student success. Based on review of the IEEI Form and Assessment Handbook, the university has a strong plan that will be able to improve its ability to directly measure student learning.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The interim president is commended for inviting all members of the administration, faculty and staff to contribute to this section of the self-study. The long list of “accomplishments” and “recommendations for improvements and enhanced effectiveness” suggest the institution has been thoughtful and reflective. However, it is not clear how the university will prioritize and address the 32 items listed under the areas in need of improvement and enhancement. The university is encouraged to take the next step in the process by organizing, categorizing and prioritizing these items.

Key Findings

The visiting team used the Institutional Report, supporting evidence provided by the university and information collected during the site visit to determine if each of the CFRs were: (1) out of compliance, (2) minimally compliant, or (3) substantially compliant. Following is a summary of the conclusion the visiting team reached by Standard and CFR:

Standard 1 - The institution demonstrated substantial compliance with all the CFRs except 1.4, which was rated minimally compliant.

Standard 2 - The institution demonstrated substantial compliance with all CFRs with the exception of 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9, which were rated minimally compliant.

Standard 3 - The institution was in substantial compliance with CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.9, and it was in minimal compliance with 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.10.

Standard 4 - The institution demonstrated substantial compliance with all the CFRs.

Generally speaking, Coleman has clearly implemented a range of new policies, procedures and systems at all levels that will help to advance the institution. However, it is too

early to determine the impact of these changes, or whether the changes are improving student, programmatic and institutional outcomes. It will take more time for the institution to allow the new policies and systems to mature. During the next critical growth period, the institution should explicitly and intentionally provide all key stakeholders, particularly students and faculty, timely correspondence regarding meetings, important policy changes and other matters that impact their performance. Moreover, the institution is encouraged to continue thinking deeply about what it means to become a regionally accredited institution, and the additional changes that will be necessary to transition from being a “trade school” to a full-fledged university.

Following are the salient commendations and recommendations that were made by the visiting team.

Commendations

1. *Student-centered support* – the team commends the faculty and staff of Coleman University for their commitment to providing students with holistic support services that are necessary to help students develop to their full potential.
2. *Continuous improvement* – the team commends Coleman University for its commitment to continuous improvement, particularly in the areas of academic and co-curricular assessments and program review.
3. *Strategic planning* – the team commends Coleman University for engaging key stakeholders in developing, embracing, and implementing *Coleman @ 60*.
4. *Board of Trustees* – the team commends the Board of Trustees for their steadfast dedication to the university, which has been demonstrated by their full engagement and active involvement in ensuring the stability of Coleman University during a very challenging and arduous period of the institution’s recent past.

Recommendations

1. *Continued commitment to diversity* – while Coleman University has made noticeable progress with regard to improving student and staff diversity; the team recommends that the institution take more deliberate actions to increase faculty diversity. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1)
2. *Professional development* – the team recommends that the University commit the necessary resources to faculty and staff for meaningful professional development and creative activities with the goal of enhancing teaching, learning, and support services. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.4)
3. *Orientation and evaluation* – the team recommends that the university use best practices in higher education to inform faculty and staff orientation and evaluation processes to improve overall institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3)
4. *Enrollment and fiscal management* – the team recommends that the university take action to improve enrollment management, ensure financial stability, and develop diverse revenue sources. (CFR 3.4)
5. *Academic organizational structures and decision-making processes* – the team recommends the university engage appropriately qualified academic leadership to improve decision-making and communication processes. (CFRs 3.7, 3.8, 3.10)

APPENDICES

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Four Federal Compliance Forms

Report on Distance Education Programs

Table 8.1
Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

CATEGORY	(1) Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	(2) Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)	(3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?	(5) How are the findings used?	(6) Date of last program review for this degree program
At the institutional level:	Yes	Catalog	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
For general education, if an undergraduate institution:	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Graded rubrics of key assignments for written and oral communication, information literacy, critical thinking, and math. Student surveys.	Dean; Center for Academic Success; and instructors.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[1]
List each degree program: 1. AS Graphic Design	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Portfolio course. Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]
2. AS Software Development	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Capstone course. Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness Faculty and Compliance, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	9/12
3. BS Software Development	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the	Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of	Departmental review. Annual planning.	9/12

		MyColeman website.	Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.		
4. AS Game Programming Development and Design [no longer enrolling students in this level, only BS]	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Capstone course. Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]
5. BS Game Programming Development and Design	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]
6. AS Network Security	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Capstone course. Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]
7. BS Network Security	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Capstone course. Student surveys. Graduate surveys. Employer surveys. Retention statistics. Placement statistics. Graded rubrics of key assignments.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]

			assignments.	informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.		
8. MBA Business Administration	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Student surveys. Graded rubrics of key assignments. Review of Theses.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	9/12
9. MS Information Systems Management	Yes	In the Coleman University catalog and on the MyColeman website.	Student surveys. Graded rubrics of key assignments. Review of Theses.	VP of Academics, Dean and faculty of the program, VP of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Faculty, and Sr. Institutional Research Specialist review data informally and as part of the Campus Effectiveness Plan Review and departmental review portion of the annual planning process.	Departmental review. Annual planning.	[2]

[1] The institution has begun a transition to systematic program reviews. This program's first review is in progress.

[2] The institution has begun a transition to systematic program reviews. This program has not yet been reviewed.

Reviewed by: Dr. Jeremy Morales 

Date: 10/27/2015

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WASCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
- 3 – Student Complaints Form
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Form

During the visit, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations, WASCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

(i) It reviews the institution's-

(A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

(B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

(ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an 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.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? In the University's Catalog and on the myColeman internal site.
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Process included in the Academic Credit Hour policy.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
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? N/A
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
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? Two (2)
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Network Administration and Mobile Development
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Courses both included a 6:4 lecture to laboratory hours ratio.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Five (5)
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS 4 <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS 1 <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? General Education, Network Security, Game Program Dev & Design, Software Development, and MBA
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: S. Clapper

Date: 10/30/15

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Located in the University Catalog and other admissions materials.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§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: S. Clapper

Date: 10/30/15

3 - 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? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Yes. Located in the University Catalog and on the internal my Coleman internal site.
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Students are able to discuss with specific party informally at first. If not resolved, students are able to have their complaint addressed as per the processes outlined in the Catalog or on myColeman.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Records are maintained in a separate folder on the myColman internal site.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Materials are dated, archived, and stored in a systematic way. Signature routing allows for tracking and monitoring of the process.
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: S. Clapper

Date: 10/30/15

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? It is located in the University Catalog, available on the university’s website.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§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: S. Clapper
Date: 10/30/15

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: Coleman University
Type of Visit: Seeking Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Cathy Corcoran
Date/s of review: October 30, 2015

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs¹ and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Master of Business Administration (MBA)

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

The MBA program is offered by on-campus and distance education formats. In addition, online courses are available in other programs. As of FA15 there was 0 undergraduate and graduate FTE enrollment. Coleman fully implemented Webclass, the Learning Management System after the WSCUC EER visit. Coleman has strategies in place to grow enrollment in all programs and delivery formats.

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

Coleman University Official Catalog 2015-2016
Fall Enrollment Report 2012-2015
Coleman University Seeking Accreditation Report
Interviews with faculty and staff during Seeking Accreditation Visit Oct 28-30, 2015

Observations and Findings

¹ See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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?	The MBA program is the only degree program offered in both on-campus and distance education formats.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	As of Fall 2015 there were 0 distance education FTE students enrolled. Online students have access to online resources, tutoring and community engagement (see student support services below).	
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Webclass, the online Learning Management System (LMS), is utilized by onsite and online students. It offers course-related information retrieval, virtual assignment submission, and it promotes more effective and timely faculty and student communication. The IT department oversees the LMS.	
<i>Student Support Services:</i> 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?	Coleman has created a Center for Academic Success, which offers online and on-campus tutors to students in their academic areas. In addition, Coleman has moved to a digital library model, so students can access research resources from anywhere at any time.	
<i>Faculty.</i> 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?	The faculty in the MBA program are responsible for both on-campus and distance education formats.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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.)	The faculty in the MBA program design, approve and evaluate the program and courses.	

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> 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>The IR department maintains data on retention and graduation data on online students and the institution as a whole. Enrollment is a concern and growth is a priority.</p>	<p>Coleman is committed to growing enrollment in all programs, including the MBA online.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> 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>The faculty in the MBA program assess student learning for the program and courses, in parallel with the on-campus program</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> 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 <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>Coleman utilizes Webclass, the online Learning Management System (LMS)</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> 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>The faculty in the MBA program assess student learning for the program and courses, in parallel with the on-campus program</p>	