

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation To:  
**California State University, Chico**  
Campus Visit  
March 5-7, 2019

Team Roster  
Barbara Sawrey, Chair  
Emerita Distinguished Teaching Professor, and the former Associate Vice Chancellor of  
Academic Affairs and Dean of Undergraduate Education,  
University of California San Diego

Jennifer Summit, Assistant Chair  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
San Francisco State University

Robin Garrell  
Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Dean of the Graduate Division  
Professor of Chemistry and Bioengineering  
University of California, Los Angeles

Jeff Hamrick  
Vice Provost for Institutional Budget, Planning, and Analytics  
Professor of Data Science and Finance  
University of San Francisco

Danielle Manning  
Chief Financial Officer  
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona

Mary Pedersen  
Senior Vice Provost for Academy Affairs  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Richard Osborn, Staff Liaison  
Vice President  
WASC Senior College and University Commission

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

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process .....	3
Description of Team’s Review Process .....	4
Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of Report and Supporting Evidence .....	5

## SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions.....	5
Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUS Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators .....	6
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality, and integrity of the degrees .....	14
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, standards of performance at graduation.....	16
Component 5: Student success, student learning, retention, graduation .....	18
Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence .....	21
Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for changing higher education environment .....	25
Component 8: Optional Essay on institutional specific themes .....	28
Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement .....	28

## SECTION III: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour Review .....	31
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review .....	34
3. Student Complaints Review .....	36
4. Transfer Policy Review .....	39
B. Off-Campus Location Review .....	40
C. Distance Education Review .....	45

## SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### A. Description of the Institution and Reaccreditation Process

California State University, Chico, is a public institution, founded in 1887 as the Chico Normal School. By 1972, the campus had grown and diversified its academic programs, and joined the California State University (CSU) system, which now includes 23 campuses. CSU Chico is a regional, comprehensive institution with seven academic colleges, offering 66 baccalaureate degree programs, 29 master's programs, and multiple teaching credentials.

Chico is a city of approximately 95,000 people, located 90 miles north of Sacramento. CSU Humboldt is the only public university farther north in the State than CSU Chico. The Chico campus also offers courses at one remote site, in Redding, California, about one hour north of Chico. The Redding site serves about 100 students, primarily in business related courses.

The Chico campus currently enrolls more than 17,000 students. It is located on a 119-acre campus adjacent to the downtown area of the city of Chico, with an 800-acre farm nearby. More than 30% of the students are of Hispanic origin, and in 2014 the campus was named a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI).

The mission of the school is articulated below, and is part of the university's 2015-20 Strategic Plan.

*California State University, Chico is a comprehensive university principally serving Northern California, our state, and nation through excellence in instruction, research,*

*creative activity, and public service. The University is committed to assist students in their search for knowledge and understanding and to prepare them with the attitudes, skills, and habits of lifelong learning in order to assume responsibility in a democratic community and to be useful members of a global society. to prepare them with the attitudes, skills, and habits of lifelong learning in order to assume responsibility in a democratic community and to be useful members of a global society.*

WASC first accredited CSU Chico in 1954. Prior to the visit covered by this report, the most recent team visit took place in 2009. At that time, the team and the Commission commented on the need of the university to refine the assessment and program review process, review the ways in which online and distance education is carried out, assure that the big questions are being informed by data, and increasing student engagement to a broader diversity of students.

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

The team completed its offsite review (OSR) on December 4, 2018. The accreditation visit (AV) was held March 4-7, 2019 in Chico. During the two full days spent on campus, the team met with and interviewed a large number of the university's stakeholders, including the President, her leadership team of Vice Presidents, administrators, faculty (including faculty leaders), deans, councils, work groups, community partners, and graduate and undergraduate students.

Team members reviewed the many documents provided for the OSR, as well as those sent in response to our lines of inquiry. The team had access to the campus' learning management system, Blackboard. The confidential email account was monitored regularly.

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

CSU Chico's institutional report, and responses to the lines of inquiry, were clearly presented. The campus was forthright in detailing their successes, challenges, and opportunities. There were many people involved in the report preparation, and the infrastructure that was set up well in advance of the report, was found to be of such value that the committees and work groups continue their efforts. Faculty, staff, and administrators all worked together in preparing the report. Everyone used the process to identify areas for improvement, many of which were underway before the AV team did its work. Institutional Research is an area of emerging growth. Faculty and administrative units are quick to find uses for additional data, as it becomes available, and to suggest new analyses. It was clear to the team that the institution gained insight into learning and educational effectiveness from the self-review process.

**SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

**A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission Actions**

CSU Chico's last review (CPR in 2007, EER in 2009) led to the WSCUC Commission granting the campus 10 years of reaffirmation. The commission letter mentioned four areas needing further monitoring: Engaging Students at a Residential Campus, Refining the Assessment and Academic Program Review Process, Using Technology Innovatively, and Increasing Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability. Campus has been responsive in all four areas, as detailed in the following sections. Aided by installation of new leadership, in particular the President, CSU Chico has shown itself to be attentive to, even embracing of the WSCUC standards.

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

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

Consistent with the requirements of Standard 1, the California State University at Chico defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. For example, in its mission statement (*CFR 1.1*), CSU Chico indicates that it delivers “excellence in instruction, research, creative activity, and public service.” Moreover, it “assists students in their search for knowledge and understanding and...[prepares] them with the attitudes, skills, and habits of lifelong learning in order to assume responsibility in a democratic community and to be useful members of a global society.” While CSU Chico currently lacks institutional learning outcomes that could be assessed for alignment with these purposes, indirect evidence of alignment can be found in many examples of program learning outcomes (*CFR 1.2*). An enormous amount of data related to the work of CSU Chico in fulfilling its educational outcomes is available at the system-wide level through the CSU Student Information Dashboard (<http://asd.calstate.edu/dashboard/>), and still further related information is available through Facts Book that have recently been generated by the Office of Institutional Research at CSU Chico (*CFR 1.2*).

CSU Chico has demonstrated its commitment to academic integrity (*CFR 1.3*) in any numbers of ways. For example, in section 1.2 of the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures, the institution addresses freedom in research and instruction, citizenship, and scholarship for pecuniary return. The institution further addresses matters of academic freedom in Appendix V its Faculty Code of Professional Ethics, section 2 of the Constitution of the Faculty, and various

executive memoranda (e.g., Executive Memorandum 96-38, Executive Memorandum 86-12). Finally, the institution has established grievance processes for both faculty and students that serve to promote and to safeguard the role of academic freedom at the institution.

In its 2009 reaccreditation, increasing student engagement to a broader diversity of students was raised as point of concern. The current team noted the institution's laudable overall improvements in retention and graduation rates, and in reducing the achievement gap even while seeing its student body become more diverse (*CFR 1.4*). However, the team also noted that CSU Chico should consider implementing campus initiatives and increasing participation in systemwide initiatives in order to accelerate progress in diversifying its faculty, so that its demographics will more closely align with the students it services. Fundamentally, however, CSU demonstrates institutional commitment to the principals enunciated in the WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy (e.g., through its Office of Diversity and Inclusion).

CSU Chico is, of course, affiliated with the California State University system, the governance structure of which is largely determined by state law. This system is ultimately administered by a 25-member Board of Trustees and is overseen by a Chancellor, who serves as chief executive officer. Elected representatives of the faculty from each campus recommend system-wide academic policy to the Board of Trustees through the Chancellor. Consistent with our WSCUC review of CSU institutions, the team finds (*CFR 1.5*) that the institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by the State of California.

Institutional information about its academic goals, programs, services, and costs is generally easy to find on its public web site (*CFR 1.6*), and there is no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. For example, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarship provides cost of attendance data and a tutorial video on its web site. Policies

concerning the definitions of grades, the assignment of grades, repetition of courses, and grade appeals are articulated in Executive Memorandum 10-018.

CSU Chico has a well-established Student Grievance and Complaint Process, as well as an Ombuds Office, that support its integrity and transparency (*CFR 1.7*). Additionally, CSU Chico's financial statements are audited in a limited way in order to facilitate consolidation into system-wide financials. The system's audits have been unqualified.

Finally, the visiting team noted that the CSU Chico had brought a great deal of "openness and candor" to both the writing of the reaffirmation of accreditation report, and the site visit itself (*CFR 1.8*).

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard 2, "Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions."

The institution's academic undergraduate and graduate programs are aligned and guided by CSU system-wide standards of performance and rigor (*CFR 2.1*). Each academic program has developed learning outcomes at the program and course level (*CFR 2.3*). The program learning outcomes (SLOs) are all published on websites and in printed materials. Currently no institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) exist except for the undergraduate General Education (GE) program. The university is considering developing campus-wide Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

The institution has developed an innovative GE program that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper-division level (*CFR 2.2a*). The WSCUC core competencies are

embedded within the GE program. Students can pursue a minor within GE through multiple pathways. The program also contains a first-year experience sequence. In fall 2017, the GE Pathways program went through a program review process and produced a 5-year report that demonstrated a culture of reflection, willingness to carry out difficult conversations, and the ability to carry out institutional change in the interest of supporting student learning. Recommendations for improvements included reducing the number of GE pathways and increasing the capacity of upper-division course offerings. Efforts around the improvements of the GE program have been very successful. The GE program is still in the early days but deserves commendation for many key components, including its willingness to make evidence-based decisions and to implement them.

The Academic Program Review (APR) process is completed by all non-accredited programs on campus during a 5 to 7-year cycle (*CFR 2.7*). The Academic Program Portfolio websites are innovative and comprehensive, including program information, learning outcomes, and assessment information. The process has recently been revised to be more streamlined, with the goal of the program self-study and site visit to be completed in one year. Each program is now also asked to address diversity in its self-study. In the past, access to data to support the APR has been challenging, but this process has been improving with programs now being provided relevant data. In some departments there is limited engagement of the faculty as well as a perceived minimal involvement of external reviewers. While improvements have been noted, additional recommendations include strengthening engagement of shared governance through the participation of more faculty and the academic senate. The campus is further advised to use the results of the APR process and annual assessment in more substantial and meaningful ways to improve student learning outcomes and program effectiveness.

Assessment of student learning is conducted for the GE program as well as at the degree program level. The GE program has recently completed a comprehensive review of the core competencies that resulted in significant recommendations for improvements. Current assessment of core competencies indicates baseline of adequate student achievement. The faculty now need to determine how student achievement will be elevated. The Academic Assessment Council (AAC) supports the review and guidance of the process of program-level assessment of student learning. Approximately, 90% of programs are compliant with submitting assessment reports on a yearly basis. Coordinators for assessment exist at the college-level, sit on the AAC, and provide feedback on the program assessment reports. Assessment of student learning is producing data and the campus is now encouraged to develop standards of performance (*CFR 2.4*) and specific recommendations for the improvement of student learning (closing the loop).

The team noted many instances where programs, processes, and data analyses were aimed primarily at traditional freshmen entry students, and consideration had not yet been considered for those students who entered as transfers from community college, or returning students. The team recommends a review of the institution's approach to supporting the growing body of transfer students and learners on campus, with an ensuing alignment of resources (*CFR 2.14*).

An active Graduate Council exists that reviews and ensures the quality of graduate degrees, and all programs undergo a program review process (*CFR 2.2b*). A minimum of five full-time faculty with terminal degrees in the appropriate discipline support each graduate program (CSU-wide

standard and requirement). Graduate students are integrated well into research, teaching and service.

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

1. Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes: The institution has successfully navigated a series of leadership changes over the past several years (*CFR 3.6, 3.8*). President Hutchinson is an experienced and pragmatic leader. She has earned respect for her deep understanding of the institution and its mission, as well as for her commitment to shared governance, communication and transparency. The institution recently completed its search for a new Vice President for Budget and Finance (*CFR 3.8*), which will further strengthen organizational effectiveness. The university conducts frequent climate surveys that support open and productive communication. There are concerns, however, about the number and duration of interim appointments in key leadership positions. The university should prioritize stabilizing the administration by making permanent appointments for positions currently held by interim appointees, and by being more transparent about the regular review of senior administrators.

There is a reinvigorated commitment to shared governance (*CFR 3.10*). The Academic Senate, Staff Council and Student Academic Senate are active participants in campus conversations and decision-making. Consideration should be given to strengthening Academic Senate involvement (e.g., the EPPC) in the academic program review process, which could make program review more meaningful and impactful.

Faculty and staff: CSU Chico faculty and staff have demonstrated exceptional commitment to the university and Chico community (*CFR 3.1*), and they are to be commended for their efforts

to help the region recover from the devastating fires of late 2018. As well, they are to be commended for providing continuity and stability during several years of leadership turnover. During the site visit, faculty expressed confidence in the senior leadership and a sense of optimism about the mission and trajectory of the institution.

CSU Chico continues to attract quality faculty (*CFR 3.2*). While women are well represented, there is a significant need to increase the ethnic/racial diversity of the faculty so that it more closely aligns with the population the institution serves.

Faculty are significantly engaged in the framing of learning outcomes and ongoing assessment (*CFR 3.3*). Staff expressed satisfaction with professional development opportunities that have enabled them to advance their careers at CSU Chico. This is commendable, given that many individuals are geographically constrained and other employment is limited. Talented junior faculty are being recruited, but they expressed the need for clearer guidelines, both at the university level and within their programs, on the criteria for tenure and advancement, and the expectations for research productivity (*CFR 3.2*).

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources: As a member of the California State University system, the campus is financially stable, though the state funding for operations has been steadily decreasing over the last decade. This means there is an increased reliance on student tuition and fee revenue. The campus has been gradually spending down its reserves. Details can be found in this report under Component 7.

Since assuming her role, the President has been improving transparency of processes and communication with the campus constituents. This includes providing more budget detail to the faculty and budget-related committees.

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

### **Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

The institution completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) for all of its programs, including 67 undergraduate programs, 30 graduate programs, and the university General Education program. Links were provided to detailed reports for all programs. Formal student learning outcomes have been developed for all programs and are published in a variety of places including: university, college or program websites; program portfolios; as well as in some course syllabi. The evidence used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degrees includes direct assessment of student work in General Education for all five WSCUC core competencies. Assessment at the program level includes a mix of direct and indirect assessment approaches ranging from comprehensive exams to embedded assessment in capstone courses and projects. Details of artifacts used for assessment are not always clear. Reflection and analysis are provided at the program level. A comprehensive, summative analysis of the assessment of student learning at the campus-level will constitute an important next step as the campus develops a culture of assessment and continuous improvement.

### **Compliance with Federal Requirements.** *(See Appendices for all Federal Compliance forms)*

The institution allows students to earn academic credit for prior experience (CFPE) (*Academic Policies and Regulations – Credit Hour*). It is not clear how widely known and utilized the option is and on what basis determinations are made on the credit to be awarded (e.g., whether the criteria are aligned with specific learning outcomes). As the institution enrolls increasing numbers of nontraditional students, the use of CFPE may grow, and there may be value in developing mechanisms for tracking how students awarded CFPE credit perform in subsequent courses, compared with peers who actually enrolled in the prerequisites.

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

CSU Chico ensures the meaning, quality, and integrity of the undergraduate and graduate degrees and credentials that it confers through annual student learning assessment, periodic program review, and other forms of faculty and program development that advance high-quality student learning (*CFR 2.3*). The recent assessment of Chico's flagship GE program featured a broadly participatory process driven by the program's holistic mission, values, and learning outcomes. The strength of that process is reflected in its results, which draw on direct assessment and candid evaluation in order to chart a clear path for continuous improvement toward foundational liberal education goals. Curricula in the majors benefit from a faculty-led development process and feature high-impact practices (HIPs) that include civic engagement (or service learning), undergraduate and graduate student research, an extended and thoughtful first-year experience (FYE), and programmatic capstone projects (*CFR 2.4, 2.5*). Program portfolios and curriculum maps clarify programs' requirements and student learning outcomes and support both student navigation and programmatic self-analysis (*CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.12*).

Faculty are clearly committed to delivering high-quality student learning, which many programs monitor through direct and indirect assessment, both formal and informal (*CFR 2.4, 4.3, 4.4*). Like faculty on many campuses, CSU Chico's are divided in their support for formal assessment protocols and their utility in driving curricular or other program changes. Where some programs have taken extensive measures to address assessment findings, others see assessment as an externally-driven compliance exercise rather than a useful component for program improvement. In contrast, Chico's Academic Program Review process (revised in Fall 2017) appears to have won strong support across the disciplines, with chairs reporting the value of

external reviewers' findings in particular (*CFR 2.7*). Moreover, many programs undertake regular assessment outside formal annual assessment processes by using student capstones as a measure of student learning (*CFR 2.7, 4.3*). Capstones also provide opportunities for many programs to gather feedback from employers and community stakeholders about the quality of graduates' skills and knowledge, which in turn inform curricular change (*CFR 4.3*). Given the faculty's strong commitment to high-quality teaching and student learning—and their willingness to undertake regular self-analysis to support both—the campus is advised to refine its annual assessment practices and to align them more visibly with markers of quality that faculty and programs find meaningful and useful.

CSU Chico offers a growing portfolio of online degree and degree completion programs at the master's and bachelor's degree levels (see Appendix). The programs have been designed to provide increased access to higher education and prepare graduates for the regional workforce. The efforts are guided by a broadly representative Distance Education Task Force, which has identified opportunities for enrollment growth and new programs. Challenges include identifying or developing faculty who are prepared to teach online, and balancing the effectiveness and flexibility of online instruction with Chico's high-touch in-person brand.

CSU Chico will have an opportunity to reaffirm its commitment to the meaning, value, and integrity of its degrees when it undertakes a new Academic Strategic Plan following the completion of the campus Strategic Plan (*CFR 4.6*). When it does so, the campus is urged to develop compelling guidelines that unite disciplinary excellence and high-quality liberal education in terms that both capture CSU Chico's distinct strengths and inspire continued development toward its highest goals.

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

The institution integrates the five WSCUC core competencies (*CFR 2.2*) into the majors and the General Education curriculum, which was redesigned into General Education Pathways in 2009-10. The core competencies are reflected in the program learning outcomes for many degree programs (*CFR 2.3*). As well, student learning outcomes are mapped to the GE course and correlated with the core competencies (*CFR 2.3, 2.4*). Innovative and comprehensive academic program portfolio websites combine program information, learning outcomes and assessment information (*CFR 2.2, 2.4, 2.6*). Student learning is evaluated through annual assessments in which all degree programs participate, and also through periodic program reviews (*CFR 2.4, 2.7*).

**Core competencies.** The institution takes a comprehensive approach to writing assessment in lower division, upper division and writing intensive courses, identifying achievement gaps and mechanisms to close them. For oral communication, assessment has proven more challenging due to lack of faculty engagement. At this point, the limited faculty survey evidence is insufficient to infer differences across pathways or between lower and upper division students. There is good leadership and this area merits continued effort. The assessment of critical thinking focused on upper division student work, and while the outcomes did not depend significantly on student characteristics, students' ability did not improve as they advanced. Consideration should be given to how students' critical thinking ability can be further developed as they progress through their majors. A self-assessment survey designed to assess active inquiry (information literacy) showed that on the whole, student performance was "well below average" (47% correct answers), but they do appear to further develop these skills as they progress. The assessment of quantitative reasoning in 2015 utilized a nationally normed

instrument. For the 631 students in 17 course sections, the average number of correct responses was 6.5, compared with 9.3 – 11.1 for all institutions and 6.0 – 8.7 for nonselective institutions. The scores improved with increasing class level and were better in some fields, such as engineering. Importantly, students showed improvement from pre- to post-test in the same course. The institution notes that benchmarking the core competencies is a work in progress. It has the opportunity to use the CSU Value Rubrics to compare student performance at CSU Chico with performance at other campuses (*CFR 4.3*).

**General Education.** There is a recognition that GE courses should broaden and challenge students (*CFR 2.5*). The team commends the recent assessment of its GE program and the associated process for continuous improvement (*CFR 2.4, 2.6*). The Fall 2017 GE Pathways report (*CFR 2.4*) demonstrates a culture of reflection, willingness to carry out difficult conversations and make evidenced-based decisions, and ability to carry out institutional change in to support student learning. A timeline for planned improvements has been mapped. Program improvements under consideration include reducing the number of pathways, increasing their cohesion, decoupling the lower and upper division courses to increase flexibility, distributing student learning outcomes more evenly across GE courses, adding upper division courses to reduce bottlenecks, mapping GE pathways to program learning outcomes, and rethinking the GE minors, which have not been as successful as hoped (*Response to Line of Inquiry; CFR 4.3*).

**Graduate programs.** The campus uses a common template for undergraduate and graduate student learning outcomes. Graduate level outcomes are reflected in the degree program requirements and are assessed either through the academic program review process (18 programs) or through external accrediting bodies such as ABET (*CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3*), and these are informing the development of student learning outcomes. Through participation in internships, assisting faculty with teaching and research and mentoring undergraduates,

graduate students gain core competencies that support their professional development (*CFR* 2.2).

Overall, the institution is engaging in thoughtful assessment of student learning outcomes, particularly in the GE. The process appears to be working well, although the team learned that in many departments the majority of faculty still view assessment as an administrative task of limited utility. Some noted that funding for assessment coordinators is becoming scarce, so people are opting out. Attention should be paid to fostering a shared understanding of the value the institution places on assessment, and its relevance to supporting student learning and advancing inclusive excellence. Commendably, the institution has identified several areas that could be targeted for additional attention: for example, addressing the slight decline in Hispanic students' grammar skills in upper division courses, and some disappointing trajectories in student learning. The team encourages the institution to focus its efforts on narrowing the identified achievement gaps and developing strategies to help students build their core competencies throughout their degree programs.

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

The campus has defined student success as “assisting students in their search for knowledge and understanding and to preparing them with the abilities, skills, and habits of lifelong learning in order to assume responsibility in a democratic community to be useful members of a global society.” Recently, additional focus has been placed on the role of civic engagement and diversity, reflecting the importance of the community nature of the Chico education.

The system-wide CSU Graduation Initiative 2025 has placed a renewed emphasis on increasing overall graduation rates and reducing graduation gaps between historically underserved

students and other groups. Chico has responded to GI 2025 with laudable efforts to build a campus culture of student success: for example, its Student Success Summit attracted a broad range of participants and established a model for campus-wide commitment to GI 2025 goals. These efforts will build momentum with greater consistency around their overall message and intended outcomes: while many faculty resist the perception that GI 2025 is primarily an effort to decrease time to degree (or to “push students through”), they are prepared to support a commitment to student retention and educational equity.

This campus identified student retention from the first to second year as the single largest factor affecting graduation rates. With this focus in mind, campus goals were developed around First Year Experience (FYE) programming, improvements in general education, and increasing effective co-curriculum student services, including increases in timely advising, more support in tutoring and supplemental instruction, mentoring programs, working to meet basic needs of students (food), as well as comprehensive counseling and wellness services (*CFRs 2.11- 2.13*).

Student retention and graduation rates have generally improved, with the First Time Freshmen (FTF) 4-year rates increasing 4% over the last 4 years to 29.3% and the 6-year rates declining by 2% to 66.3% in the last 2 years. Further analysis was conducted showing that high school performance and preparation is the single most important factor predicting 4-year graduation rates with the student’s choice of major the second strongest predictor. The graduation rates of females are double the rates for males. Breakdown by ethnicity showed the rates were the highest in white students, followed by Asians, Hispanics and blacks. Non-Under Represented Minority students graduated at a 10% higher rate than URM students (*CFR 2.10*). A common factor that was identified to explain graduation rates is the risk of failing certain courses,

identifying the need to work on reducing the failure rates in high fail rate courses. Currently a campus-wide effort is underway to address some of these high fail rate courses.

Improvements were also observed in the graduation rates of transfer students. The 2-year rates increased recently from 29% to 40.4% and the 4-year rates also increased from 77.3% to 79.7%. Graduate students currently demonstrate 2-year graduation rates of 45.2% and 4-year rates at 81% in the master's programs.

The combined data from 2009 to 2016 reveal overall that 70% of students graduated, 12% were dismissed, and 18% dropped out. The dropout rates for URM students was the same as non-URM students but the dismissal rates for the URM students was higher than the non-URM students, primarily in the first year. This again corroborates the focus of support and interventions on first-year students who are not performing well in courses. The dropout rates are also the highest for students in the first year, declining years 2 and 3 and then increasing rapidly in years 4 and 5. As mentioned in the self-study, a similar detailed analysis needs to be extended to 2- and 4-year graduation rates for transfer students (*CFR 2.14*). Evaluation of the data for Pell eligible students would also be very valuable.

The report cites very high values for the Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR), average of 91% (2008 – 2016), and the Average Unit Redemption Rate is 92% (2008 – 2016). These high values indicate a large number of students eventually graduate with degrees. The campus is very efficient in coordinating course offerings that contribute ultimately towards degrees.

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

There is sufficient evidence that quality improvement efforts at CSU Chico are broadly participatory, iterative, and evidence-based. For example, assessment takes place in all academic, academic support, and non-academic programs, including programs that have external accreditation (*CFR 4.1*). All degree programs participate in a faculty-led annual assessment of learning and submit an annual assessment report. Each school or college has a funded assessment coordinator or the equivalent. An Academic Assessment Council provides governance, steering, and oversight. Evidence of iteration can be found in institutional investments in Faculty Institutional Research Fellows and sending five faculty members to the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy (*CFR 4.3, 4.4*). Evidence connected to quality improvement efforts ranges from program-specific data from the Office of Institutional Research, to rubric-driven reviews of student capstone projects.

**Program Review.** In its 2009 reaccreditation, WSCUC commended CSU Chico for the quality of its Academic Program Review process and its emphases on organizational learning and continuous improvements. At CSU Chico, Academic Program Reviews are completed every 5 to 7 years for programs without a separate professional accreditation (*CFR 4.1, 4.4*). The visiting team continued to find much to commend about the strength of the institution's Academic Program Review process. In particular, the visiting team noted that the process itself has been assessed and improved (e.g., the streamlining of the process implemented in academic year 2017-18). There are clear and organized templates that support Academic Program Reviews (*CFR 4.1, 4.4*). Moreover, the institution is building upon annual assessment processes in co-curricular programming and moving towards Co-Curricular Program Reviews (*CFR 4.3*).

The visiting team noted that while the Academic Program Review process itself appears to have fairly broad support across the institution, the Academic Senate plays a limited or nonexistent role in it and recommends greater involvement of the Academic Senate in the future. Some Academic Program Reviews have had limited engagement by faculty members and minimal involvement of external reviewers, though the Provost indicated that the latter problem is abating). Evidence of closing the loop through program improvement (e.g., the transformation of the B.A. in Communication Design) plans is also somewhat limited. The institution should consider how the Academic Program Review process could be used more systematically and consistently to develop program improvement plans which, in turn, are connected to improvements in student learning outcomes and program effectiveness.

**Assessment of Student Learning.** All degree programs must participate in a yearly assessment of learning at CSU Chico (*CFR 4.1, CFR 4.4*). Programs have assessment facilitators who work with faculty to select one or more program learning outcomes to assess (*CFR 4.1, CFR 4.4*). This annual work is guided by individual program assessment plans (*CFR 4.1, CFR 4.4*). Assessment methodologies at CSU Chico range from indirect to direct. The visiting team encourages placing additional weight on more direct methods going forward. Assessment results are recorded in an annual program assessment report (APAR), with running, multi-year accountings being recorded in “status updates” (*CFR 4.1, 4.4*). Many features of sound and ongoing assessment of student learning — e.g., student learning outcomes, curriculum matrices, assessment plans, assessment summary updates, etc. — are available at a centralized program portfolio web site (<https://www.csuchico.edu/wasc/academic-program-portfolios.shtml>). The visiting team was impressed with this resource.

There is acknowledgement at CSU Chico that the decentralized approach to assessment has some demerits: mostly, the lack of a shared sense of accountability and a shared vision around a culture of assessment. The visiting team noted some other challenges, too. While not uncommon, the faculty at CSU Chico is divided on its support for formal assessment practices. Some faculty see assessment as a useful vehicle for program improvement, while others see it as “checking the box.” Annual assessment practices for graduate programs may suffer under the current decentralized model. Care should be taken to ensure that graduate programs are hewing to a relatively coordinated vision and set of practices for assessment. For example, the M.A. in Art Assessment Status Update indicates a great deal of reliance on summative evaluation of capstone projects and a protracted conversation about the program’s faculty changing its approach to assessment. On the other hand, the Assessment Status Update for the M.S. in Electrical and Computer Engineering shows heavy reliance on the pass rates on final examinations for years in which the program learning outcome under consideration was simply not evaluated.

With these challenges in mind, there is much to praise about annual (or ongoing) assessment of student learning at CSU Chico. The visiting team praised the concentrated assessment work in connection with the General Education program, and the ensuing improvements made to that program (*CFR 4.3, 4.4*). Recent assessment work in connection to the assessment of writing in lower-division, upper-division, and writing-intensive courses was deemed laudable by the visiting team (*CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.4*). The efforts to standardize and to institutionalize annual assessment efforts in the co-curricular (i.e., student affairs) sphere are commendable, too (*CFR 4.1*).

With respect to both the Academic Program Review process and annual assessments of student learning, the visiting team has some concerns about the budgetary and human resources that

are available to attend to and further develop a culture of assessment. For example, during its visit the team received data indicating that the discretionary budget for assessment-related activities (e.g., to fund travel for external program reviewers) has declined at CSU Chico over the past half-decade.

**Data Collection and Analysis.** As is typical at many institutions of higher learning, most assessment-related data are retained and analyzed at the program level (e.g., data from completed rubrics for capstone projects). However, the Office of Institutional Research also provides both general and data-driven support for program review and, as appropriate, for graduation. The recent reorganization of the institutional research function at CSU Chico, as well as the innovative work of its first Faculty Fellow, has resulted in the provision of increasingly consistent summaries and visualizations of data, as well as helpful insights related to retention, persistence, time to completion, etc. (*CFR 4.2*).

The visiting team was impressed by the relatively sophisticated governance structures around data, and the clear understanding that a robust, secure, and upgraded data warehouse is a necessary first step in strengthening the foundation of an even more data-driven culture of decision-making (*CFR 4.2*). The institution's first forays into using Tableau dashboards have been well-received by faculty and staff alike; this tool can be further leveraged to build a data-driven culture of decision-making (*CFR 4.2*).

The visiting team finds that Academic Program Review and annual assessment of student learning could be further and better informed by institutional data. To that end, the team recommends further clarification of the role of the institutional research function at the University and a more widely-understood sense of how the Office of Institutional Research fits into the University's overall administrative and academic structure. The team also recommends

clear visioning around how the Office of Institutional Research will support future data-driven decision-making (*CFR 4.6*), with a concomitant identification of incremental budgetary and human resources and professional development opportunities to match this visioning.

**G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for changing higher ed.**

**Environment**

Chico State has undergone a period of leadership challenges and transitions over the last decade. The current leadership team has several new members, including the President (2016), Provost (2017), Vice President for Student Affairs (2018), and Vice President for Business and Finance (2019). The university has not filled several key academic and administrative positions on a permanent basis which is important for long-term operational sustainability and organizational structure (*CFR 3.1 and 3.7*). During the leadership transition period, the campus community is recognized for its commitment to advance strategic initiatives and planning efforts in support of the university's mission.

Under President Hutchinson's leadership, Chico State is demonstrating a commitment to enhanced transparency and shared governance and the senior leadership team is meeting on a bi-weekly basis with the Academic Senate Executive Committee (*CFR 1.7*). The university is also providing more detailed budget information to the University Budget Committee. Chico State's commitment to collaboration, transparency, and shared governance provides a strong foundation for the university's upcoming strategic and fiscal planning efforts.

Chico State's financial statements are audited on a limited scope basis for consolidation into the CSU Systemwide financials (*CFR 3.4*). The CSU System-level audits have been unqualified. The university continues to adjust to the decline in state support and changing higher education landscape. State support for operations declined from 72% in fiscal year 2009 to 53% in fiscal

year 2019. The university has been spending down its undesignated operating reserves from a peak high of \$54 million in fiscal year 2014 to balance ongoing operational needs. Also, the divisions have undesignated operating reserve balances and have been using their divisional reserves for strategic investments. Since 2014, Academic Affairs has invested \$14 million of its reserves in faculty professional development, diversity initiatives, computing and classroom technology refreshes, lab equipment, and modernization of learning spaces in the library (*CFR 3.5*). The university is seeking to reduce its spenddown of reserves by revenue diversification, such as increased philanthropy and public-private partnerships, and by realizing operational efficiencies using lean process management and technology (*CFR 3.4*). The university launched its inaugural capital campaign and is on target to achieve its \$100 million capital campaign goal by 2020. CSU Chico is also taking advantage of CSU funding opportunities for academic initiatives such as course redesign and curriculum innovation (*CFR 3.4*). Examples of recent operational efficiency initiatives include a work-flow and document management solution, a procure to pay process, and web-based travel and expense management system to cut costs and streamline operations.

With a heavy reliance on student enrollment and tuition and fee revenue, CSU Chico is strengthening its enrollment management and planning infrastructure through strategic investments in its Institutional Research and technology capabilities (*CFR 3.4, 3.5*). IR is now providing critical support to help refine and reinforce student enrollment modeling which supports the reliability and sustainability of the university's operating budget models. The university did not achieve its budgeted enrollment targets for fiscal year 2019 due to a decline in non-resident student enrollment. The decline of 116 FTE students put pressure on the university to utilize its remaining centrally managed reserve balance. IR is working with enrollment management to enhance the university's enrollment modeling capabilities to better

anticipate and respond to enrollment fluctuations. The Office of Enrollment Management recently implemented a customer relationship management system (CRM) to improve student engagement and enhance student success and is seeking faculty input to better inform decisions regarding levels of credit and priority registration.

While CSU Chico's FTE student enrollment increased from 15,332 in fiscal year 2010 to 16,130 in fiscal year 2019, the university has struggled to maintain its tenure density. Operating budget constraints have limited Chico State's ability to increase its tenure density (FTE) numbers in recent years (from a high of 70.5% in 2009 to 60.7% in 2018) (*CFR 3.1*). CSU Chico's tenure density is fifth highest in the System at 61% and it has hoped to increase tenure density with a focus on diversity hires, but Chico and the surrounding geographic area face serious housing shortages as a result of the Camp Fire. The university will need to develop a plan to locate affordable housing options for faculty candidates. The university also noted in its Institutional Report that it cannot meet its aspirational goals of investing more in its academic and student support services, however, it has begun to evaluate ways to improve its high impact practices (*CFR 2.13*).

Due to the timing of State appropriations and the CSU budget process, the campus is not preparing a long-range financial plan, but plans to develop one once the new strategic plan is finalized. CSU Chico's academic division utilizes an Activity Based Costing (ABC) budget model to align resources with the cost structures of the colleges. The model is an improvement from the historical incremental budget methodology as it allocates budget based largely on FTEs by college; the dollars follow student enrollment, and shift accordingly. CSU Chico has unmet demand for select graduate programs and these programs require an initial investment for faculty resources and staffing to identify student internship opportunities.

Although the university has limited financial resources, it has continued to invest in its facilities to support students. Since 2008, the university has added several new buildings, including new Student Services and Recreation Centers and two academic buildings. CSU Chico has significant deferred maintenance totaling over \$290 million and is undertaking a campus master planning effort to assess its facility needs. While the university is allocating \$1.2 million annually to meet its CSU campus contribution funding requirement for capital projects, including its new Science Building, the \$1.2 million annual budget allocation is not sufficient for its long-term capital and deferred maintenance needs.

**H. COMPONENT 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes NA**

**I. COMPONENT 9: Reflection and Plans for the Future**

Reflection and future plans have been incorporated into the report for each component.

**SECTION III: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Commendations:**

1. The team commends the university for its caring response to the 2018 devastating local fires. The support and leadership demonstrated, as well as the extraordinary volunteer efforts of the university community and all its stakeholders, have been exceptional. In this university, the North State has a valued partner.
2. The team commends the university's faculty and staff for providing continuity and stability during a recent period of leadership turnover at many levels.
3. There is a reinvigorated commitment to shared governance, effective communication, and an inclusive strategic planning process — all of which have contributed to rebuilding trust and morale.

4. The team commends the strong commitment to the success and well-being of Chico students by faculty, staff, and administration in all areas.
5. The university has a thoughtful, strategic and collaborative approach to distance education. This approach addresses the needs of students, employers and community partners in the North State.
6. The team commends the recent assessment of its program of General Education and the associated process for continuous improvement.
7. The university has made laudable overall improvements in retention and graduation rates, and in reducing the achievement gap while increasing diversity.

**Recommendations:**

1. Although the university conducts annual assessments of academic programs and periodic program reviews, these processes could be connected in more substantial and meaningful ways with improving student learning outcomes and program effectiveness. They could also be better informed by institutional data, academic senate engagement, and external input, and would benefit from sustained commitment of resources. (*CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.7*)
2. The team applauds recent efforts to reorganize and to reinvigorate the institutional research function in advance of its visit. The team encourages further developing institutional research's role at the University, reassessment of how IR fits into the University's overall structure, clear visioning of how IR will support future data-driven decision-making, and identification of additional resources and professional development opportunities that match this vision. (*CFR 4.3, 4.5*)
3. Given its history, mission, location in the North State, and market position, CSU Chico serves -- and will increasingly serve -- transfer students and non-traditional learners. The team

recommends a review of the institution's approach to supporting this growing body of students and learners on campus, with an ensuing alignment of resources. (*CFR 2.14*)

4. The university should prioritize stabilizing the administration by making permanent appointments for positions currently held by interim appointees, and by increasing the transparency of regular reviews of senior administrators. (*CFR 3.7, 3.2*)
5. CSU Chico should consider implementing its own initiatives, and participating in systemwide initiatives, to accelerate progress in diversifying the faculty, so that its demographics will more closely align with the students it serves. (*CFR 1.4*)

**SECTION IV: APPENDICES**

**Federal Compliance Forms**

**1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM**

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</b>
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? Via the <a href="http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/acaregs.html">University Catalog</a> (see <a href="http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/acaregs.html">http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/acaregs.html</a> ). Also: CSU Definition of Credit Hour ( <a href="#">AA-2011-14</a> ).
	<p>Comments: A Student Credit Unit (SCU) is defined by the US Department of Education, WSCUC, the CSU, and Chico State. See <a href="#">Academic Policies and Regulations, Credit Hour</a>. Credits indicate how much time a course will meet and the minimum out-of-class student work required. The amounts vary with type of instruction: one credit of lecture or discussion = 50 minutes of classroom and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester. One credit = 100 minutes of classroom and a minimum of one hour of out-of-class student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester. One credit of laboratory = 150 minutes of classroom time per week. Most of the student work is done in lab.</p> <p>Credit earned by students in faculty-led study abroad programs or other intensives is limited to no more than 1.2 units per week requiring students to spend 18 hours each week on work directly on the course. This limit is based on a survey of third-party programs offered through a number of universities and intended for broadly-accepted transfer to other institutions. Programs which intend to grant credit in excess of that amount are not approved until the amount of credit proposed meets this criterion.</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)? <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: Chico State consistently abides by CSU's course classification

	<p>system, which further defines the amount of time per credit hour that must be accounted for by faculty instruction (the rest of which will be accounted for by the students' preparation and other independent work). The classification and unit amount assigned to a course is carefully considered by the department curriculum committee, the college curriculum committee, the Educational Policies and Programs Committee (<a href="#">EPPC</a>) of the Academic Senate, the Academic Senate, and the Provost at the time that the course is approved. The amount of work required of students for the course must justify the total number of units. The assigned classification and number of units applies to all sections of the course unless it is approved as a variable-unit course and the curricular differences between different unit levels is explicit.</p>
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	<p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments: Course schedules are available on-line at <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/schedule/">http://www.csuchico.edu/schedule/</a> Audits are run each semester to assure that courses are scheduled for the appropriate amount of time, based on their course classifications and number of units. The classroom scheduler and curriculum coordinator work with the departments to correct any errors, sometimes referring difficult situations to the appropriate dean or associate dean and to the Vice Provost for Academic Programs.</p>
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? One from each degree level
	Type of courses reviewed: X online X hybrid
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS X BA/BS X MA/MS <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Religious Studies; Nursing, Psychology, Social Work
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Chico State's online, hybrid, and web-facilitated course policy can be accessed <a href="#">here</a> and within the following Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures: <a href="#">FPPP 1.1.5</a> , <a href="#">FPPP 8.1.1.e</a> , <a href="#">FPPP 8.1.4.b</a> , <a href="#">FPPP 8.a.4.h</a> . Please note that this policy is in the process of being revised.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical,	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kinds of courses? SWRK (Social Work) 653: Foundation Field Practicum; KINE 480: Exercise Testing and Prescription Lab; CMST 684: Advanced Clinical Practicum; KINE 196: Service Learning in Movement Studies in Disability
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS x BA/BS x MA/MS <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? SWRK, KINE, and CMST
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Five
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? BS Geosciences; BS Construction Management; BFA Art; MS Nutritional Science; MA Education
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA/MS <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? See above
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

## 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	<p>Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Chico State adheres to Section 487(a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and provides no incentive compensations, in any form, that are tied to meeting enrollment. Further, Chico State adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in the <a href="#">CSU Admission Handbook</a>.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Chico State provides cost information in a variety of ways including current fees and tuition information, which are available by semester at <a href="https://www.csuchico.edu/fa/costs/cost.shtml">https://www.csuchico.edu/fa/costs/cost.shtml</a> and through a Cost Calculator at <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/fa/costs/netpricecalc.shtml">http://www.csuchico.edu/fa/costs/netpricecalc.shtml</a>. Recruitment discussions and communications with prospective students also include information regarding costs of attendance. Several resources allow students to understand a typical time to degree at Chico State. These include degree Major Academic Plans (<a href="#">MAPs</a>) for different programs, advice on graduating in four years, as well as specific information for Associate Degree Transfer programs at <a href="https://www.csuchico.edu/aap/understanding_requirements/aat-ast_advising.shtml">https://www.csuchico.edu/aap/understanding_requirements/aat-ast_advising.shtml</a> and California Promise programs at <a href="https://www.csuchico.edu/aap/ca_promise/">https://www.csuchico.edu/aap/ca_promise/</a>. Data are available regarding graduation rates and time to degree online from the campus <a href="#">Graduation Initiative page</a> or from the campus <a href="#">Academic Program Review (APR) page</a>.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: The Career Advisors in the Career Center use numerous local, regional, and national resources to gather data, including the <a href="#">California Employment Development Department</a>, the County of Butte, the Bureau of</p>

	<p>Labor Statistics, the Occupational Outlook Handbook, National Association of Colleges and Employers, and Onet Online. Chico State conveys this information to students and faculty in a multitude of ways and formats, including individual appointments, Career Center daily drop-ins, workshops, classroom presentations, and various career fairs. The Career Center also maintains a Job Database and manual to manage jobs and internship opportunities for students: <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/get-a-job-or-internship/jobcat-search-jobs-and-internships.shtml">http://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/get-a-job-or-internship/jobcat-search-jobs-and-internships.shtml</a> and <a href="https://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/job-search-tools/documents/career-center-manual.pdf">https://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/job-search-tools/documents/career-center-manual.pdf</a></p> <p>Additionally, the Career Center collects First Destination Data from all graduates at both graduation and six months following their graduation. The Center ask about their post-graduation plans including grad school, careers, etc. This data is compiled and summarized in the Career Center Highlights report <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/departmental-annual-report.shtml">http://www.csuchico.edu/careers/students-and-alumni/departmental-annual-report.shtml</a>. For the 2016/2017 academic year, the office collected 1,362 responses from Chico State graduates, equaling a 37% response rate.</p>
--	--

\*\*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 requirements do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

**3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulation\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</b>
--------------------------	---

(See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executive Memoranda from the President's website: <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/EMs/2005/05-010.shtml">http://www.csuchico.edu/prs/EMs/2005/05-010.shtml</a></li> <li>Executive Order 1097: Systemwide <i>Policy</i> Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking against Students and Systemwide <i>Procedure</i> for Addressing Such Complaints by Students <a href="http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1097-rev-10-5-16.html">http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1097-rev-10-5-16.html</a></li> <li>Student Judicial Affairs website: <a href="http://www.csuchico.edu/sjd/policies.shtml">http://www.csuchico.edu/sjd/policies.shtml</a></li> <li>The <i>University Catalog</i>: <a href="http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/STUDJUDAFFAIRS.html">http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/STUDJUDAFFAIRS.html</a></li> </ol>
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly For student grievances: the informal process includes addressing the incident with the faculty or staff member, as well as their Chair or direct supervisor. If an informal resolution is not reached, a formal grievance may be filed with Student Judicial Affairs and the student may present their grievance to a Hearing Panel of faculty/staff and students. For Title IX or DHR complaints (pursuant to EO <a href="#">1096/7</a> ): the student may file a complaint with Student Judicial Affairs. If accepted by the <a href="#">Title IX Coordinator</a> , a formal investigation would be initiated, which may result in a referral for conduct and discipline pursuant to <a href="#">EO 1098</a> (if the respondent is a student). For general student behavioral or conduct complaints: referrals to Student Judicial Affairs are reviewed for potential conduct charges and addressed through the Student Conduct Procedures established in <a href="#">EO 1098</a> .
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The procedures are outlined in the policy regarding student grievances. Student Judicial Affairs has three Conduct Administrators who manages complaints. Complaints regarding Title IX are managed by several <a href="#">Title IX Deputies</a> located in SJA and the Title IX office.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? Chico State maintains records of student complaints and grievances through the <a href="#">Maxient</a> case management system.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student

	complaints over time? <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</span> If so, please describe briefly: Chico State tracks and monitors student complaints and grievances through the <a href="#">Maxient</a> case management system.
	Comments: Chico State maintains records of student grievances filed. Chico State has methods for tracking and monitoring; however the process could be improved for tracking and acting on complaints that are raised (if trends are found). Currently, the information is stored with the Grievance Coordinator, but the general student issues reviewed are not disclosed and discussed, just the statistics (i.e. grade change: denied/approved). This does not allow for significant structure changes to be made in instructional quality or training.

#### 4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? 1. The <i>University Catalog</i> : <a href="http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/CREDIT.html">http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/CREDIT.html</a>
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: In accordance with policies and practices of the California State University, transfer credits are reviewed and received, and subsequently posted to a student’s Degree Audit Report. Additional “Business Processes” for reviewing transfer credits are maintained within the Office of the Registrar. The number of credits, subject matter equivalencies, and policies for Credit by Examination, Advanced Placement Tests, (and other subject matter tests), Prior Instruction, and credit limitations are all publicly available in the <i>University Catalog</i> . Transfer credit practices and guides are available from the Office of the Registrar. Transfer credit practices are developed, reviewed, and maintained in accordance with CSU Directives (Executive Orders, Administrative Memoranda), Chico State Academic Policies, and CSU system-wide practices ( <a href="http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/codedmemos/asa-2017-13.pdf">http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/codedmemos/asa-2017-13.pdf</a> ).

\*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

## OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: CSU Chico/Redding satellite

Type of Visit: AV

Name of reviewer/s: Barbara Sawrey

Date/s of review: March 26, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed<sup>1</sup>. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

### 1. Site Name and Address

Shasta College University Center  
1400 Market Street  
Redding, CA

### 2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

CSU Chico has a regional center in Redding, in space rented from Shasta Community College, located in downtown Redding, CA. The facilities are modern and have suitable classroom technology for in-person, hybrid and distance learning courses. Only one major is offered at the site — Management. Enrollment is small, with 10-12 students in each entering cohort. The majority of entering students have completed two years of course work at Shasta Community College and are transferring to CSU Chico, without the need to travel to the main campus. All students are full time, although they work. All classes are offered in the evening. Classes may be taught in Redding and streamed to Chico, or vice versa. That allows the Redding students to work with their Chico counterparts as well as their local cohort. General Education courses are available asynchronously online, so that students may take them at the regional site or from home.

There are three faculty who share the teaching in Redding, and one 0.55FTE staff member/site coordinator.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

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

All written materials are the same as those reviewed by the entire visiting team in Chico, March 4-7, 2019. The visit and interviews at the regional site were held on a Tuesday evening, just before classes began. All three instructors were interviewed together. Since the student population is small, only two students were interviewed — one a first year transfer student (male, veteran), and one a graduating student (female). The local staff member, and several administrators from the Chico campus (whose portfolios include the regional site as part of their responsibilities) were interviewed.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The site is a partnership with the institution’s main community college feeder. It fits CSU Chico’s mission well, as it provides additional regional access to returning students, veterans, and other non-traditional entry students. All infrastructure is maintained by the community college. CSU Chico rents space and provides the instructors and access to the support staff.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The building is co- branded with the CSU and the community college. It appears to have strong visibility in the region. Students attend classes only at night, since they all work during the day. They are oriented and advised by Chico staff who come in person each fall, and then are available</p>	

	<p>online at other times. The students see themselves as full Chico members, and can be as participatory as they wish in Chico activities. Due to their busy work and class schedule, most opt out of co-curricular activities, with the exception of the local Management Club.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>0.55FTE on-site administrator is knowledgeable and well regarded. The instructors are all long-term, and students reviews are strong. They also have taught or are teaching at the main Chico campus or Shasta Community College. They know their students well.</p> <p>Shasta manages the facilities, and has an excellent working relationship with Chico.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>Each fall, the Chico advising staff come to Redding and work out a two-year plan with new students. These same staff are available online the rest of the year, though the instructors and onsite administrator are all willing and able to help students who need advice. Financial aid deals with the students in a similar way. The students feel well served.</p> <p>CSU Chico's Library is available completely online (which how most students on the main campus use it also),. Students can access from their home as well as at the regional center. In Redding they are also provided full access to Shasta</p>	<p>Although the Redding students have access to career assistance from the main campus, there doesn't appear to be any localized attention to helping the students find jobs, if they need that. Some attention would be helpful here.</p> <p>A CSU Chico alumni chapter could be very helpful to students.</p>

	<p>CC's library.</p> <p>Computing help is available onsite in Redding.</p> <p>The only request that was voiced to me by a student is for access to tutoring help.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>Courses that originate in Redding are taught by three long-term part-time adjuncts. Courses that originate in Chico are taught by a variety of faculty — permanent, adjunct, full and part-time.</p> <p>The Redding instructors participate in teaching and learning development workshops and brown bag lunches via Zoom, and have access to annual funds to attend conferences. They claim to be feel well integrated into the CSU Chico culture.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>The courses are the same as those taught on the main campus. Curriculum is developed jointly with others teaching the course at the home location. Redding faculty have influence on content, books, etc. the SLOs are the same, regardless of the instructor.</p> <p>The Redding students are flagged in the database, so that outcomes can be compared, but the numbers are so small as to make statistical comparison between sites meaningless. Some classes use common exams, so there is some ability</p>	

	to calibrate with the Chico students. Virtually all students from the Redding campus finish the program.	
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	The cohort size is very small, so straight comparison with the main campus doesn't say much. However, the care and attention that the instructors and staff provide at Redding, and the strong bonds for, Ed among the students, keep students on track. Once they start the program, they finish.	
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Since the students at the off-campus site take the courses along with the Chico students via synchronous distance learning, they are all subject to the same assessment. They do well, and in many cases better, because of their uniform commitment.	
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	There is a strong commitment among the faculty, staff, and Chico administration to making this program work well, but it is quite small. Due to that size, everyone knows when something doesn't work, and it gets fixed.	

## Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: CSU Chico

Type of Visit: AV

Name of reviewer/s: Robin L. Garrell

Date/s of review: March 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs<sup>2</sup> 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)

182-PSYC381-01-1671 Abnormal Psychology (Psychology)

182-SWRK653-30-4907 Program Evaluation (Social Work)

192-RELS332-02-3345 World Religions & Global Issues (Religious Studies) Courses where you

188-NURS620-01-4951 Advanced Nursing Research & Theory (Nursing)

### 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)

#### *Online degree and degree completion programs*

BA in Liberal Studies (2001): 82 FTES (Sp 2019)

BA in Religious Studies (2018): 8.2 FTES (SP 2019)

BA in Sociology (2011): 138.18 FTES (SP 2019)

BA in Social Science(2001): 64.6 FTES (SP 2019)

MS in Agricultural Education (2011), online via multi-instit. consortium: 7.68 FTES (SP 2019)

MS in Nursing (2004): 3 FTES (SP 2019)

#### *Hybrid delivery*

BS in Nursing (BSN to RN) (2001): 16 FTES (SP 2019)

BSW (Bachelor of Science in Social Work) (2012): 24.87 FTES (SP 2019)

MSW (Master of Science in Social Work) (2009): 35 FTES (SP 2019)

---

<sup>2</sup> See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

*Growth history:* FTES in online degree programs increased 104% from 2013 to spring 2019.

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

Institutional Report

Institutional web pages for the fully-online and hybrid degree programs

Blackboard learning management system course websites, syllabi, instructional materials and student work

Meeting with the Distance Education Task Force during the accreditation visit

**Observations and Findings**

<b>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</b>	<b>Observations and Findings</b>	<b>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</b>
<p><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?</p>	<p>Aligns with mission to make education more accessible to non-traditional and remote students, and to develop the workforce for jobs in the North State, now and in the future.</p> <p>Students from all over the state participate in distance education. Some residential CSU Chico students opt to enroll in online courses for a portion of their workload. Still others participate in synchronous distance courses in management that may originate at the Redding satellite site.</p> <p>The Liberal Studies program is attractive to transfer students. Community college articulation agreements are in place.</p> <p>The provost’s advisory council appointed the Distance Education Task Force to support implementation of strategic plans. Faculty discussions within schools are moved forward to the Regional Continuing Education (RCE) enterprise, which supports implementation and assessment.</p>	

	<p>Programs are approved through the institution's system of shared governance.</p> <p>The RCE provides administrative and other infrastructural support for distance education, including access to campus library and other resources. RCE operates on a revenue-sharing model.</p> <p>The MS in Agricultural Education program was developed collaboratively with external partners and is offered through a multi-institutional consortium based in the Midwest.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Students are provided information and access to resources through the campus web portal. Most students in the online program are non-traditional (work full-time, older) with different needs and expectations for a campus life experience. Students in hybrid degree programs seem to be fully integrated.</p>	
<p><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?</p>	<p>The Blackboard learning platform supports effective faculty-student and student-student interactions and feedback. Data/content reside in Blackboard's cloud data center and can be restored via a ticket to Blackboard.</p>	
<p><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?</p>	<p>Students have 24/7 access to online library materials. Based on information provided by the Task Force and on student outcomes (satisfaction, good degree completion data), the academic support and other services appear effective.</p>	

<p><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?</p>	<p>In the 2017-2018 academic year, 45% of faculty teaching in online programs were full-time and 55% were part-time or adjuncts. The Distance Education Task Force identifies needs and resources for faculty development to support online teaching.</p>	
<p><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.)</p>	<p>Courses are designed by faculty in the disciplines, guided by the Distance Education Task Force and supported by the RCE. Online, hybrid and in-person courses are subject to the same campus review and approval processes. Based on the courses reviewed, the online and hybrid courses are consistent with the credit hour policy.</p>	
<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>Retention and graduation data collected for online students are essentially the same as what is collected for on-campus students. CSU Chico's division of Regional and Continuing Education (RCE) reviews and shares online program retention and graduation data with departments offering online degree programs. Degree retention and graduation data are reported to the Chancellors Office, which aggregates online and on-campus data. RCE tracks online retention and graduation data separately, so the institution can compare data for students participating online student and in-person. Students in online programs generally persist and graduate at levels consistent with those for in-person programs, with some online programs outperforming in-person programs</p>	

	and other online programs falling slightly below the in-person program rates.	
<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?	The mechanisms for assessing student learning are comparable to those for on-ground courses. All of the reviewed syllabi include course and student learning outcomes, and if relevant these are mapped to professional standards and outcomes.	
<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> ?	The campus Blackboard LMS is used for all of the courses reviewed. The MS in Agricultural Education degree program is offered through a multi-institutional consortium and was not accessible for evaluation.	
<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>Online courses are vetted by faculty outside the program. This inclusive process has fostered broader understanding, interest, and support for distance education.</p> <p>The agricultural education courses are also reviewed by outside partners.</p> <p>The institution actively monitors the newly-introduced online programs to ensure quality and effectiveness. This has engendered a dynamic process for program innovation and improvement, ensuring the curricula are of interest to prospective students and meet their needs. All but one degree program have been reviewed at least once through the regular campus review process.</p>	

Rev 3/2015