

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To JOHN F. KENNEDY UNIVERSITY

March 14-17, 2016

Team Roster

Geoffrey M. Cox, Chair  
President Emeritus, Alliant International University

Maryann Jones, Assistant Chair  
Dean Emerita, Western State College of Law

Thomas A. Hannen  
Professor Emeritus, Notre Dame de Namur University

Nathan Long  
President, Saybrook University

Deborah A. Markos  
Chief Operating Officer, TCS Education System

Barbara Gross Davis  
Vice President, WSCUC

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process.....	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process .....	5
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	5
<b>SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions .....	6
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.....	8
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees	26
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation .....	29
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation ....	32
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence .....	35
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment.....	39
H. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement.....	46
<b>SECTION III - COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>51</b>
A. Federal Compliance Forms .....	51
1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review .....	51
2-Marketing and Recruitment Review .....	54
3-Student Complaints Review .....	56
4-Transfer Credit Policy Review.....	58
B Off-Campus Locations Review .....	60
C Distance Education Review .....	72

## **SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

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

John F. Kennedy University (JFKU) has three colleges serving approximately 1,100 students at three campuses in the San Francisco Bay Area as well as on-line. Campuses are located in Pleasant Hill, San Jose, and Berkeley. The College of Undergraduate Studies, the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, and the College of Law offer 16 degrees and 5 certificates at the BA, BS, MA, MBA, JD, and PsyD levels. There is also a Continuing Education Division. The institution is served by approximately 42 full-time and approximately 300 adjunct faculty members.

Four programs, BA Journalism and Digital Media, BS Criminal Justice Leadership, MBA, and MA in Sports Psychology are offered entirely in an on-line format. More than fifty percent of a fifth program, BS Business Administration, can be completed on-line.

The institution was founded in 1964. It is a not-for-profit institution that became affiliated with the National University System (NUS) in 2009. JFKU's mission is to "provide access to high-quality, innovative educational opportunities that integrate theory and life experience," with core values of accessibility, quality and innovation, transformative growth, diversity, global view, and a strong commitment to the public good. JFKU has been designated as a Hispanic Serving Institution. The institution

recently instituted a requirement of community service as part of all degree programs, and incorporates service into the curriculum as well as in several off-campus programs, such as legal clinics, affordable counseling services, school counseling services, and work with disadvantaged youth.

JFKU was granted WSCUC candidacy in 1973 and initial accreditation in 1977. Accreditation was reaffirmed most recently in 2009, albeit with a formal Notice of Concern and a 2011 Special Visit. Concern over the institution's finances has been a pervasive theme in JFKU's dealings with WSCUC. The issues that precipitated the Special Visit were financial stability, strategic planning and unifying vision, board leadership, shared governance with NUS, enrollment management, and diversity. Following the Special Visit, the Commission noted significant improvements, but designated enrollment management and financial stability as issues that continue to require close attention.

For the comprehensive review for reaffirmation, in addition to the site visit conducted at Pleasant Hill, one member of the team conducted a visit to the San Jose campus. The team reviewed the institutional report and all appendices, the university's website, catalogs and other publications, as well additional documents requested by the team following the Offsite Review (OSR). The team was also provided access to distance education courses in advance of the visit. Contents of the confidential email account were regularly monitored.

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

The institution was responsive in providing the team with the information and documents requested pursuant to the OSR. Information that was not provided prior to the visit was made available during the course of the review, to the extent it existed. During the Accreditation Visit, the team met either in person or via teleconference with the following individuals and/or groups: president, several members of the Board of Trustees, chancellor of the National University System (NUS), chief financial officer, chief academic officer, accreditation liaison officer, WSCUC Steering Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Enrollment Management Team, department chairs and college deans, institutional research staff, students (including on-line students), faculty (full-time and adjunct, including on-line faculty), staff, faculty senate, president's leadership team, and development/grant staff.

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

One commendation that resulted from the OSR was the quality of the institutional report. It was extremely well-written and organized, with easily accessed and comprehensive appendices. The institution used this reaffirmation process to engage in self-inquiry and reflection, and to articulate an institutional vision, which had been found lacking during previous accreditation cycles. The Institutional Learning

Outcomes (ILOs) and Statement of Meaning of Degrees resulted from this process. Data were used appropriately to support assertions in the report. There appeared to have been broad institutional engagement in the process.

The institution responded appropriately to requests for additional information following the OSR. Meetings with the various institutional constituencies during the OSR generally yielded candid and thoughtful responses to team questions and inquiries, and the team found a significant level of engagement at all levels.

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

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

Immediately before the submission of JFKU's institutional report, an interim president was appointed who became the permanent president before the Accreditation Visit. In addition a new chief financial officer was appointed in summer 2015.

Following the 2011 special visit, the March 8, 2012 Commission action letter stated that financial stability and enrollment management required close attention. In terms of enrollment management, the Commission found that the institution had limited resources and expertise, and had a focus on tactical thinking as opposed to strategic planning. The institution was requested to have in place by the time of the next comprehensive visit a realistic enrollment plan and adequate qualified staffing. The

enrollment plan was to be tightly integrated with other institutional planning efforts, aligned with mission, and broadly understood throughout the institution.

JFKU'S institutional report addresses enrollment management, and it was a focus of the Accreditation Visit. While the institution has created an enrollment management plan and is nearing completion of a new strategic plan, the team found that strategies and resources continued to be lacking in this area. The team found that the institution has not yet adequately responded to this Commission directive.

In terms of financial stability, the action letter directs the institution to monitor expenses, make steady progress on enrollment and programmatic growth, and diversify funding, to include private donations and grants. The institutional report addressed this issue and documents provided following the OSR as well as meetings during the Accreditation Visit provided the team with significant information about this issue. While the affiliation with NUS has provided a level of financial stability previously lacking, and the institution is not operating at a loss, declining enrollments continue to be of paramount concern for the institution. However, the institution is taking steps to diversify its revenue stream, and has in place a robust development department that has been quite successful in acquiring significant grants.

## **B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

Component 2 of the institutional report discusses how JFKU is in compliance with the WSCUC standards. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that JFKU has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation. The sections below describe the results of the team's review of each standard. Final determination of compliance with the standards rests with the Commission.

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

John F. Kennedy University's founding in 1964 was predicated on furthering the 35<sup>th</sup> president's legacy of public service toward the common good. Focused on transformative learning experiences geared towards adults, the institution is firmly grounded in its mission, which emphasizes the integration of theory and life experience, with the goal of inspiring personal and academic growth and advancing the well-being of diverse local and global communities. The university's mission, vision, and core values are clearly accessible through the website and the general catalog as well as threaded across most course syllabi (CFR 1.1). The law school's mission as identified in the law school's catalog is connected yet distinct from the university's overall mission. The university's general mission statement does not appear in this document; the team

suggests that the university mission be published in the law school catalog to demonstrate alignment with the university as a whole.

The university demonstrates a strong commitment to the collection, analysis and dissemination of data pertaining to educational effectiveness. The Office for Educational and Institutional Effectiveness is home to the Accreditation Liaison Officer and institutional research. The office is primarily responsible for all data collection and reporting functions (including retention and graduation data), ensuring that these data are appropriately tracked and disseminated to appropriate constituent groups (CFRs 1.2, 1.7). The team found sufficient evidence, including internal documents, catalogs and downloadable documentation from the website, that the institution's educational objectives, student achievement data - including retention and graduation data - are publicly available and accessible (CFR 1.2).

The university's dedication to promoting academic freedom and due process among its faculty is clearly documented in its publications as evidenced by policies in both the institution's faculty handbook (section 4.8.2) and pages 15 and 22 of the 2015-16 general catalog. These policies are in keeping with higher education's best practices pertaining to both classroom and scholarly activities (CFR 1.3). While due process was clearly articulated with respect to the student population, policies related to the academic freedom of JFKU students were more difficult to identify. The team encourages the institution to provide clearer guidance pertaining to student academic freedom.

Throughout the review of documents and interviews, there was strong team consensus that diversity is both valued and nurtured throughout the institution. The university maintains a webpage with a well-articulated diversity statement that includes a definition, strategies for cultural implementation, and initiatives being undertaken by the diversity council. Furthermore, the office of the ombudsman's webpage reaffirms the institution's commitment to "ensure that every member of the John F. Kennedy University community receives fair and equitable treatment in support of a positive work and learning environment." In keeping with the office's purpose, the webpage identifies both the institution's commitment to federal regulations pertaining to non-discrimination as well as processes for advocacy and filing complaints (CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 1.8).

As an affiliate of the National University System (NUS), JFKU is the beneficiary of the system's strong financial position as well its back-end services. The team expressed some initial concerns regarding the autonomy of the university to fully enact its academic mission particularly with respect to board governance and oversight of the university president. However, it was apparent from interviews with various stakeholder groups that the institution does not experience undue interference in substantive decisions or educational functions (CFR 1.5). The affiliation appears to have strengthened JFKU's ability to conduct its operations with greater capacity by leveraging the various benefits offered by its relationship with NUS.

The university has a demonstrated commitment to treating students equitably and fairly with respect to academic and business practices. This commitment is evidenced throughout institutional documents, including the general and law catalogs. These documents incorporate well-articulated time-to-degree statements for each program, the meaning and purpose of those degrees, well-established and published credit hour policies, clear refund policies, and amply defined due process procedures that encompass policies for filing grievances (CFR 1.6). Additionally, the Office of the Ombudsman provides guidance on complaint resolution as well as confidential services to students, faculty, and staff of the university further assuring the community of the institution's commitment to fair treatment. University officials and team members noted that the office only has three-and-a-half years of the required six years of data pertaining to the retention of grievance records. While this deficit was cause for initial concern, the institution has implemented sufficient rectifications by scanning and uploading all current and future grievance documentation to a secure location for safekeeping (CFRs 1.6, 1.7). Lastly, as an affiliate of the National University System, the university annually conducts an A-133 audit and general annual audit of its finances by fully qualified, independent auditors. Furthermore, the audits are independent from the system's audit, providing reasonable assurances of the institution's financial condition (CFR 1.7).

The team's review of institutional documentation and lines of evidence indicated the university's commitment to a transparent self-study process, including as noted by the team, an exceptional final report that called attention to both the institution's strengths and challenges. The team found no issues or areas of concerns with respect to JFKU's adherence to the Commission's policies and procedures, with the understanding that the only material finding related to grievance documentation (noted by the institution during the self-study process) is already being rectified (CFR 1.8).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

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

### *Teaching and Learning*

Degrees offered by JFKU have clearly articulated program and institutional learning outcomes that support its mission and purpose. The university disseminates this information to both internal and external stakeholders through the university's website, student and faculty handbooks, and catalogs. Review of the website, admissions policies, catalogs, and student handbooks show evidence that the university makes every effort to ensure that all student materials truthfully portray the university (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.12).

JFKU has qualified core faculty and an actively engaged and committed pool of adjunct faculty. The institution has focused on the development and active engagement of adjunct faculty as evidenced by the faculty mentoring programs and inclusion in governance through the faculty senate. The institution recognizes the vital role that adjunct faculty have in teaching and learning at JFKU and engages in significant efforts to include adjuncts in governance and all aspects of the community.

The team notes that only 57% of faculty members possess terminal degrees. The team encourages JFKU to increase, through the hiring process, the number of qualified faculty for type and level of degree offered (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b).

JFKU has made significant progress on the development of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs )and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) since the last visit. Faculty contracts place the responsibility for the development of student learning outcomes and standards of performance with the faculty (CFR 2.4). In response to previous Commission concerns about a lack of unifying institutional vision, faculty exercised leadership in developing the ILOs during their annual retreat and faculty leadership was able to build broad institutional support. The faculty also attained consensus by the community at-large on the definition of the meaning of JFKU degrees, with key components of applied learning, collaborative learning, and specialized knowledge (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b).

Furthermore, the institution has a highly developed and evolving system of assessment of student learning outcomes and program review (CFRs 2.3 – 2.7). The university's Annual Learning Results (ALR) process, the 5/6-year program review cycle, as well as the review of undergraduate student work to assess achievement of the core competencies demonstrate the university's commitment to assessment.

The team notes that recent review of undergraduate student work by the core competency task force found that students did not meet the university's agreed upon 75% achievement of core competencies. The team encourages JFKU to create a process that both documents the use of findings to make necessary improvements and tracks the outcomes of changes implemented as a result of these assessment activities.

### *Scholarship and Creative Activity*

JFKU has shown a commitment to learning and scholarship as evidenced by the continued financial support and investment for these endeavors. Each full-time faculty member has \$1,000 available for professional development and additional funds for presentation at conferences. In addition to funds allocated in the budget, the university provides opportunities for faculty to submit requests for additional financial support outside of the aforementioned activities. The team found that the faculty is actively engaged in scholarly activity appropriate to the nature of the institution (CFRs 2.8, 2.9).

### *Student Learning and Success*

JFKU provided evidence of consistent reviews of year-over-year retention and graduation rates by providing data for a period of five years. The university

demonstrated through these data that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and results appear to be in alignment with national benchmarks (CFR 2.10). Although many programs show high pass rates on licensure examinations as well as evidence of employability, the College of Law will want to continue its efforts to improve both bar passage rates as well as evidence of employability.

The university is in the process of making organizational changes in both the admissions and student affairs department to increase support for students with a focus on student retention. During the visit the institution noted that a process was underway to clearly define roles and responsibilities for both departments in order to more effectively support students. As a result of this process, the institution has identified the need for a student advocate position to provide students with a point person to ensure resolution of concerns.

In addition to organizational changes to support students, the university has developed a student orientation for all incoming students regardless of modality to ensure preparedness. Use of an online delivery method for all students has provided 24/7 access to these materials. The university provides academic and student support services for new, continuing, veteran, and transfer students through various programs and resources, to include tutoring, library services, academic advising, veteran student success center and new student orientation (CFR 2.13). Notable focus on transfer

students is evidenced through formal transfer policies as well as a significant number of formal articulation agreements. The university's commitment to transfer students is also evidenced by its entering into agreements that serve to minimize the loss of credits in the transfer process (CFR 2.14).

In furtherance of the institution's commitment to under-served student populations, JFKU was recently designated a Hispanic Serving Institution. As a result of this designation the university was able to apply for a grant through the Department of Education and was awarded over \$2 million over five years. This grant will benefit all undergraduate students with a particular impact and focus on Hispanic and under-served populations.

Overall, student surveys across disciplines indicate that students are satisfied with the level of support provided across the university. Student grievance processes are in place, and records are now maintained. As noted elsewhere in this report, the university does not have record of six years of student grievance.

The university has shown commitment and focus on co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals and designed to support students' personal and professional development (CFR 2.11). As noted by the institution, there is currently no formal assessment of co-curricular activities. The team suggests that JFKU create a formal process of assessment of these activities.

### *Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators*

JFKU's Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators shows that all programs have well- defined learning outcomes, identifies where the outcomes are published, describes how the outcomes are assessed and who is responsible for the assessment, and provides information on how the findings are used. The date of the last program review or next scheduled review for each degree program has also been provided. The institutional report provides a detailed overview of the assessment of program learning outcomes, but as noted earlier, the institution does not appear to have a clear process in place that documents and formally tracks recommendations for improvement.

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

### **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Structures**

#### *Faculty and Staff*

The team found that, to support its programs and operation, JFKU has a faculty and staff that are sufficient in number, qualified, and diverse. As of fall 2014, the institution reports that it had a student to full time faculty ratio of 255:9 = 28.3 undergraduate, 841:36 = 23.4 graduate, and 138:4 = 34.5 law. Total adjunct faculty teaching in fall 2014 was 149 which was distributed 27% to undergraduate, 54% to graduate and 19% to law.

The faculty roster supplied to the team indicates that for the 2015-16 academic year there are 42 full-time and 191 part-time faculty teaching classes. For 2015-16, all graduate programs have at least one full-time faculty member actively teaching.

The institution reports that it is actively trying to increase the number of its faculty with terminal degrees. The team notes the institution appears to be making some progress in this area. Although most faculty members teaching in undergraduate programs have masters level degrees, generally those teaching in graduate programs do have terminal degrees. All active law faculty for 2015-16 have the JD degree and all active faculty in the Doctor of Psychology program are doctorally qualified. In the MA in Sports Psychology, MA in Counselling Psychology (MFT), and the MA in Consciousness and Transformative Studies 50% of those teaching this year have terminal degrees. In the MA in Business Administration six out of nine faculty members active this year have terminal degrees. For the MA in Counseling Psychology Holistic Specializations, 12 out of 39 have terminal degrees and in the MA in Museum studies one out of four have terminal degrees. As noted above, the team encourages the institution to intensify its efforts, through the hiring process, to increase the number of faculty with terminal degrees teaching in these graduate programs.

The institution notes that as a result of what it learned from preparing its institutional report, it has increased the participation of adjunct faculty members in learning

outcomes assessment and governance. One adjunct from each of the three schools is now a voting member of the elected faculty senate (CFR 3.1).

Faculty policies and evaluation procedures are set forth in the Faculty Handbook and the Adjunct Faculty Guide. Online orientation, including a review of university policies, is available to all faculty and staff. Recruitment and promotion for faculty and staff follow strict guidelines and, for staff, are supervised by the Human Resources Department. Faculty hiring is initiated by the academic department, approved by the senior vice president for academic affairs and recommended to the president. Recently JFKU has enhanced both faculty and staff guidelines for hiring a diverse workforce (CFR 3.2).

Faculty development funds are managed by the faculty senate. Each full-time faculty member has \$1000 available for professional development and additional funds for presentation at conferences. The team reviewed a spreadsheet demonstrating that faculty members are making full use of these funds. For staff there are professional development programs available on-line and in the libraries. Tuition remission programs for both JFKU and National University are available to both faculty and staff (CFR 3.3).

### *Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources*

The institution reports clean financial audits and clean A-133 audits for the last 14 years. The team reviewed the clean audited financial statements for the last three fiscal years ending June 2015. In each of these three years there was an increase in net assets. The team was able to determine during its visit that, through careful control of expenses and with the support of the National University System, the institution has access to adequate resources to fulfill its academic mission in spite of declining enrollments for the past six years. The A-133 audit for 2015, which was issued after the submission JFKU's institutional report, does report some weaknesses in internal controls which the institution is now addressing.

In November 2014 the institution completed an enrollment management plan covering the academic years 2014-16. This plan is currently being updated as is the institution's strategic plan. Zero based budgeting is done annually and tracked monthly (CFR 3.4). The team notes with concern that the institution does not yet have well-integrated multi-year plans that link strategic, enrollment, and financial planning.

To improve and better track and evaluate student outcomes, JFKU has recently implemented a new Blackboard learning management system (LMS), an upgraded Jenzabar enterprise management system, and the Taskstream system which supports

assessment of student learning. It has also improved WiFi speed and classroom technology at its main campus and upgrades are being considered at its San Jose campus. Technology support and training for faculty and students are provided by the National University System (CFR 3.5).

### *Organizational Structures and Decision Making Processes*

JFKU has new leadership. The president was appointed on January 5, 2016 (interim from July 1, 2015). The chief financial officer was appointed on July 1, 2015. Both are full-time. The senior vice president for academic affairs has been with the institution for some time and provides continuity (CFRs 3.6, 3.8).

JFKU has an organizational chart which indicates clear lines of responsibility. The institution reports that this is the result of continuous improvement and clarification of the organizational structure over the past few years. These changes are supported by a new zero-based budgeting process that is more transparent and allocates responsibility more effectively than in the past (CFR 3.7).

The National University System (NUS) has an independent governing board. JFKU is an affiliate of this system. During meetings of the system board, time is set aside for this board to sit as the JFKU board. The JFKU board and the system board are made up of the same people with the same officers and the same committees. The minutes of the JFKU board indicate that its main function is to receive and act upon a report from the

JFKU president. These minutes do not refer to any board committee meetings. However, the JFKU bylaws, approved February 2014, Section 4.3, state that the Executive Compensation Committee of the board (ECC) “shall be responsible for reviewing the performance of the senior executives of the University. In particular, it shall annually review the performance of the President. In addition, the ECC shall negotiate and determine compensation packages for senior executives.” Section 5.2 states that “The Board or its delegate shall choose the officers of the corporation and each shall serve at the pleasure of the Board, subject to the rights, if any, of any officer under a contract of employment.” Section 5.5 states that “The President has, subject to the control of the Board, general supervision, direction and control of the business and officers of the University.” The JFKU president’s job description indicates that she reports to the system chancellor rather than directly to the board.

The team found reasons for concern that this governance structure might not ensure the degree of independence and focus that is expected of a board overseeing an independently accredited institution. Furthermore, there is ambiguity in the dual reporting relationship of JFKU’s president to the board and to the chancellor of NUS. While the team found no evidence that this governance structure has disadvantaged JFKU, it was pleased to hear that the governance structure and reporting relationships are currently under review and that changes may be forthcoming (CFR 3.9).

Shared governance at JFKU is guided by an elected faculty senate. As a result of the institutional self-study undertaken in preparation for this accreditation review, the faculty senate, which historically included only full-time faculty members, was expanded to include one appointed adjunct faculty member from each of the three colleges. There are four faculty senate committees: the Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Quality Committee, the Professional Development Committee, and the Program Review Council. The rights and roles of the faculty are set forth in the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws and in the Faculty Handbook. The team was able to determine that this faculty senate structure is working well and that the institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership through this structure (CFR 3.10).

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

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

##### *Quality Assurance Processes*

John F. Kennedy University (JFKU) has provided substantial evidence to demonstrate its commitments to quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement. The university is to be commended for its data-driven approach to planning and decision-

making, and to its commitment to continuous evaluation of quality in all of its programs.

JFKU has an extensive and rigorous program evaluation process. Each degree program produces an Annual Learning Results (ALR) report that documents student outcomes against stated learning objectives. These reports are detailed and specific, and both track prior year assessments and set future goals. With such data, programs are well informed about the progress they are making toward their highest academic aspirations (CFRs 4.1, 4.3). The institutional report notes that, while faculty members believe that this annual review process is contributing to improved student learning, this has not yet been borne out with data. The fact that the university continues to question and examine its own assessment practices is laudatory and suggests that the institution is not content to let process substitute for actual evidence related to student learning. Nevertheless, the team recommends that the institution redouble its efforts to assure that an effective feedback loop is created in which the results of program reviews lead to specific reforms that are, in turn, assessed.

The university has invested in its institutional research capabilities, both by strengthening the Institutional Research (IR) Office and by improving the supporting information systems. It is noteworthy that the institution has tracked data requests over three years and has worked to improve the timeliness and quality of responses (CFR 4.2). The IR function appears to be a valued resource that is available to all parts of the

university, not merely the senior leadership. This is a good way to assure that data are useful to those directly responsible for program delivery and management. Both the departmental Annual Learning Results reports and documents from leadership (the institutional report and the draft strategic plan) are well-informed by both internal and external data.

At the time of the team visit, the University had just produced a draft of its strategic plan. The plan throughout shows evidence of serious consideration of the higher education landscape, both locally and nationally, and of the institution's strengths and challenges (CFR 4.7). The plan has been developed with substantial involvement of faculty and other university constituents (CFRs 4.4, 4.5). While the plan has not been fully disseminated for discussion, the team understands that this is scheduled to occur in the coming months and that there will be substantial opportunity for community input (CFRs 4.5, 4.6). The strategic planning process began during a period of interim leadership, but since the interim president has now been named to the position permanently, the draft strategic plan will appear at an opportune time and could form the core agenda for the new leadership.

### *Institutional Learning and Improvement*

This subcategory of Standard 4 requires that the institution be involved in sustained evaluation and self-reflection. JFKU clearly meets this subcategory. However, there is danger that its appetite for analysis and self-improvement can lead to an overwhelming

set of tasks. The team notes that the draft Strategic Plan includes an appendix listing more than 100 major priorities to be addressed in the next two or three years. While virtually all of these seem important, it is unlikely that a small institution with limited resources will successfully address such an extensive “to do” list in such a short amount of time. The Team recommends that this list of priorities be pared down to a more reasonable set, and perhaps targeted over a longer period of time.

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

### **C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees**

JFKU has shown evidence of community engagement in the development of the university’s meaning of a degree. Faculty exercised leadership in the process through a faculty senate retreat and the development of a faculty led steering committee to develop ILOs and Statement of Meaning of Degrees (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b). The university is now able to clearly articulate the areas of learning across degree levels and disciplines (applied and collaborative learning and specialized knowledge) (CFRs 1.2, 2.2-2.4, 4.3). ILOs clearly align with the university’s mission and are posted throughout the classrooms and published on the website (CFRs 1.2, 2.2-4, 4.3).

The institution's Statement of Meaning of Degrees is as follows: "JFKU's degrees prepare graduates to deliver their acquired skills and knowledge in an applied fashion, informed by multiculturalism, professionalism, and service to the community. The university accomplishes this result by fostering a learning community of experienced practitioner-faculty and staff who are committed to each student's individual success."

JFKU's ILOs are as follows:

- Intellectual Skills
  - Demonstrate intellectual skills and abilities appropriate to a particular field of study.
- Specialized Knowledge
  - Apply specialized knowledge in a particular field of study.
- Ethical Practice
  - Apply relevant ethical principles or frameworks to help inform decision making.
- Multicultural Professionalism
  - Effectively practice with an awareness of multicultural and diverse community.
- Community Service
  - Demonstrate commitment to service to the community

The institution has shown evidence of a highly developed and evolving system of assessment of student learning outcomes and program review through its Annual Learning Results reports, with a 5/6-year cycle (CFRs 2.3 – 2.7). In addition to the

program review process, the quality of degrees is measured by defined outcomes included in each PLOs (CFRs 2.2 -2.4, 2.6, 2.7). Outcomes are assessed via direct forms of evidence of student learning at or near degree completion to ensure integrity of degrees. Results of the institution's seven years of academic program assessment show programs reporting 59% of students having met or exceeded program expectations. Results of the ALR are widely shared with faculty through the program review council and the community at large as evidenced by published results on website (CFR 4.3). In addition, achievement of outcomes in the undergraduate programs are assessed through the core competencies task force review of student work in the core competencies defined by the university. JFKU reported that students did not meet the university's agreed upon 75% achievement of core competencies. Attention should be directed to the development of a clearly defined plan for improvement.

Although commendable progress has been made by JFKU, there is a need to have continuous focus on the assessment process in that the institution acknowledges that "many programs struggle to accurately and confidently make claims regarding student's achievement of PLOs" (CRF 2.6). In addition, although PLOs have been completed for all programs, the team notes there is still opportunity to ensure that all PLOs are clearly aligned with ILOs.

As this report makes clear in a variety of sections, the team recognizes the significant progress JFKU has made on assessment of student learning. The team further recognizes that the university has well-defined methods of identifying valid data which

assists in determining areas of needed improvement through its ALRs, program review, and assessment of undergraduate core competencies. However, as noted throughout this report, the university has not shown evidence of a formal process to develop and monitor action plans as a result of these assessment activities (CFR 2.10).

#### **D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation**

The team commends JFKU for its progress in assessment and for successfully developing a culture of assessment (CFR 4.3). The institution has been actively involved in assessment for at least seven years and has a robust system of annual reviews and periodic program reviews in place, to include alumni and employer input. There are now institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) as well as a Statement of Meaning of Degrees (CFR 2.3). ILOs and PLOs are widely disseminated in university publications, including catalogs and the website. During the visit, the team found that students were aware of learning outcomes at both the course and program levels (CFR 2.4).

Student learning outcomes are in place at the course, program, and institutional level (CFR 2.3). PLOs are assessed, during a five-year cycle, at or near degree completion, often by means of capstone projects, and as part of the Annual Learning Results (ALR) process and periodic program review. Assessment of the ILOs utilizes the results of assessment of each program's learning outcomes (PLOs). While the institution reports

that 77% of students in the 2014 assessment cycle met or exceeded program expectations, accurate and consistent reporting of attainment of student success has been identified by the institution as an area needing improvement. The team strongly supports the institution's efforts to ensure accuracy of these assessment results.

Following the ALR, programs propose and implement improvements, and then evaluate those changes during the following review cycle. The ALRs themselves are assessed using a rubric. Following program reviews, each program creates a Quality Improvement Plan based on the outcome of the review. Results of both annual and program review are widely shared. However, the team found that the institution needs to strengthen processes to ensure that recommendations contained in the ALRs and Quality Improvement Plans are implemented and monitored in a timely fashion.

The institution has in place a Program Review Council (PRC), comprised of volunteer faculty, to assist programs with assessment efforts. In addition to providing training on assessment activities, the PRC, utilizing a rubric, scores each program's ALR and provides feedback on each program's assessment efforts (CFRs 2.6, 4.3).

Undergraduates are expected to achieve five core competencies as well as outcomes for their individual discipline. The institution plans to assess each competency in a five year cycle (CFR 2.2a). JFKU began assessing undergraduate core competencies in 2013 by administering a test on information literacy. Since then, written communication and

critical thinking have also been assessed (student work from each program was submitted and random samples were assessed by a faculty review team utilizing a rubric). While the institution defined success as a 75% achievement of core competencies, the institution reports that the results of all three core competencies assessed fell short of this standard.

Findings of the results of the undergraduate core competency assessment were shared with faculty and administration. In response, the faculty decided to include core competencies in the curriculum alignment matrices for each program. Through this process, programs will be able to identify gaps in coverage and formulate an improvement plan. However, no clearly defined plan for improvement, with specific recommendations and implementation timelines and monitoring protocols, resulted from this assessment.

The undergraduate core competency assessment process will be replicated with the remaining two core competencies (oral communication and quantitative reasoning), to include holding a forum to discuss results and recommend improvements. The institution should create a process for implementing recommendations that result from the assessment of core competencies and for monitoring progress.

### **E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation**

The JFKU faculty, staff, and administration demonstrated a strong commitment to the mission of the university and to students' success across degree levels and disciplines. JFKU has dedicated resources focused on assessment, student affairs, and alumni relations and, as a result, the university has presented a well-organized, complete data portfolio of student enrollment, retention, and time to degree for each of their colleges. Data reports on enrollment and retention are consistently produced and reviewed by the Office of Educational and Institutional Effectiveness (OEIE) to assist in identifying at-risk students in order to deploy appropriate faculty and staff to intervene (CFR 2.10). Data were disaggregated for multiple subpopulations including, gender, ethnicity, major, site, residence and number of units transferred into the university. Of specific note was JFKU's finding that ethnicity was an insignificant factor in determining student success for the university.

The team recognizes the significant level of commitment by the institution in the development of a robust, well-developed system of annual assessment and periodic program review that has informed retention, graduation, and learning initiatives across the university. While faculty can speak about how data are used to make changes in curriculum and pedagogy, it appears as if there is no formal process for tracking the impact of these changes. The team recommends that JFKU create a process to

document to ensure that recommendations are implemented, monitored, and then eventually assessed again.

Although commentary was provided by faculty during the Accreditation Visit as to the use of data and reporting to implement change, the faculty recognize the lack of documentation and formal tracking of these initiatives. Attention should be directed to creating a process that both documents the use of findings to meaningfully address and make necessary improvements and tracks the outcomes of implemented changes.

### *College of Undergraduate Studies*

JFKU provided data on retention over a five-year period from 2009 to 2013 that showed that retention has increased to 72% from 64%. The university also provided data on completion rates for a five-year period from 2006 to 2011 that showed on average 50% of students enrolled in these programs completed their degrees. A 50% graduation rate is slightly lower than the national average. National Center of Educational Statistics reports a 6 year average for public institutions of 58% and 65% for private non-profit institutions: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40> (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14).

### *College of Graduate and Professional Studies*

JFKU provided data on retention over a five-year period from 2009 to 2013 that showed retention in these programs have been in the mid-80% range since 2010. The university also provided data on completion rates for a five-year period from 2006 to 2011 that

indicate on average 60% of students enrolled in these programs are completing their degrees (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14). Noteworthy are the results provided for Museum Studies showing 97% first year retention and a 97% graduation rate. There were also high pass rates on Counseling Psychology licensure exams with a pass rate of 73.9% on the first attempt and 35.9% on second attempt. The university noted results of the most currently available MFT pass rate data for a full year from the BBS which indicated that the university's Counseling Psychology program, with its 86% pass rate on the licensure examination, has the highest pass rate for first-time test takers in Northern California for comparable programs on the Standard Written Examination. The program also has the highest pass rate for first-time test takers in all of California for comparable programs on the Written Clinical Vignette Examination at 87%. These pass rates are compelling evidence of student success.

### *College of Law*

JFKU provided data on retention over a five-year period from 2009 to 2013 that indicated a decline from 76% in 2009 to 62% in 2013 due to deliberate actions taken by law faculty on the College of Law Academic Standards Committee to increase student success in both program completion as well as bar pass results. It was determined by the committee after review of student progress that first year students with low grade point averages typically had little chance to raise their grades to be in academic good-standing. Therefore it was decided that students would be dismissed versus continuing on academic probation. The university provided data on completion rates for a five-

year period from 2006 to 2011. On average 60% of students enrolled in these programs are completing their degrees (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14). The institution has dedicated greater resources to students in an effort to better prepare them for success on the bar examination, as evidenced by formal faculty advising and the creation of a custom bar preparation course.

The cumulative bar passage rate of the university's law school graduates over the past five years totals 63%. This pass rate exceeds the 40% minimum cumulative pass rate set by the California Committee of Bar Examiners in its newly established accreditation guidelines. First time bar pass rate of the university's law graduates has averaged 38% over the past five years and has only recently increased. The College of Law should continue its efforts to improve first time and cumulative bar pass rates.

In summary, JFKU has developed a robust program assessment process, but needs to focus on closing the loop to ensure academic programs use their assessment findings to improve student learning, retention, completion rates, and licensure pass rates.

**F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence**

JFKU has, since 2007, crafted a thoughtful, deliberative quality assurance and improvement program that in addition to a robust assessment of student learning, directly informs a very thorough program review process. Central to the institution's

success has been the Office of Educational and Institutional Effectiveness, which manages data collection and analysis across the institution.

### *Learning Assessment*

In order to effectively execute programmatic reviews, the university has created and nurtured a comprehensive culture of assessment, with annual assessment of learning outcomes. The presence of these outcomes is clearly evident in all programs and appropriately shared across the whole university (CFRs 1.2, 2.3).

The assessment process culminates in an Annual Learning Results (ALR) report that is informed by program learning outcomes (PLOs), student learning outcomes (SLOs), and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4). This connectivity is central to providing the institution a broader view of educational effectiveness at all levels and is vital to the well-designed program review process. Use of soundly-constructed rubrics, scored by members of program and institutional teams, offer a collaborative approach to reviewing assessment data (CFR 2.4).

Following data collection, results are presented each fall in an event called the annual assessment forum in which program chairs and faculty take part in the review process (CFR 2.4). During this experience, the institution has noted a shift from discussing the process of assessment to learning outcomes and applying lessons learned from the data both institutionally and at the program level.

The institution publicly informs its stakeholders regarding program and course outcomes as evidenced by the presence of these on syllabi, and clear mention in the general catalog (CFR 2.4). The team could not find mention of learning outcomes in the law catalog, an area that can be easily rectified in future publications. Sample syllabi, including those online, provided compelling evidence that assessment is woven throughout the institution, both on-ground and online, and is publicly acknowledged and part of the culture (CFRs 1.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6).

### *Program Review*

The university, as part of its assessment programs and protocols, conducts programmatic reviews every five (5) to six (6) years, using a comprehensive review schedule process that is adequately informed by a program review guide. This guide offers a thorough overview of the process, including protocols for collecting, analyzing, and reporting review data (CFR 2.7).

The institution's process begins with a program-level self-study. This involves a review of student learning results, assessment processes, curriculum, faculty quality, student satisfaction, graduates' success, enrollment, retention, and graduation; program sustainability, and societal and professional demand. In addition to the processes already identified for assessing outcomes, the programs use these data to then identify areas for strength, challenges, and revision. Thus, the programmatic self-study is an

invaluable opportunity for reflection in all areas – including previously submitted Annual Learning Results reports (CFRs 2.4, 4.3). During this reflection, programs consider ways in which previous and current results of program learning outcomes have impacted student learning and whether changes should be made to the existing program so as to enhance student learning. These suggested changes culminate in program-level quality improvement plans (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.5). Several constituent groups noted that while in some instances the review of data lead to additional classes, restructuring of capstone experiences, and hiring of new adjunct faculty to support programmatic growth, there was a greater tendency of programs to “leave the quality improvement plans on the shelf.” As a result, the feedback loop is not closed and potential improvements are not implemented.

Furthermore, the team also noted one potential area of concern given the fact that programs have agreed to an 80% target in meeting standards for a particular area or program. Over the seven (7) years, programs reported meeting 59% of standards. In 2014, that number had risen to 77% but it is still unclear whether this was sustained or an anomaly. In addition, there was little discussion within the institution’s review documents dealing with why there was difficulty in achieving the 80% target (CFR 2.6). The team therefore recommends that these program-level targets be clarified and that quality improvement plans become further ingrained into the review process that include plans for consistent reflection and action.

Despite the aforementioned areas of the concern, the program review process at JFKU is evolving well and is woven into the culture of assessment in an authentic, effective manner.

### *Data Collection and Analysis*

The team found the general approach to data collection and analysis through the Office of Educational and Institutional Effectiveness of exceptionally strong quality. Clearly, there is definitive value for the services offered by the office and its obvious expert-handling in pulling together necessary processes related to programmatic reviews specifically and assessment in general. The team recognizes the significant contributions of the Office of Educational and Institutional Effectiveness, noting that it has been an invaluable resource to JFKU in advancing its institutional assessment efforts (CFR 4.2).

## **G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment**

### *Financial Viability and Enrollment*

The team finds that JFKU's sustainability and financial viability are heavily dependent on its relationship with the National University System (NUS) (CFR 3.4). From a high of 1635 students in 2009, total enrollment at JFKU has declined every year over the past six years to the 1111 enrolled in the fall of 2015. During those years however, the totals within each of JFKU's three colleges have varied. In fall 2015, the enrollment in the undergraduate college was 222, which represents a 12% decrease from the enrollment of

253 students in 2014. The graduate college has shown steady decline over the six-year period and at 772 in fall 2015 is 8% lower than the 839 of 2014. The college of law has seen fluctuating enrollment over the years but in fall 2015 at 117 had declined 15% from the 138 of 2014. This is partly due to a policy, new in 2013, of dropping law students after the first year if they are not making satisfactory academic progress. Enrollments at the college of law at JFKU are also affected by the forces that have reduced the opportunities for legal employment and thus law school enrollments all across the USA. JFKU has received clean financial audits for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013, 2014, and 2015 (CFR 3.4). These audited statements show:

	2013	% change	2014	% change	2015
Net tuition & Fees	24,124,327	(3%)	23,356,427	(7%)	21,692,153
Total Revenue	25,794,608	(0.01%)	25,792,260	(3%)	25,044,988
Total Expense	26,166,957		23,754,796		24,943,755
Change in Net Assets from Operations	(372,349)		2,037,469		101,233
Change in Net Assets	22,224		2,737,638		158,863
Total Net Assets	13,008,581	21%	15,746,219	1%	15,905,082

(Parenthesize in table represent negative numbers or declines).

Over these three fiscal years, net tuition and fees have declined as a result of the enrollment declines. Total revenue has declined less because of a modest increase in revenue from other sources including grants. It should be noted, however, that since the fiscal year (FY) ends June 30, the further enrollment decline in fall 2015 is not included in these numbers. Although JFKU's self-study reports three years of positive results from operations, the audited reports show that in FY 2013, change in net assets from

operations was negative largely due to high professional services expenses. Even though total revenue in FY 2014 was essentially unchanged from FY 2013, expenses, including those for professional services, were reduced substantially with the result that the change in net assets from operations in FY 2014 was strongly positive. In FY 2015 compared to FY 2014, while revenue was down, expenses increased due, in part, to an increase again in professional expenses, and the change in net assets from operations, while still positive, was much reduced from its FY 2014 level. Change in total net assets was positive in all three fiscal years and as a result the total net assets of JFKU have grown over this period. The audited statements also show that JFKU has adequate cash for its operations and that its endowment has been growing modestly during the past three years. A-133 audits for FY 2014 and 2015 show some weaknesses in internal controls which the institution is now addressing.

#### Ratios

	2013	2014	2015
Primary Reserve Ratio	0.31	0.44	0.44
Return on Net Assets Ratio	0.18%	21.04%	1.01%
Net Tuition and Fees Contribution Ratio	92.19%	98.32%	86.96%
Net Operating Revenues Ratio	(0.39%)	7.24%	0.71%
Viability Ratio	0.58	0.76	0.78
Debt Service Coverage Ratio	NA	NA	NA

Despite its declining enrollment, JFKU, with the support of the National University System, has been gradually building its financial viability during the three fiscal years ending in June 2015. Its primary reserve ratio is positive and has improved since 2013. The return on net assets ratio is positive, although with the exception of 2014, not high.

The net tuition and fees contribution ratio decreased in FY 2015 indicating improved diversification of revenues. Recently, JFKU has been successful in obtaining several substantial multiyear grants. NUS has supported, and continues to support, JFKU in searching for available grant opportunities, writing grant applications, and managing grants when received. JFKU's Viability ratio is low but improving. The debt service coverage ratio is not meaningful although JFKU has a long term loan to NUS. In these three fiscal years JFKU was paying interest only on its long term loan to NUS. Principal payments begin in fiscal year 2016.

### *Budgets*

The team reviewed JFKU's budgets for fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015. In each year actual revenues were substantially lower than budgeted revenues. However, expenses were well managed so that actual expenses were also substantially lower than budgeted. The exception was FY 2013 where significant unbudgeted professional service expense had a substantial effect on the change in net assets from operations. The team also reviewed the FY 2016 budget with results for year to date through February 2016. It shows a likely continuation of the pattern of both revenues and expenses coming in lower than budget (CFR 3.4).

Because JFKU engages in annual zero-based budgeting, board approved budgets beyond FY 2016 are not yet available. However, the team was able to review a preliminary unapproved draft budget projection without supporting notes, which is

being prepared to support the draft strategic plan for the fiscal years 2015-2020. Both the draft budget and the draft strategic plan show JFKU's intention to continue to improve its financial viability but both are too preliminary for the team to draw any conclusions about JFKU's likelihood of achieving its goals (CFR 3.4). The team recommends that JFKU further develop these budgets into a multiyear financial plan to support its strategic plan and its strategic enrollment management plan. The financial plan should contain detailed notes explaining how the numbers were derived and how they link to, align with, or otherwise support the numbers and goals in the strategic plan and in the enrollment management plan.

#### *Alignment with Institutional Priorities*

JFKU's institutional priorities and fiscal resources are well aligned (CFR 4.6). By examining budgets and other documents, the team has verified JFKU's claim in its institutional report that in recent years it has expended considerable effort in improving and clarifying this alignment. It has terminated, and is currently in teach-out mode for, several programs that had been started in prior years to increase enrollment but which had not developed as expected and were not aligned with institutional priorities. Part of this was accomplished under the strategic plan, which matured in 2015. Further improvements are contemplated in its draft strategic plan for 2015-2020. Here are three examples of successful alignment:

The first example is JFKU's introduction and funding of service learning in every program in its curriculum. This aligns well with JFKU's strong public service commitment.

A second example is JFKU's strength in its highly developed assessment structure. In the academic area, program learning outcomes have been assessed for several years and institutional learning outcomes were added in 2015. Each program evaluates itself in an Annual Learning Results (ALR) report and these in turn feed into a Program Review Report which involves external evaluation and is done every five years. Although the institution does not currently assess co-curricular areas, it is in the process of developing assessment methods of these areas. All of this assessment process helps align the university's activities and expenditures to encourage student success in achieving the institution's desired learning outcomes.

A third example of alignment of fiscal resources to support student success is the recent expenditure on technology. In addition to upgrading its Wi-Fi system and its classroom technology, JFKU has invested in a Blackboard Classroom Management System, a Jenzabar upgrade to improve institutional data collection and analysis, and Taskstream which supports the assessment process. All of these are examples of expenditures that facilitate student success.

### *Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment*

JFKU's strategic plan was completed in 2015 and a new strategic plan for 2015 - 2020 is being developed. The team has reviewed a draft of this new plan, which among other things addresses the institution's expected response to the changing higher education environment (CFR 4.7). JFKU recognizes that the cost of education is a major concern for most students today. It is therefore looking at various ways to reduce its costs. This could be done by enhancing its collaboration with NUS and the other NUS affiliates, by further developing partnerships with community colleges, community groups and educational associations such as ACE, and by developing and implementing online and competency based programs.

In its draft plan, JFKU also notes that the segment of higher education likely to experience the most growth in the next few years is adult education. This is a demographic to which JFKU has always been dedicated and with which it has extensive experience. Although the higher education environment in the San Francisco Bay Area is highly competitive and many other institutions already have or are developing programs aimed at adult learners, JFKU believes that its experience with such programs continues to give it a competitive advantage. In its draft plan JFKU responds to the changing environment by reiterating, refining, and expanding upon its existing focus

on providing often-underserved adult students with an excellent, transformative education with a strong public service component.

The team is concerned that this response to the changing environment of higher education may be inadequate to address JFKU's continuing enrollment challenges. Although JFKU did develop a strategic enrollment management plan in response to the concerns expressed by the WASC special visit team in 2011 and by the WASC Commission's letter of March 8, 2012, enrollment continues to decline. The draft update to this enrollment plan does not give the team confidence that it will lead to reversal of the decline. The team found that the responsibility for enrollment and retention operations at JFKU had recently been separated and that neither of these appears to be directly linked to strategic planning. Given that JFKU has set enrollment growth as its highest immediate priority, the team recommends that JFKU go far beyond the proposed update to the 2014 plan to create a new Strategic Enrollment Plan that is much more ambitious in addressing strategic, structural, and operational enrollment issues. Adequate resources will need to be made available to assure collaboration, integration and alignment between the strategic and operational dimensions of this challenge.

#### **H. Component 8: Reflection and Plans for Improvement**

The team found at JFKU a lively, energetic, and robust institution with a strong sense of purpose, a committed community of faculty, staff and students, and newfound

confidence as a member of the National University System. JFKU has renewed its historic commitment to adult education across a core of important academic disciplines, and has articulated a set of institutional learning objectives that reinforce the identity of the university and inform its academic development. It is actively engaging in processes of strategic planning and quality review, and has demonstrated its commitment to continuous improvement in all of its programs and operations. It is clear that the affiliation with NUS assures the fundamental long-term viability of the institution, and therefore provides it with new opportunities to plan for the future with renewed confidence. It is further clear that the relationship with NUS is evolving, and that additional benefits may be derived from it as integration and collaboration among NUS affiliates increases.

The team appreciates that JFKU has recently undergone a change of leadership, and is also in the process of finalizing a five-year strategic plan that has not been issued in final form. While this might suggest a moment of hesitancy, the team found just the opposite. Virtually every member of the JFKU community spoke enthusiastically about a common sense of purpose and a shared vision of the future. While JFKU will face challenges in meeting its ambitious long-term plans, the team finds that a strong foundation is in place in most administrative and academic areas.

The team recommends two areas for specific ongoing concern. In the area of governance, the team found reasons for potential concern about the focus of a board of trustees that has simultaneous oversight of at least three independently accredited institutions, various other affiliates, and a central system. While the team wishes to

stress that it finds no evidence that this arrangement has disadvantaged JFKU, the structure does not assure the kind of independent and exclusive focus normally expected of a Board overseeing a separately accredited institution. Second, the team found ambiguity in the relationship between JFKU's president and the NUS system. While the president nominally reports to the Board, the president's relationship to the Board is clearly mediated by the Chancellor. The team understands that reporting relationships and the overall governance structure are under review and that some changes may be forthcoming.

Second, the team found deficiencies in JFKU's enrollment management function at both the strategic and operational level. The institution does not have a strategic plan for reversing long term enrollment declines, despite a clear mandate from the Commission after the last comprehensive accreditation review to devise such a plan. The team found a lack of cohesion on enrollment goals within the administration, and a lack of resources to reverse recent trends. JFKU has access to such resources from the NUS system, but it has failed thus far to effectively incorporate them, or to develop its own internal capacities. The team understands that this is a priority for the new President, and that enrollment growth is the single most important strategic goal of the institution.

### SECTION III - COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**The team commends JFKU for:**

1. A high level of faculty and staff engagement and widespread commitment to student success and to the values and mission of the institution.
2. Its deep commitment to student learning and its well-developed and robust assessment process.
3. Its visible commitment to serving the community, which is reflected throughout its curriculum, practical training programs, and co-curricular activities.
4. The leadership of its faculty for developing and widely disseminating Institutional Learning Outcomes and the Statement of the Meaning of the Degrees.
5. The meaningful inclusion of adjuncts in governance and all aspects of the JFKU community.
6. The faculty senate, and in particular its leadership, for its active and constructive engagement in furthering university priorities and initiatives.
7. The diversification of its revenue stream through expanded development activities and its significant accomplishments in obtaining increased grant funding for initiatives related to student success..

8. Its successful management of the affiliation with National University System (NUS) and for steadily increasing collaboration with NUS and affiliation partners..

**The team recommends that JFKU:**

1. More clearly define roles and responsibilities of those involved in the admission and retention of students, and ensure adequacy of resources and systems to meet institutional goals, given the institutional priority on enrollment growth (CFRs 2.10, 3.4).
2. Emphasize efforts to enroll new students to meet strategic growth initiatives (CFR 3.4).
3. Strengthen processes for ensuring that recommendations in the Annual Learning Results reports and Quality Improvement Plans are implemented and monitored in a timely fashion (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3)
4. Formulate multi-year financial plans that are tied to strategic planning initiatives (CFRs 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6)
5. Finalize the strategic plan with a manageable number of prioritized initiatives (CFR 4.6).
6. Continue to maximize the benefits of affiliation with NUS and other affiliates in both administrative and academic areas (CFRs 2.10, 3.5-3.7, 4.4).

## APPENDICES

### A. Federal Compliance Forms

#### 1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review

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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Policy is located on page 4 of the <a href="#">catalog</a> .
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Program chairs review syllabi required for new course approval to ensure that the student workload (e.g. lectures, assignments, reading, exams, and activities) equates to the credit units offered for the class. Program chairs also periodically review syllabi for courses before the start of the term to ensure continued compliance with the credit hour policy. There are three additional levels of review of credit hour assignments. The first occurs with the production of the University catalog. Program chairs, deans, registrar, and vice president of marketing and communications review the catalog for accuracy. The second occurs with the generation of the schedule by program chairs. They create a schedule and review section syllabi to ensure the accuracy of meeting time and credit assignment. The final occurs when the registrar's office coordinates with the faculty coordinators in the colleges during the final scheduling review. The credit hour assignments are matched with meeting times each term. This review is ongoing and ensures

	compliance with the credit hour policy.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The schedule of classes is available on the student portal, and on the <a href="#">University website</a> . Printed copies are also available in the registrar's office, college front desks and University front desk.
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? 10
	Type of courses reviewed: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> online <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> hybrid
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Journalism, Criminal Justice, Business, Sports Psychology
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 12
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Business, Liberal Studies, Legal Studies, Sports Psychology, Counseling Psychology, Museum Studies, Health Education, Law
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program)	How many programs were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Counseling Psychology, Business Administration, Law

materials)	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
	Comments:

## 2-Marketing and Recruitment Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?                      XXYES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>No incentive compensation paid for success in enrolling students. Vendors managing JFKU's online and media advertising do not receive any incentives for inquiries or enrollments generated, but do get evaluated annually based on performance in generating inquiries and enrollment.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?                      XXYES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?                      XXYES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Tuition and fees are on the website and there is also a tuition calculator available for undergraduate studies. Completion rates, retention rates, and time to degree are also available on the website, as is evidence of student learning.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? XXXYES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>The institution provides information on its website, by program, as to what type of employment for which the graduate will be qualified.</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> YES XXNO The institution does not keep statistics on employment of its graduates.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

--	--

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Maryann Jones  
Date: March 16, 2016

### 3-Student Complaints Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? On website and in catalog.</p> <p>Comments:            There are policies in place to address student complaints, with specific provisions contained in the civil rights violations policy, grade challenge policy, and Student Code of Conduct. For all other complaints not within the purview of these two policies, there is a university Ombudsman who confidentially addresses the complaints.</p>
Process(es) / procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES  <input type="checkbox"/> NO            If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES  <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Complaints falling under the Civil Rights grievance policy and Student Code of Conduct policy provide due process and opportunity to be heard, to include the right to an appeal. The procedures are published both in the catalogs as well as on the website.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO            If so, where? Director of Student Affairs has responsibility for</p>

	<p>maintaining student grievance records. There is a shared drive accessible by Director of Student Affairs, Academic VP, and President. However, the university only has records for three and one-half years of student complaints and is not in compliance with the six year requirement.</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO          If so, please describe briefly: While there are only records for three and one-half years, there is now a system in place to scan and upload student complaints to a shared drive reviewable by the President, SVPAA, and Director of Student Affairs.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Maryann Jones

Date: March 16, 2016

#### 4-Transfer Credit Policy Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Both catalog and website
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Criteria are clearly stated for both undergraduate and graduate levels in catalog, to include maximum number of units transferable, grades required, documentation required, types of courses, and institutions from which units can be transferred. <a href="http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/11/17/456378738/america-s-test-kitchen-founder-chris-kimball-leaves-show">http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/11/17/456378738/america-s-test-kitchen-founder-chris-kimball-leaves-show</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 WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.  
Review Completed By: Maryann Jones  
Date: March 16, 2016

## Appendix B

### **B Off-Campus Locations Review**

Institution: John F. Kennedy University, San Jose Campus

Type of Visit: Off-Campus Locations Review

Name of reviewer/s: Nathan Long

Date/s of review: February 4, 2016

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

**John F. Kennedy University, San Jose Campus**  
**3031 Tisch Way**  
**3 Plaza West**  
**San Jose, CA 95128-2541**

#### 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)

##### Programs and Degree Levels

##### a. Programs

- i. Bachelor of Arts – Psychology
- ii. Master of Arts – Counseling Psychology
- iii. Master of Arts – Counseling Psychology (Holistic)

##### Faculty FTE

- b. 6 Full-Time Core
- c. 2 Part-Time Core
- d. 20+ Adjuncts

---

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

Enrollment

- e. 175
  - f. Designation: Satellite
3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
- a. Material Examined
    - i. Reaffirmation materials submitted to Site Team
    - ii. Campus information submitted by ALO
  - b. Persons Interviewed
    - i. ALO (1) and Project Coordinator (1)
    - ii. Site Director (1)
    - iii. Student Services Staff (5)
    - iv. Program Directors (2)
    - v. Faculty (6)
    - vi. Students (6)

***Fit with Mission. 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)***

Site: There is a clear connection between the university mission and the satellite campus, aligning with the offerings provided by the institution. The common theme presented across all constituent groups reinforced that the San Jose campus faculty and staff view their presence as serving an unmet need in the San Jose region, specifically that the three degree programs offered are distinctive and needed as well as mission-connected. The key degree programs being offered appeal to a student demographic who desires access, smaller class environments, a desire to enhance their own station in life and expand their education. The master's in counseling psychology (holistic) was called out by several individuals who noted there was a definite demand as evidenced by enrollment trends and desire for more holistic approaches to mental health care and counseling.

Strengths: Strong clarity on community institutional/program purpose across nearly all constituent groups.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Several stakeholders noted some concern that there is occasional disconnect with the Pleasant Hill campus with respect to information dissemination and student support services. While this was a stated concern, other constituent groups noted improvements, recognizing that the new university administration needed

time to implement strategies to enhance communications and services.

Administrative Structure: The structure is one that provides general operational management and academic and student support. In general, staffing appears largely integrated into the overall university. For example, the Site Director (who reports directly to the president of JFKU) also provides support to the Pleasant Hill and Berkeley Campus; At least one of the two Academic Advisors (both of whom also serve as admissions counselors), provide cross campus support for various functions; the Career Services and Student Advocate services the whole university; while the Learning Resources coordinator focuses efforts on campus. Program Directors are split across the university in that they run the overall programs and then provide leadership to each satellite – both reporting to a dean. Faculty also teach courses both specific to the San Jose site and across the institution. The campus staff demonstrated a significant commitment to student support and students reiterated in many ways that the campus support team and faculty are some of the finest professionals they have worked with in their academic careers.

Strengths: The team reviewer observed a demonstrated commitment by all towards students and student success, reinforced by a very articulate, dedicated collective of students, specifically areas related to learning resources, career counseling and student advocacy.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Several individuals noted concerns that the feedback loop was at times problematic, that campus goals were not always in synchronization with the larger university, and that communication was at times non-existent. However, there was also consistent acknowledgement that this could be attributed to what was perceived as continual shifts in leadership and priorities of the university.

Despite the fact the enrollment management is a stated priority of the university, enrollment management goals did not seem to be clearly communicated nor logically defined with regard to the admissions funnel. Specifically, there was a lack of clarity as to what was needed in terms of prospects all the way to admitted students. Furthermore, enrollment targets for San Jose did not appear to be constructed in a way that incorporated the insights of those on the ground; moreover, there was lacking insight as to why there was what many described as continual changes in the student management system and why rationales for these changes hadn't been communicated effectively. Lastly, several constituencies noted that enrollments were in steady decline. These individuals attributed this decline to concerns based on the operational performance of the Pleasant Hill campus and a flawed enrollment

management plan.

Resources: Upon inspection, resources were deemed to be generally acceptable to accomplish the mission and program purposes:

Strengths: Library and media services appear to be more than adequately resourced. The coordinator had a very strong handle on the materials, available resources for students requiring accommodations, and virtual and physical library collections.

Career services and student advocate: While not solely specific to the San Jose site, it was clear intentional outreach was made to provide students with exceptional, continuous support related to career guidance and ombuds-like support to students.

Faculty space for student engagement was nicely laid out, providing a true on-campus feeling.

The interim president was specifically called out for her commitment to campus safety: windows on doors and investment in a security guard on site was viewed as a good first step at recognizing the well-being of students, faculty, and staff.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: None.

Follow-up Required (Identify the Issues): Follow-up on institution-wide enrollment management, including processes connected to goal-setting and outcomes, should be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled visit.

***Connection to the Institution. 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)***

Visibility/Depth of Institutional Presence with Off-Campus Site: Both JFKU and National U have moderately strong brand presence at the San Jose campus. The overall facility provides a campus feel, good visibility from the Interstate (I-280), and a physical perception of connection. While not a concern, an area for further investigation is determining how connected Pleasant Hill administration and staff are to the campus. There were conflicting views as to the frequency of engagement with staff and faculty (as well as degrees of desire in terms of how much was actually necessary). It is worth noting that of the students in attendance, all were most positive about the extent and quality of engagement with main campus, with the exception of the distance and traffic, all of them acknowledged these issues were not barriers.

Strengths: Staff and Faculty appear to be very connected to the campus environment. Faculty government representation for San Jose is provided through the program directors and other faculty remain involved with respect to the structure of the degree programs being housed under the College of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: None

Integration of Campus Students into Life and Culture of Institution: Students are encouraged to attend main campus events and governance activities, as appropriate.

Strengths: The San Jose campus community are offered appropriate opportunities offered onsite and by the main campus.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Consideration of other ways for students to participate virtually and sharing activities between campus locations will further enhance engagement especially given challenges of Bay Area traffic. Generally, reasonable efforts appear to be made.

***Quality of the Learning Site. 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)***

Learning Environment: The entire second floor, located at 3031 Tisch Way, was occupied by JFKU and is outfitted with generally appropriate amounts of office space, learning space, community areas, and spaces with nicely apportioned access to technology, especially given the size of the campus. Faculty offices, located in the back portion of the facility appear secure. Cubicles and cubby spaces are provided to all site-based faculty along with access to necessary equipment. These office areas seem adequate for effective faculty and student engagement given the size of the campus.

Strengths: The facility is sufficiently equipped for didactic instruction. Technology is appropriate for the needs of the students, with potential for improvement over time.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Improved WiFi might be of benefit to student and faculty population. Many did note that current technology was sufficient. Others noted that as part of the relationship with National, WiFi will be upgraded in time.

Oversight to Ensure Well-Managed Location: The campus has appropriate oversight as evidenced by presence of site director and work being done by Program Directors; appeared to be in good condition.

Strengths: Staff presence, including security, was clearly evident. The site appears well-managed and maintained.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Some members of the campus community proffered that the feedback loop and general communication with main campus was occasionally challenging, leading to delays in certain services, staffing requests, etc. Others remarked that while such communication issues got in the way of delivering effective student experiences, the recent changes in leadership, including the permanent selection of the president, would likely mitigate their concerns.

***Student Support Services. 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)***

Site Capacity for Advising, Counseling, Library, Computing Services, and Other Appropriate Student Services: As noted in the previous section, the site is well-apportioned relative to the availability of space for advising, counseling, library, computing services and the like. Of particular note, the location of the library/media resource center was quite effective, with what appeared to be a thorough complement of books and periodicals to the main collection.

Based on the reaffirmation document and interviews, the library also contains extensive e-book and electronic journal offerings through the JFKU holdings.

Advising space was appropriate and while absolute confidentiality might not always be available in the office cubicles, it was clear that there were other appropriate spaces throughout the facility should such privacy be needed.

Computing services were located in the library, with students having what appeared to be reasonably appropriate access to software/hardware technologies, including availability of accommodations software (i.e. Dragon, etc.). Some concerns about availability of the network were periodically expressed, but the sense of the severity was mixed.

Strengths: Learning Resource space was well-equipped with computers, library resources that complemented technological resources (several hundred books were available).

Classrooms were appropriately designed, with technology enhancements

to augment didactic instruction. Additionally, tables and chairs were moveable to allow for different types of classroom facilitation.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: See data section below for additional context. It was unclear as to whether or not a financial aid or registrar representative was available on site during peak periods. Further, a few stakeholders noted that while interaction with main campus offices was positive, having the face-to-face service at San Jose might help alleviate or eliminate problems before they begin. It is therefore suggested that provision of human resources be considered during these times to ensure an enhanced student experience.

An audit of hardware/software technologies might prove useful as well so as to determine whether to update infrastructural needs, determine capital investment priorities, etc.

Data Related to Effectiveness of Services: Data presented in the institutional report aligns with the feedback received relative to the following:

Library support (San Jose) services are generally viewed as satisfactory; Other student services, including advising and other provided services are viewed favorably; technology/computing received still favorable but ratings that fell below 4.0. Because financial aid and registration services were not disaggregated for this particular report, it does seem reasonable to extrapolate that given site-based anecdotal evidence when compared to overall campus student satisfaction, these services are provided and generally effective with some potential considerations for improvement.

Strengths: Academic advising, library, and other support services are viewed favorably and student-centric.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: While general student satisfaction with services remains at a reasonable level, it is suggested that consideration be given to adding face-to-face, campus-based services during peak periods, specifically in areas such as registration and financial aid.

***Faculty. 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)***

Course Instruction: Across all courses, much of the course instruction in upper-level undergraduate and upper-level graduate courses are taught by qualified core and part-time (and include program directors/chairs). All other related courses are largely taught by adjunct instructors. Program Directors noted that they do not employ part-time faculty as a rule. There is a strong reliance on

adjunct faculty in the delivery of courses, but faculty staffing seemed generally adequate, though workload of key individuals might necessitate additional review by the institution as a whole to ensure guidelines are met. For those faculty working overload, compensation appears to be paid in accordance with contractual expectations.

Strengths: The JFKU San Jose campus presents a strong faculty community, which is further enhanced by recognition that adjunct faculty are vital partners in the educational process.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: While there are ongoing efforts with respect to adjunct and faculty on-boarding, the university as a whole and the San Jose campus in particular might be well-served to advance their faculty orientation programming for new and existing faculty. Several statements by faculty members, alluded to ambiguity with respect to job duties/responsibilities.

Additionally, review of workload for core faculty might benefit the campus and programs.

Off-Campus Faculty Academic Oversight: From the review of materials and interviews, it is clear that academic oversight is very present from program directors to core faculty. The two program directors interviewed had clear knowledge of the San Jose campus, its relationship to the university, and the status of faculty and programs. Moreover, there was significant understanding of the market demographics informing the San Jose campus as well as the enrollment pressures on the institution. Lastly, there was a clear, abiding commitment to both faculty governance and institutional coherence across campuses.

Strengths: The clear dedication and expertise of faculty leaders pertaining to the oversight of academic programs is highly evident and of strong value within the JFKU system.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Review of whether workload and academic support staffing levels are appropriate will further advance the San Jose campus and ensure the right balance between faculty support and student services.

Curriculum Preparation, Development and Assessment: All faculty interviewed demonstrated facility with the Annual Learning Results reports (ALRs) and corresponding curriculum development/approval procedures. All faculty participate in some way towards the assessment of the curriculum as well as the development/creation of curriculum.

Strengths: There exists an outstanding culture of assessment evidenced by the embedded nature of assessment throughout the San Jose campus and

among the faculty. The ownership of assessment comes from the faculty and they exude a pride for the work they have done to date in review and improvement of courses. They, along with the Accreditation Liaison Officer, should be commended for an outstanding approach to assessment.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: N/A

***Curriculum and Delivery. 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)***

Design of Programs and Courses at Site: Faculty own curriculum development – new and revised. As one example, the bachelor’s program is bound by standards. The curriculum went through major, deliberative institutional review. This process was fine-tuned in 2012-2013.

Approvals: New Programs are designed and implemented with a process that includes bringing the instructional design team together, vetting through approximately eight levels of review, then pre-WASC review, peer review, senate review, with final approvals coming at the provost level.

Evaluation: conforms to JFKU’s ALR process, with what appears to be a strong formative and summative assessment process as reinforced by overall institutional approach to assessment and evaluation.

Comparability: In terms of comparability of the curriculum to the main campus, the programs and courses share many of the same faculty, program and course outcomes, etc. This leads to synchronicity and compatibility.

Strengths: A mature, strong assessment program and faculty involvement in the development of courses, along with full buy-in from the academic community related to assessment and evaluation permeates the campus. The collaboration of faculty in the development of student learning outcomes is outstanding.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: In terms of adjunct involvement, it would be helpful to further engage adjuncts in the development process, recognizing that this approach poses several challenges for any institution. As JFKU continues to evolve, this is one area that could serve them well for the future.

***Retention and Graduation. 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)***

Retention and Graduate Data for Site: Standard, effective data that are collected include year-over-year retention and persistence to graduation rates, as well as analyses on why students withdraw. These rates are generally in line with most benchmarks. Where the institution and the San Jose campus find areas for improvement, data is used to produce actions that appear to help with the overall student experience. Retention initiatives include the following:

- “Intrusive” advising: advising that actively identifies struggling students, reduced performance and identification of interventions.
- Writing support: this was identified as a key area of concern among different groups. San Jose staff and faculty noted there is a concerted effort by the learning resources team along with faculty towards improving student writing skills.
- Comprehensive approach to Academic Advising: Advisors serve students from prospect through graduation. While this approach was noted to have challenges (see below), this model does seem to connect students more closely not only with the institution, but with the San Jose campus in particular.
- Based on conversations with various stakeholders, students are also engaged with retention initiatives. While it is not entirely clear the scope of their involvement, the act itself is laudable.

Strengths: Ongoing efforts to continually improve retention and persistence to graduation rates were clearly visible. Furthermore, there exists a strong level of satellite campus staff to the students’ well-being as evidenced by knowledge of socio-economic challenges and student demographics within the region.

Faculty demonstrated strong commitment to both rigor and retention. The efforts noted above identify a dedication that works to serve students as well as possible. Across all stakeholder groups, faculty were commended for their “in the trenches” approach to not only coursework but keeping students moving along towards degree completion.

As reiterated in other areas of this document, it is abundantly clear that the learning resources center and career services and student support staff are doing outstanding work on behalf of the San Jose campus community and JFKU in general.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: In general, there wasn’t clarity as to how retention and persistence to graduation connected with the overall institutional enrollment management plan. An institution-wide commitment to a more comprehensive understanding of enrollment

management and layering it across campuses would foster coherence and clarity for staff, faculty, and students.

One potential area for concern that became clear was the need for reviewing the role of academic advising as it relates to the scope of the position from prospect to graduate. The number of staff, skills, and responsibilities as well as service area may need review. For example, staff appear to be shared across campuses for the purposes of admissions and advising. There might be value in identifying how these roles can be further integrated into a comprehensive, strategic enrollment management plan.

Access to financial aid and registration services – as a function of retention – may merit additional attention from the main campus. Generally, the access to these services was noted as an area of concern for San Jose campus students in that these are services offered by the Pleasant Hill campus and do not seem as robust for the San Jose site. Access and engagement was noted as occasionally spotty in terms of servicing the needs of students, potentially impacting the overall student experience and retention.

***Student Learning. 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)***

Assessment of Student Learning at Off-Campus Site: Assessment consists of the Annual Learning Results Report (ALR), in which each year, they (faculty) assess one of the various identified categories. It was clear from discussions that every department decides how they structure assessment, from in classroom to counseling centers. San Jose is engaged fully in the assessment process and participates with campuses, for example using/completing interrater assessments. These interrater assessments help with improving objectivity, in turn leading to better decisions with respect to the data.

Because the assessment process is institution-wide, there is strong comparability in terms of learning results across campuses and no concerns at all with the execution of assessment at the San Jose campus in terms of process. Both undergrad and grad programs were confirmed to be part of the ALR process and that the San Jose and Pleasant Hill campuses have combined results. This aggregate set of results provides a robust view for the university, though disaggregation will be necessary as a next step to get clearer campus-based assessment data.

Strengths: The maturity of JFKU's assessment program as evidenced by clearly articulated processes and data points, is outstanding and should serve as an area of pride and a model for other institutions still in the nascent stages of development.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: The University is working on disaggregating assessment data by campus. This will be a welcome development. Given the maturity of their assessment program, it is abundantly clear that this next step towards campus-based assessment will only further enhance their ability to review campus-associated outcomes.

***Quality Assurance Processes: 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)***

Quality Assurance Processes – Design and/or Modification: Across the spectrum, the process for assessing educational effectiveness is generally clear, comprehensive, and inclusive. Based on the overall review of JFKU and specific information and interviews on the San Jose campus, there was involvement across stakeholders in terms of the effectiveness of the educational enterprise.

Evidence ranging from the use of graduation/retention rates, program learning outcomes (PLOs) and overall Annual Learning Results reports (ALRs), capstones, practicum assessments and evaluation (off-campus and which naturally include others beyond the core faculty and students), and other assessment techniques are in place as are the data collected that connects outcomes with action items to continually review and enhance educational effectiveness. Evidence documents that students at the San Jose campus are learning and coming away with the necessary skills upon graduation. Additional work will be done to further disaggregate results.

Strengths: There exists a strong culture of both assessment and action with regard to educational effectiveness data.

Other Comments, Questions, Concerns: Sufficient documentary evidence exists in the institutional report related to alumni, board member, etc., involvement in terms of educational effectiveness. It is clear that there is substantial and appropriate involvement across stakeholders in the overall review process.

## Appendix C

### C Distance Education Review

Institution: John F. Kennedy University

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: Nathan Long and Maryann Jones

Date/s of review: February and March 2016

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)

BA Journalism and Digital Media (JOU)

- JOU 3000: Comparative Journalism
- JOU 3250-O: Digital Journalism

BS Criminal Justice Leadership (CJL)

- CJL 3200-O: Change Management: Contemporary, Civil, and Public Leadership
- CJL 4040: Management and Information Systems
- CJL 4300: Advanced Study of Organizational Problems and Issues in Law Enforcement

---

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

MA Business Administration (MBA)

- BUS 5152-O: Management Info Systems
- BUS 5385-O: Leading a Global Workforce
- BUS 5263: Venture Capital and Private Equity Investments

MA Sport Psychology (PSP)

- PSP 5803 B: Ethics and Professional Issues in Sport Psychology
- PSP 5885-O: Best Practices for Remote Consulting

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)

*Current online programs being offered as outlined in the Institutional Summary include the following:*

- BS Business Administration
- MBA
- Journalism
- BS Criminal Justice Leadership
- MA Sport Psychology

Total Enrollment in Distance Programs (only)

- 2015 (does not include undergraduate enrollment)
  - Fall 2015: 71
  - Spring 2016: 69
- 2014: 53
  - Undergraduate: 6
  - Graduate: 34
- 2013: 38
  - Undergraduate: 4
  - Graduate: 15
- 2012: 12
  - Undergraduate: 10
  - Graduate: 3

*History of Offering Distance Education*

Based on the accreditation history, JFKU submitted requests to the Substantive Change Committee in earnest for distance education offerings in 2010-11. These include the following:

- 2010-2011
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 4/28/11: Not Accept the following proposal: BS in Law Enforcement Leadership (online).
- 2011-2012
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 6/6/11: Grant Interim Approval of the following proposals: LLM (online) and MA in Sports Psychology (online).
  - Substantive Change Commission Approval: On June 24, 2011, the Commission acted to grant Final Approval of the following proposals: LLM (online) and MA in Sports Psychology (online).
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 8/17/11: Grant Interim Approval of the following proposal: BS in Law Enforcement Leadership (online).
- 2012-2013
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 11/29/12: Grant Interim Approval of the following proposal: Master of Business Administration (online).
  - Substantive Change Commission Approval, 1/8/13: Grant Final Approval of the following proposal: MBA (online).
- 2013-2014
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 8/26/13: Not Accept the following proposals: BA and MA History of Conflict (both online).
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 10/3/13: Grant Interim Approval of the following resubmission proposal: BA and MA History of Conflict (both online)
  - Substantive Change Commission Approval, 11/13/13: Grant Final Approval of the following proposal: Bachelor of Arts in History of Conflict (online) and Master of Arts in History of Conflict (online).
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 11/14/13: Not Accept the following proposal: Bachelor of Art in Legal Studies (online) and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (online).
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 12/6/13: Grant Interim Approval of the following proposal: Bachelor of Arts in Health Sciences (online) and Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (online).
  - Substantive Change Committee Action: 12/20/13: Grant Fast Track Authorization for Distance Education Modality, no expiration.
  - Substantive Change Committee Action, 1/13/14: Grant Interim Approval of Resubmissions Bachelor of Arts in Health Sciences (online) and Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (online).

- Substantive Change Committee Action, 1/22/14: Grant Interim Approval of Bachelor of Arts in Convergence Journalism (online).
- Substantive Change Commission Approval, 2/6/14: Grant Final Approval of the following Distance Education Programs: Bachelor of Arts in Health Sciences, Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Art in Legal Studies, Bachelor of Arts in Convergence Journalism.
- Staff Substantive Change Action, 3/3/14: Grant the expedited proposal: BA in Psychology (online).
- Substantive Change Committee Action, 4/7/14: Grant Interim Approval of BS Accounting (online) and Fast Track Authorization for DE Programs.
- Substantive Change Commission Approval, 5/14/14: Grant Final Approval of BS Accounting (online) and Fast Track Authorization for DE Programs.
- Staff Substantive Change Action, 3/2/15: Approve expedited proposal: BS Psychology (online).

#### Platforms and Formats

- BlackBoard Learning Management System (BlackBoard Learn); previously used eCollege.
- Largely asynchronous methods in online format, using reading-discussion format in facilitating online learning; some multimedia also in use such as online web viewings, etc.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
  - a. Syllabi for all courses
  - b. Instructional Materials including Asynchronous and Synchronous Activities
  - c. Student Support Materials / Course Support Areas
  - d. Meeting with Online Faculty and Students
  - e. Meeting with Director of Online Learning
  - f. Documents pertaining to Course and System Back-Ups

## Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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>Institution has built a strong online presence, with a philosophy of creating increased accessibility and flexibility to on-ground students and diversified enrollment streams as relates to those programs that are fully online. These initiatives are central to their mission and stated delivery models (CFR 1.2).</p> <p>Online programs and course learning are created through a faculty-directed process, including a course review committee, requiring faculty who submit courses for online delivery to follow a series of prompts when creating courses so as to meet contact/credit hour requirements and adhere to quality guidelines (CFRs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2).</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Curriculum/Programmatic: Integration is relatively seamless given that students cross in-and-out of online and face-to-face experiences (with the exception of the fully online students - a relatively small percentage of the overall student population).</p> <p>For those courses solely online, there are efforts underway to further enhance engagement with institutional life and culture</p>	

	<p>including use of BlackBoard's organizations portal, connection with the National System's student support services and student government interactions with students online encouraging their involvement via email and virtual experiences (such as GTM). This is an area of continued focus for enhancement. (CFRs 2.10-2.13)</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>BlackBoard is the industry standard. The shells and materials reflect a good understanding of general instructional design principles. Furthermore, the JFKU team makes extensive use of the Center for Innovative Learning (NUS) and their own institutional equivalent of Quality Matters, ensuring elements of good design and deployment (CFRs 3.4 and 3.5).</p> <p>Back-ups are managed through the BlackBoard hosted solution. A three-level back-up process is in place that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1: 7 days, daily increments; Database - 5 days (point in recovery)</li> <li>• Level 2: 7 days, daily increments, 30 days, weekly increments;</li> </ul>	

	<p>Database - 30 days (daily increments)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 3: 4 weekly increments</li> </ul>	
<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>Student information and help is clearly located with direct access to Safe Assign, ADA support, technical support, and library services. General university academic advising provides support to JFKU students via email and telephone (CFRs 2.11-2.13).</p> <p>A very prominent help desk prompt is front-and-center in each course shell, with other student and faculty support functions (CFR 2.13).</p> <p>Evaluations of student learning and satisfaction point to effective delivery of these services. Additionally, the institution has demonstrated a commitment to continued enhancement of the distance learning environment (CFR 2.10).</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>Full-, part-time, and adjunct teach online at JFKU as the majority of the programs with online components complement the face-to-face programs. Adjuncts make up a significant portion of the instructional team in the online environment (CFR 3.1).</p> <p>Orientation/training of faculty is provided through two days of onsite training, synchronous, as well as asynchronous training. All faculty, as outlined in the</p>	

	<p>Institutional Report have access to this online training. BlackBoard Support and instructional concierges from National University System provide consistent platform support to faculty (CFR 3.3).</p> <p>There is ample evidence demonstrating faculty involvement in the development of courses, use of instructional designers to ensure a quality experience on the BlackBoard LMS, and broad involvement in assessment as evidenced by their work in online assessments (2014) as well as the extensive work being done across the institution with respect to assessment of learning outcomes (CFR 3.2).</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?</p>	<p>Course designers and faculty work collaboratively to design the online course experiences, with the actual program and course content created and nurtured by program faculty. The philosophy that online courses mirror ground courses in content provide a level of seamlessness with respect to outcomes (CFR 3.2).</p> <p>Course and program approvals go through a standard set of processes involving faculty/academic governance, and also include substantial attention to aligning online experiences with best practices in online course delivery (CFRs 2.1-2.4; 3.2, 3.10).</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>Current enrollment in online distance education programs only, as of 2014, was 53. This number fluctuates given the ability of students to move in-and-out of on-ground and online (CFR 3.4).</p> <p>The enrollment trend, year-over-year, showed increases in enrollment over time. The university should pay increased attention to clearly disaggregating the results for sole distance learning students from the remainder of the on-ground/face-to-face population.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>As with all other areas associated with the assessment process, there is a robust assessment of online learning. At a meta-level, program faculty are responsible for reviewing data and making recommendations with both on-ground and online offerings. Various lines of evidence point to a strong culture of assessment of student learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7).</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>This section is in compliance (CFR 3.5).</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses</p>	<p>The Institutional Report and evidence show clear assurance processes covering distance education. The ALR process, as outlined in the institution's report, began in earnest effective</p>	

<p>are educationally effective?</p>	<p>2014. Data strongly suggest consistent efforts in assessing the effectiveness of online programs is in progress, with substantive efforts in the use of data to inform course and program improvements relative to online modalities (CFRs 2.1-2.7; 4.3-4.7).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Student Identity Verification: Current efforts to ensure student identity:</p> <p>Students access Blackboard through a Single Sign On portal <a href="https://my.jfku.edu/ics">https://my.jfku.edu/ics</a> (Jenzabar Internet Campus Solution or JICS). JICS and Blackboard have a shared secret used for calculating a message authentication code. MAC authentication is used for security. The information is passed between the two systems through a Auto-SignOn building block (developed by Blackboard Global Services).</p> <p>Blackboard authenticates users through the MYJFKU portal, which secures Blackboard behind a login, where each user is provided a unique username and password. If users forget their password, they can reset their password through the University issued email address. Security Questions are recommended to users for increased security verification.</p>	
-------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>The MYJFKU portal uses a HTTPS (Security Certificate), which encrypts information passed to Blackboard, and provides a preventative measure to keep third parties from accessing information.</p> <p>Exam Identity Verification: The National University System has piloted a few Identity Authentication providers (ExamGuard, BioSig, Acxiom) over the last several years, but has not committed to an institutional wide provider. These software solutions required users to provide Bio-metric information prior to accessing an exam or course information. JFK University currently supports examination best practices when offering exams to their students. Faculty often use exam pools, randomization of questions, and Blackboard functionality to require a pass code in order to access an exam (CFRs 1.7, 3.5).</p>	
--	--	--

Rev 3/2015