

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM  
Special Visit**

To California Lutheran University

December 2 – 4, 2020

**Team Roster**

**Joseph Jones**, President, Fresno Pacific University (Team Chair)

**Karen Lee**, Provost, Wheaton College (Team Assistant Chair)

**Rhonda Brown**, Former Vice President of Equity and Inclusion, Chief Diversity Officer,  
Occidental College (Team Member)

**Marne Campbell**, President, Faculty Senate, Associate Professor  
of African American Studies, Loyola Marymount University (Team Member)

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

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

- A. Description of the Institution, its Accreditation History, as Relevant, and the Visit
- B. Description of Team’s Review Process
- C. Institution’s Special Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

### **SECTION II – TEAMS’S EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS**

- A. Issue: Diversity among students, faculty, staff, and board; student achievement gaps for students of color, particularly African-American students; and campus climate related to fostering diversity
- B. Issue: Leadership structures that support and promote graduate education
- C. Issue: A university faculty governance structure that accommodates growth in graduate education

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

## SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### A. Description of Institution, Accreditation History, and Visit

*Background, Mission, & History:* California Lutheran University (Cal Lutheran) is a private, non-profit institution with its main campus in Thousand Oaks, California. The [mission](#) is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice. Cal Lutheran is a scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of the Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. Additionally, as part of the Lutheran education experience, the University has also been a [Hispanic Serving Institution](#) since 2016. (CFR 1.1)

Cal Lutheran is one of 26 colleges and universities affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), the third largest Protestant church body in the country. Cal Lutheran is the only ELCA college or university founded since the First World War. In 1954, a “Committee of Twenty-Five” was organized from five separate national Lutheran Church bodies (who decades later merged to form the ELCA) to plan for a Lutheran College on the West Coast. Two years later, Richard Pederson donated the deed to a 130-acre ranch in Thousand Oaks, California, to establish California Lutheran College (CLC), which opened in 1961 and earned first accreditation in 1962. Cal Lutheran offers courses on its main campus of Thousand Oaks as well as other California cities such as Oxnard, Westlake Village, Woodland Hills, Santa Maria and Berkeley.

Undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs are offered through the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Management, Graduate School of Education, Graduate School of Psychology, School for Professional and Continuing Studies, and Pacific Lutheran Theological

Seminary. Forty majors and 41 minors are offered in the traditional undergraduate program, including 29 Bachelor of Arts and 17 Bachelor of Science degrees. The Bachelor's Degree for Professionals program offers degrees in nine majors. Graduate programs include doctorates in educational leadership, higher education leadership, and clinical psychology; 17 master's degrees in education, psychology, business, economics, information technology, public policy and administration, divinity, and theological studies; and 15 credential/certificate programs. By design, nearly all graduate programs accommodate adults who are employed full-time and pursuing new educational goals.

Cal Lutheran [enrolled](#) 4,027 students in Fall 2020 and 4,303 students in Fall 2019. In Fall 2020, 2,804 students were undergraduate students and 1,223 were graduate students. In Fall 2019, 3,078 students were undergraduate students (including 252 students in the Bachelor's Degree for Professionals program) and 1,225 graduate students. In both years, students came from around 40 states and 49 countries, representing different faiths and cultures. About 30% of all Cal Lutheran students are the first in their families to attend college, and 31% are federal Pell Grant recipients. The most diverse population of students is in the Bachelor's Degree for Professionals program: 64% come from underrepresented ethn racial groups compared to 53% of traditional undergraduates and 43% of graduate students. 60% of Bachelor's Degree for Professionals program students are first generation and 47% are federal Pell Grant recipients.

***Recent Accreditation History:*** The WSCUC Special Visit with California Lutheran University was originally scheduled for March 18 –19, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 disruptions, the visit was rescheduled in a virtual format for December 2 – 4, 2020. This Special Visit is for the purpose of reviewing the following three issues cited in the [2015 WSCUC Action Letter](#):

- a. Diversity among students, faculty, staff, and board; student achievement gaps for students of color, particularly African-American students; and campus climate related to fostering diversity;
- b. Leadership structures that support and promote graduate education; and
- c. University faculty governance in accommodating growth in graduate education.

**Major Changes Since Last WSCUC Visit in 2015:** Since Cal Lutheran's [comprehensive review](#) in 2015, a [Strategic Plan](#) was developed and implemented that lays out a vision for 2017 through 2022 with the following [three strategic goals](#):

**Inclusion.** As a community committed to inclusion and excellence, Cal Lutheran set its diversity targets to approximate those of the ethnoracial demographics of the state of California. The campus culture will be more inclusive and equitable in order to enhance education for all students, with particular focus on equity in recruitment and retention of faculty/staff of color, becoming an authentically Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), and increasing the pace of internationalization efforts.

**Innovation.** As a community of educators that develops programs for current and potential students, Cal Lutheran will foster a culture of innovation. The University commits to facilitating the introduction of new ideas, programs, and methods, with special encouragement given to programs that draw together different disciplines, multiple schools and colleges, or several administrative divisions. With an emphasis on academic program development, the University is focused on increasing crossdisciplinary and dual-degree opportunities between the undergraduate and graduate programs.

**Investment.** As a community committed to the future, Cal Lutheran will complete the [physical master plan](#) of the main campus, enhance off-campus centers, and increase the endowment. Current and long-range goals include meeting our Second Nature goals for carbon neutrality and resilience; anticipating future housing needs for students as well as faculty and staff; and providing state-of-the-art teaching and learning spaces in [Science](#), [Business](#), Music, and Theatre facilities.

Additionally, according to the Institutional Report dated December 20, 2019, several WSCUC Substantive Change approvals have occurred since the previous WSCUC visit in 2015:

- Executive MBA Program (2016)

- Master of Science degree in Financial Planning for students not seeking the MBA (2017)
- Bachelor of Science degree in Hospitality and Tourism Management (2017)
- [PLTS relocation to downtown Berkeley](#) (2017-18)
- Certificate program in Global Supply Chain Management (2017-18)
- Master of Science degree in Management, both onsite and distance (2018)
- PLTS distance education (2018-19)
- Master of Science degree in Clinical Psychology revised with a focus on applied quantitative psychology and preparation for doctoral studies (2019)
- Bachelor of Arts degree in Film and Television (2019)
- School of Management MBA Pathways Certificate (approved by WSCUC and expected to launch in Fall 2020)

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

Each team member evaluated the self-study report submitted on December 20, 2019 by California Lutheran University for the special visit, then conferred over a team conference call on November 12, 2020 among team members and the WSCUC Liaison. The virtual site visit occurred on December 2-4, 2020, when team members interviewed groups relevant to the three main areas of review. In the weeks leading up to the visit, the team members asked for additional evidence relevant to trends in faculty and student demographics, including demographic data disaggregated by race and ethnicity at the academic department level.

The accreditation liaison officer, who is an associate provost at Cal Lutheran, also provided the team members with an update on constructive steps taken in the wake of racist incidents in Spring 2020. The update, dated October 26, 2020, was provided in a letter format and summarized the anti-racism actions taken by Cal Lutheran’s constituents to ensure racial healing and an equitable and inclusive campus environment. The letter also provided updates to

the new shared governance structure, particularly the activities of the Faculty Senate, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic upon the campus.

Throughout the interview process, the team met virtually to debrief and share notes. After the virtual visit was complete, the team members each drafted their assigned sections of the Special Visit Team Report.

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

The institutional report is clear and concise in addressing the three issues of concern. The report indicates a strong community effort to address the issues raised. It also shows a willingness to engage consultants to introduce best practices and help guide the conversations on governance. Several examples are provided regarding Diversity and Inclusion initiatives, and the report cited measurable improvements in several areas such as increased success data for LatinX students and creating space for students of color (i.e. Center for Cultural Engagement and Inclusion). The strength of the report is in addressing the diversity issue, and Cal Lutheran appears to be very aggressive in that area. Measurable data was monitored and tracked concerning representational diversity for faculty and students as well as for student success. The institutional report provided the following list of actions taken to address diversity, equity, and inclusion: (p. 36)

- Received federal designation as a Hispanic Serving Institution;
- Emphasized inclusion in the university's strategic plan;
- Developed an Equity Leadership Council;
- Worked with USC's Center for Urban Education to fully revise the faculty search process;
- Developed a Comprehensive Equity and Inclusion Plan;

- Increased full-time faculty diversity from 17% to 29% and adjunct faculty from 18% to 26%;
- Added a Faculty Affairs: Equity and Inclusion Subcommittee to the new faculty governance system;
- Improved retention and graduation rates of Latino/a students; and
- Received over \$14 million in grants for programs supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **A. Diversity among students, faculty, staff, and board; student achievement gaps for students of color, particularly African-American students; and campus climate related to fostering diversity.**

Shortly after the 2015 WSCUC team visit, California Lutheran partnered with the University of Southern California’s Center for Urban Education (CUE) to develop new methods to increase the ethno-racial diversity of the faculty and improve campus culture to support faculty of color. (CFR 3.1) The team is encouraged by the development and launch of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Affairs Equity and Inclusion Subcommittee and the inclusion of Equity Advocates in each search. It appears that Cal Lutheran is beginning to incorporate best practices into faculty hiring. The institution recognizes this work is in the early stages and appears committed to continue to improve the faculty hiring process. One concern of the faculty is the amount of additional work that is placed upon the Equity Advocates and the need for additional people to serve in this important capacity. This concern has been

acknowledged by Cal Lutheran. During the virtual site visit in December 2020, a number of faculty and staff also expressed the need for Cal Lutheran to evaluate the fairness of its employment practices, including faculty and staff reviews and promotion practices. (CFR 1.6) Several constituents emphasized the importance of anti-bias training such as the one completed by the Equity Advocates, and that Cal Lutheran’s promotion and tenure committee would also benefit from similar anti-bias training, as well as staff hiring committees. (CFR 1.4, 3.1)

Cal Lutheran is to be commended for the progress the institution has made to date to increase the number of students of color and faculty of color increasing the proportion of faculty of color from 17% in 2015 to 29% in 2019 while simultaneously increasing the student diversity to 53%. (CFR 2.10) These diversity advances were aligned with supporting the goal of obtaining status as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and as a result, the majority of faculty and students included in this increase identify as Hispanic or Latinx. The Special Visit Team heard repeatedly that programming done under the umbrella of HSI-affiliated programming was designed to meet the needs of all students of color. While that may be effective for certain academic support programs, students whose salient cultural identity is not Latinx may require additional administrative support. Cal Lutheran is to be commended for the work of the faculty, student affairs teams, and students in creating and sustaining programming that supports African American students like “Sister’s Circle” and “Black African American Male Initiative which includes a summer bridge program. (CFR 1.4)

The Special Visit Institutional Report, dated December 20, 2019 described several areas where sustained progress was necessary for Cal Lutheran’s diversity, equity, and inclusion goals, specifically in the following areas: “More efforts are needed to ensure equity and inclusion, to provide institution-wide equity and inclusion training, and to integrate culturally sustaining

pedagogy and practice. Refinement is needed in the Comprehensive Equity and Inclusion Plan, including assessment of progress. Changes are needed to improve retention and graduation rates of Black students as well to ensure that Cal Lutheran is not only a Hispanic enrolling institution, but an authentically Hispanic *servicing* institution” (p. 37).

One long-term goal described in the 2017 - 2022 strategic plan was for Cal Lutheran’s demographic diversity to reflect the ethnoracial composition of the state of California (39% Latina/o, 15% Asian American and 7% African American). According to the data shared with the team, Latinx student enrollment appears on track to meet this goal but the African American student enrollment has varied slightly since the last team visit currently registering at 3.8% showing no overall increase. The combined percentage of Asian American and Pacific Islander students fell from 6.5% to 5.2%. It appears both populations will fall short of the 2022 goal. (CFR 4.3) Faculty and staff members in the groups interviewed by the Special Visit Team stated the need for more targeted onboarding process for students of color beyond the general orientation provided to all new students, and the importance of reinforcing anti-racism and diversity-enriched curriculum throughout general education and major requirements. (CFR 1.4) Although some constituents were aware of a diversity-related competency added to general education, not all constituents were aware of university-wide [Student Learning Outcomes](#) include “Cross-Cultural Competency” and a reference to “Diversity and Connectedness” as traits of Cal Lutheran’s “Learning Environment,” nor could refer to assessment findings pertaining to diversity-relevant learning outcomes. (CFRs 1.4, 2.3, WSCUC Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Policy)

Cal Lutheran is commended for taking the initiative to obtain over 14 million dollars in grant funding to support diversity and inclusion initiatives directed to improving

student retention and graduation rates. The team asked faculty, administrative staff, and Regents about sustainability but could not determine how the institution plans to support these initiatives as well as the faculty and staff associated with them when the grants expire or sunset. The response was that the institution continues to seek outside funding to support these efforts, and there is a hope that some of the positions could be absorbed by open lines. This response raised concerns that left the team questioning whether or not these meaningful initiatives are sustainable through long-term institutionalization. (CFR 3.1)

Throughout the special visit, both faculty and staff cited multiple strategic plans that were not completely executed, and that the presidential and senior administrative response to diversity issues on campus were reactive instead of proactive. There seems to be disparity between Cal Lutheran's documented strategic diversity plans, which appear sporadically as described by the university's constituents throughout the interviews, without consistent reinforcement with sustained implementation. There is need for senior academic leadership to spearhead and coordinate a campus-wide strategic plan with transparent communication on timely progress.

Faculty and staff frequently stated the need for mandatory diversity and inclusion training for all employees at the university, and that certain units were deficient in demonstrating adequate intercultural competencies. The constituents also cited a need for campus-wide training on holding difficult conversations about race and other politically charged topics about identity, and the necessity of reinforcing the training throughout the academic year. They cited Human Resources as lacking the professional knowledge and resources to provide such trainings. (CFR 1.4, WSCUC Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Policy)

The issues of campus climate, retention of faculty of color, the rate at which faculty of color leave Cal Lutheran rose to the forefront of every faculty discussion. Campus climate was

repeatedly referred to as toxic, and members of the community painfully described their experiences. The team heard conflicting information regarding the use of faculty exit interviews, and whether or not faculty of color leave the university disproportionately in comparison to white faculty, and if the actual number of faculty has increased or decreased since the last team visit. (CFR 3.1) Some of these concerns were raised previously when Cal Lutheran faculty worked with CUE, which revealed that faculty of color did not leave in numbers disproportionate to white faculty. However, CUE acknowledged that there may be other contributor factors that lead to departures by faculty of color. Overall, there is a shared campus perception that the experience of faculty of color and other marginalized members of the faculty is less than ideal and must be addressed by Cal Lutheran at the level of the President, Cabinet, and Board of Regents. This perception is coupled with the belief that faculty of color are over-extended because of spoken and unspoken expectations to mentor and support the increased number of students of color. In turn, this situation places the institutional responsibility to support these students solely on the shoulders of the aforesaid faculty. (CFRs 1.4, 1.6, 3.1)

The development of affinity groups within at Cal Lutheran is also commendable but in the absence of an administrative role to manage and resolve their concerns, the groups have no formal mechanism to enact change or voice their concerns. While the team commends the grassroots work done at the departmental colleague level to support faculty of color, similar progress must also be made with regard to hourly and administrative staff, and there needs to be overall coordination of these initiatives at the institutional level, driven by leadership.

Although the University has encouraged affinity groups among students, the team is specifically concerned with LGBTQ+ and African American students who further voiced concerns for their personal safety and sense of belonging in the Cal Lutheran community. These

students expressed concerns about the inconsistency in responsiveness and professional attitude of public safety officers, which contribute to their reluctance to rely on them for support for personal safety. (CFR 3.1)

The team also heard concerns voiced regarding the role of an ombudsman at Cal Lutheran. This concern is tied to a vocalized lack of trust in the Office of Human Resources. It is difficult for the team to assess the effectiveness of human resources, but the team feels compelled to stress the importance of creating a mechanism that has the ability to advocate for faculty and staff. The absence of this role translates into a climate of fear and frustration for many members of the community. (CFR 4.7)

#### **B. Leadership structures that support and promote graduate education.**

The special visit team members interviewed the graduate librarians, graduate faculty members, the Graduate Curriculum Committee and Graduate Academic Standards Committee, and Graduate and Professional Students Council. Concerning the areas of leadership structures that support and promote graduate education, there is some evidence of improvement, mostly at the level of faculty-driven initiatives and increased participation in shared governance. California Lutheran University has taken the initial steps in designing and implementing new structures of leadership in graduate education, and to improve communication between the main campus in Thousand Oaks and the regional centers (additional locations). Graduate faculty and students frequently cited the need for university leadership to allocate funds towards infrastructure expansion to support graduate education processes such as academic advising and administrative support. They also cited the need to develop a sense of community among graduate students, and

the importance of providing graduate student funds for presenting at national meetings. (CFRs 2.13, 3.5)

The graduate programs at Cal Lutheran were reported to lack adequate staffing infrastructure and need more resources to support faculty and student success. (CFRs 2.13, 3.5) While graduate faculty and students expressed their appreciation for the new writing center, they were concerned about the limited resourcing provided to the writing center staff. For example, the writing center does not provide for open or extended hours accessible to graduate students. Faculty cited that the writing center needs to be adequately resourced in order to expand its support to doctoral-level students and international students. Graduate faculty and staff both emphasized the need for increased overall attention to sustained resourcing of student-centered academic services at the graduate level overall. (CFR 2.13)

Graduate faculty cited the need for more frequent and transparent communication, adequate staffing infrastructure such as administrative roles and administrative support, and resourcing for the additional locations. (CFR 3.5) Moreover, the faculty and students at the regional centers (additional locations) are less connected to the university leadership and issues on the main campus, such as the ongoing discussions about anti-racism and diversity. In general, other than their interactions with graduate faculty and peer students, the graduate students lack a physical recreational space and sense of community in comparison to undergraduates. Faculty and student groups cited the need to administer faculty and staff satisfaction surveys and campus climate surveys with questions specifically tailored to graduate education, graduate faculty, and graduate student experiences, and the importance of ensuring the findings are shared and acted upon to ensure continuous improvements. (CFRs 2.13, 3.1, 4.1)

Graduate faculty affirmed the new graduate committee structure and graduate representation as positive changes which promote communication and the visibility of graduate concerns across the university and the additional locations. The new committee structure has also started to improve the responsiveness to needs of graduate students. Examples of improvements include the updated petition process, the revised IRB templates and instructions, and overall frequency of communication with graduate students. Although the new structure is less than a year old, the graduate committees and graduate representative overall provide clearer pathways for communication which are additionally strengthened by interactions with faculty senators. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10)

The graduate faculty expressed concerns that their heavy administrative workload is due to the lack of staffing support and a weak infrastructure for the graduate programs. The allocation of resources towards enhancing graduate education has not materialized as a university priority. For example, graduate student participation in collaborative research with faculty in research-based disciplines could be further resourced through university funding and encouraged through more frequent communication about opportunities. Faculty and students stated that there is no dedicated budget line for conference presentations, so graduate students often cannot afford the costs of presenting at national conventions. To pay for conference presentations, graduate students have used their own graduate assistantship stipends or sought external grant funds to support their research and travel. The Graduate Student Council supports graduate student clubs with a limited programmatic fee but does not have any funds to reimburse for conference presentations. (CFR 2.3)

The library and graduate librarians play a key instructional role that includes visits to classes, participation in orientation, and providing research consultations with faculty and

students. However, the librarians report the lack of adequate staffing and funds for information resources to support the entire scope of academic offerings, graduate-level research, and scholarship. Despite the challenges of limited resources, however, the librarians are commended for taking the initiative to recruit and retain ethnic-racially diverse library staff, and for designing anti-racism, diversity-enriched reading lists to share with faculty and students. To improve the university's educational effectiveness, librarians should be considered for faculty status with representation to the Faculty Senate, and opportunity to participate in academic shared governance processes of institution-side importance like strategic planning and assessment of information literacy. (CFR 3.10, 4.5) For instance, there should be a central library director with an information science background who can work collaboratively with the librarians to design a strategic plan and represent the librarians in the Faculty Senate. The librarians also provided adequate evidence of academic qualifications for status as academic librarians. (CFRs 2.2b, 3.5)

### **C. A university faculty governance structure that accommodates growth in graduate education.**

According to the institutional report dated December 20, 2019, the faculty governance structure was “in transition” at the time (p. 37). Since then, Cal Lutheran has made progress in rebuilding their shared governance structures. The Special Visit Team met with members of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Governance Task Force. There is positivity about shared governance, and about the way governance works across the university. The Faculty Governance Task Force has completely updated the Faculty Governance Handbook which allows for clearer

understandings of the faculty's role in shared governance and created a list of "Governing Principles" to help guide them. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10)

Overall, the new governance structures were welcomed by the majority of faculty and the president. However, there is no indication that staff and librarians are included in this new structure. Because the new governance system is in its infancy, Cal Lutheran has an opportunity to include formal mechanisms to allow channels for staff voice and transparent communication. By including all stakeholders, shared governance becomes inclusive of all members of the community. (CFRs 3.7, 4.5, 4.7)

Faculty Senate and Faculty Governance Task Force members overall cited greater transparency from the leadership and better communication with faculty regarding university policy. They also expressed high hopes for working with the new president. It is still early to fully gauge how this new structure is working out, however, because the new senate convened in February and COVID-19 closed the campus in March. Senators expressed a bit of difficulty in its ability to effectively meet the needs of faculty because of the pandemic. Rather than working on new agenda items, the senate spends much of its time triaging issues that arise due to current circumstances. The senate, therefore, has yet to devise a clear assessment plan of their work or effectiveness. When asked if faculty feel their needs and concerns are being heard, senators did not know what to say except they had no way of knowing. Rather, a few senators cited informal polls of their constituents. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10, 4.5)

There are several concerns about institutional assessment with no clear plan for how this would be carried out or which governing body will conduct and disseminate information. There was little evidence of ongoing inquiry to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment. While there may be plans for improving curricula and pedagogy, little was known about assessment of

student learning at the program level, as well as assessment of the effectiveness of shared governance processes, and other aspects of institutional effectiveness such as strategic planning. (CFRs 2.3, 4.4, 4.5) It is clear that the new structure for institutional assessment has not yet had a chance to be properly implemented. One area of concern is that the new structures were designed for the former leadership. While the new president is opened to working within the new structure, it would be beneficial for the entire university to have structures that inform and guide leadership at any point. This would ensure consistent decision-making structures and processes with clearly defined roles of those involved. (CFR 3.7)

Since the workload is significant, the Senate Executive Committee would benefit from compensation that is commensurate (increasing stipends, course remissions, and so forth) with the amount of work shared governance requires. There should also be greater representation of adjunct faculty in the process, either by increasing their membership on the senate, or by ensuring they are represented at all governance levels. The senate should also have representation from the library. (CFR 3.7)

Many faculty members at California Lutheran University are supportive of the new shared governance structures. Although they still need time to clarify and refine some of the details of their plan, they have designed it and subsequently put it in motion, and are adjusting and refining it. The faculty and senior administration could benefit from more communication and interaction with each other with clear reporting lines drawn. For example, the senate executive committee could meet with the provost once a month, in addition to other meetings with leadership in the senior administration. It was difficult to know whether this is being accomplished since the senate is still reacting to changes brought by COVID-19. What is clear,

however, is the senate's willingness to adapt to the ever-changing everchanging higher education environment. (CFR 4.7)

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

Cal Lutheran's institutional report dated December 19, 2020 and the organization of the virtual visit indicated strong preparation for this review by the university's constituents, particularly by the associate provost who serves also as the university's accreditation liaison officer. However, the visit team found that interviews with some administrators, faculty, staff, and students indicated a high level of frustration with the campus climate and that significant progress is still necessary in meeting the goals set forth in the December 19, 2020 institutional report. Although new equity programs were launched to enhance the retention and success of racially-ethnically underrepresented students, these programs were launched most often through the grassroots efforts of faculty, with very little in the way of supporting the faculty of color who invested time in seeking external funding sources and managing the new initiatives. Throughout the interviews, the team found that faculty and staff repeatedly aired concerns relevant to the WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy, as well as CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.11, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.7, 3.10. Many constituents indicated their concerns about a toxic work environment and unsafe campus for people of color. The team offers the following sets of commendations and recommendations:

### ***Commendations***

1. The implementation of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) programming by the faculty and librarians which includes student success programs, anti-racist curriculum, and reading lists that have been shared with students.
2. A new Faculty Senate structure that has fostered more productive discussion and opportunities for engagement in governance among the faculty overall.
3. The Center for Cultural Engagement and Inclusion which has served as an active hub for supporting and encouraging diverse students.

### ***Recommendations***

1. The Board of Regents should hold the president and cabinet accountable for being proactive and taking concrete action around the areas of campus and workplace climate. (CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 2.10, 2.11, 3.2, 3.5, 3.7, 3.10, 4.7, WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy)
  - a. There is a sense that groups of students, specifically African American, LatinX, and LGBTQ+ students, feel less physically safe on campus. There also seems to be pockets of toxic work culture where staff feel disrespected and unheard. More diverse representation and empowerment at levels of senior leadership including Deans, College Council, Faculty Senate, Cabinet, and Board of Regents may help to broaden the perspective of underrepresented groups across campus and elevate their concerns and priorities.

- b. Consistent with the vision and values of the institution, the president and cabinet should design and frame a campus-wide vision and strategy for implementing and sustaining diversity programs and grant-funded initiatives through an inclusive process that leverages shared governance. This should include evidence-informed processes to retain, support, mentor, and advise faculty of color as well as dedicated resources for recruiting diverse faculty.
  - c. Continue to implement mandatory ongoing anti-racism, anti-discrimination, and implicit bias training for all faculty and staff such that a campus culture of inclusion and tolerance can be sustained.
  - d. Direct assessment and research data to appropriate bodies to assist data-driven decision-making that impact campus climate.
2. Commensurate with the university's core commitments and learning outcomes, commit to culturally sensitive pedagogical practices and coordinate more intentional efforts towards clear outcomes in terms of the integration of diversity-enhanced curriculum. (CFRs 2.2a and 2.11, WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy)
3. Expand information resources available to faculty and students to support academic offerings, research, and scholarship by providing the library with fiscal and institutional resources, including director level leadership with academic qualifications in library and information sciences. Consider equipping current librarians with faculty status and the opportunity to participate in the academic shared governance processes of institution-

wide importance, strategic planning, and assessment of information literacy. (CFRs 2.2b, 3.5)

4. Provide staff hiring processes consistent and resonant with faculty hiring processes, such as the training and procedures designed for the Faculty Equity Advocates. Provide staff with a mechanism such as an elected forum for elevating concerns to the level of senior administration. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)
5. Clarify policies and processes that hold constituents accountable with specific and clear consequences for inappropriate behavior or conduct. (CFRs 2.10, 3.5, 4.7)
6. Reevaluate the effectiveness of the current support structure for graduate programs which includes support services for graduate students. (CFR 2.2b)