

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To The Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising (FIDM)

Visit Dates: October 15 – 18, 2018

Team Roster

Melany Hunt, Dick and Dotty Professor of Mechanical Engineering at California Institute of Technology;
Team Chair

Melea Fields, AVP of Accreditation Affairs/ALO at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology;
Assistant Chair

Ryan Brown, Associate Dean/ALO at San Francisco Conservatory of Music; Team Member

James Smith, Senior VP of Finance at Ashford University; Team Member

Aaron Kleist, Associate Dean of Faculty, Humanities and Social Sciences at Biola University; Team
Member

Tamela Hawley, Vice President, WSCUC; Staff Liaison

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	3
Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	4
Description of Team’s Review Process	5
Institution’s Reaffirmation of Accreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	5
Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	6
Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	6
Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	6
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	9
Standard 3: Deploying and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability	11
Standard 4: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	12
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees	13
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	14
Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	16
Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	18
Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment	18
Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes – N/A	19
Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement	19
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)	20
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	20
Commendations	20
Recommendations	21
APPENDICES	23

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

The Fashion Institute of Design and Merchandising (FIDM) is a proprietary degree-granting college, which was started in 1969 by its current president, Tonian Hohberg. On opening, FIDM offered Associate of Arts (AA) degrees in fashion design and in merchandising and marketing in downtown Los Angeles. FIDM now offers 23 AA programs in wide range of industry specific disciplines, including apparel industry management, interior design, jewelry design, menswear, social media, costume design, and visual communication. Beginning in 2005, FIDM introduced a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree in business management. Since 2014, FIDM has added seven other BS and Bachelor of Arts (BA) degrees. In 2017, FIDM also started a Master in Business Administration (MBA). In addition to the original Los Angeles location, FIDM has campuses in San Francisco (opened in 1973), Orange County (opened in 1981), and San Diego (opening in 1985). FIDM offers two distance education programs: an AA degree in merchandising and marketing (started in 2003) and a BS degree in business management (started in 2010).

Throughout FIDM's history, the emphasis of the college has been to provide a rigorous educational program that focuses on creativity, design, and the business of the apparel industry and related fields, such as consumer products, interior design, and entertainment. FIDM's mission statement, which was updated in 2016, emphasizes that students develop skills that enable them to be leaders in these design-related industries. FIDM's faculty (as found in the Faculty Profile dated August 2018) include 73 full-time faculty members (teaching 4 or more classes per quarter), 249 part-time faculty members (teaching 3 or fewer classes per quarter) and approximately 30 faculty members who also hold staff appointments such as program directors. More than half of FIDM's faculty members have worked for over 10 years at FIDM. Many of the part time faculty also work within the industry or hold teaching positions at other institutions. In fall 2016, FIDM had a fall enrollment of 3,133 students across the four campuses, including 91 students enrolled in the distance education programs. In fall 2017, the total enrollment was 2,783 students; in fall 2018, there are 2,659 students.

As FIDM moved to increase the number of bachelors-level programs, FIDM's accrediting body was shifted from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). In August 2013, the Commission granted initial accreditation to FIDM. In the 2013 letter, there were several areas

deserving of commendation, which included support for student learning, institution-wide quality improvement, linkage to industry, and consistent and visionary leadership. In addition, the Commission noted three areas that required attention: review of the governance structure, including a Governing Board with appropriate committees, bylaws, and membership; the development of a faculty organization that provides a mechanism for faculty engagement and ownership over the curriculum, academic policies, and other key areas for faculty leadership; and the development of structures to meet the academic and support needs of a diverse student body.

With the initial granting of accreditation, the 2013 letter also requested an interim report in 2015. FIDM filed its interim report, which outlined the steps taken in these three areas. In the 2016 letter to President Hohberg, the Commission commended FIDM on developing policies and procedures for the FIDM Governing Board and encouraged FIDM to expand its board to include individuals with backgrounds in post-secondary education. The Commission congratulated FIDM for establishing the Faculty Council and noted that FIDM should be able to demonstrate how the Council has progressed and how it has contributed to the academic success of the institution. The Commission also commended FIDM on its efforts to meet the needs of a diverse student body.

Description of Team's Review Process

The team reviewed FIDM's Self-Study and the supplementary materials prior to the off-site review. From these materials the team developed lines of inquiry that were conveyed during the conference call with the FIDM leadership team on May 3 and via email on May 14, 2018. In addition, the team requested additional documentation from FIDM including updated enrollment and financial data; these materials were received prior to the on-site review at the Los Angeles campus on October 15-18.

Prior to the on-site review, members of the team visited the San Diego (September 4), San Francisco (September 6), and Orange County (September 7) campuses. At the branch campuses, the team met with students, faculty, and key administrative staff. The team was also given the opportunity to see the facilities and samples of student work at each location. During the visit to the Los Angeles campus, the team met with students, faculty, and staff, and had the opportunity to speak with FIDM alumni, members of the FIDM Governing Board, and industry experts who serve as adjudicators for reviewing student projects. The team gave the exit brief to a group of approximately 200 stakeholders on October 18.

Institution's Reaffirmation of Accreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The Self-Study Report was organized along the nine components, as suggested in the WASC Handbook of Accreditation; FIDM's institutional report did not have component 8, an optional essay. The report included supporting documents in an appendix. The report contained all required components and provided a foundation prior to the visit. The materials showed FIDM's commitment to provide a high-quality education to its students.

To prepare for the Self-Study, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and the Accreditation Steering Committee organized meetings with FIDM stakeholders, which included the Faculty Council, students, academic departments, student support services, members of the governing board, and administrators at all FIDM campuses. Faculty members who were not part of the Faculty Council participated through focus groups in August 2017.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

In 2013, FIDM was approved under Pathway B to move accrediting bodies from ACCJC to WSCUC. An Interim Report was submitted in 2015 and FIDM received recommendations to undertake a comprehensive revision of internal planning processes, develop the governance structures and policies, fully engage faculty in key academic processes, and work to meet the diverse student needs.

The 2017 Self-Study briefly described the progress on each of these areas. As found in the Self-Study, FIDM has re-imagined their strategic planning process, which has helped to guide and reposition their degree programs and has included key stakeholders. Although no details are provided, the Self-Study indicates that the Governing Board is working under its new set of bylaws. FIDM has continued to support its diverse student body, including students transferring from other programs.

In addition to addressing commission actions from the 2015 report, FIDM provided brief responses to the recommendations received from the Master of Business Administration Structural Change application filed August 2016, and the BA in Social Media (online) application filed July 2017. The issues

identified in those reviews were related to program review and assessment, faculty roles, and strategic planning, which FIDM has worked to address.

Based on prior commission letters and on the materials provided in the Self-Study, the visiting team focused on four areas: institutional sustainability, governance, strategic planning, and educational effectiveness.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

FIDM's mission statement can be found on the website and in other materials. The statement was updated in 2016 to reflect the aspirations of FIDM graduates to become leaders in industries involving design and business:

FIDM's engaging learning environment and rigorous programs of study develop graduates who become leaders in the industries of global design and business. Under the guidance of faculty who are industry professionals, FIDM students learn to strategically integrate design thinking with technology, producing work that is grounded in critical and creative thought. FIDM graduates embrace cultural diversity and ethical choice while advancing the well-being of their communities.

During the campus visit, the team found that stakeholders were familiar FIDM's mission and its approach to prepare students for work and service.

As found in the mission statement, FIDM is committed to advancing the well-being of its communities and demonstrates its commitment to the public good in several different ways. FIDM maintains a Museum and Library, which provides an open venue for the public to access collections and exhibitions, publications, and other research materials related to the fashion and design industries. FIDM opens its doors to community-based organizations and participates in high-school access programs. FIDM has also continued to raise support for financial aid for its students (CFR 1.1).

FIDM has a clearly defined set of objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. These learning objectives are reflected in FIDM's educational programs and in their approach to assessment. On FIDM's web page for Institutional Effectiveness, statistics are published on the percent of students

who met expected learning within certain academic programs. The assessments are based on rubrics and analyzed through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Overall, 94.7% of students performed at or above expected levels. In addition, FIDM makes public data on disaggregated graduation rates by gender, race and ethnicity, and type of financial aid. The overall 2017 6-year graduation rate is 63%. The website also includes Performance Fact Sheets for each campus and each degree program. Although the Fact Sheets have data on completion, most of the Fact Sheets do not include information on job placement. The website also provides a template for each academic program that captures the percent of students graduating on time, the cost of the program, the amount of debt at graduation for students in the program, and information on the percent of program graduates who find jobs. In examining these templates, the graduation data for approximately half of the majors was not provided, presumably because these programs were new. However for all of the degree programs, the job placement information was not given. During the visit, the team inquired about the data, especially the data on job placement. Although the team received a spreadsheet with information on the job placement of individual students, the team did not receive any report that summarized information on student success after graduation or that analyzed graduate placement. As found in CFR 1.2, institutions are expected to evaluate and make public data on student achievement.

FIDM has a statement on academic freedom: “Faculty members are free to teach and discuss the facts and ideas within their curriculum which they believe to be in accord with available evidence, and to examine unpopular or controversial ideas in classroom teaching when appropriate to course content.” This policy is on FIDM’s webpage. As noted in the Review Under WASC Standards (RUWS) prepared by FIDM, FIDM acknowledges that the policy does not extend to students or to staff. It is unclear whether there are due-process procedures that ensure that faculty and students are protected. In the appendix of the Self-Study provided for the RUWS (document 1.3.1), the FIDM Academic Freedom & Responsibility Policy includes a statement with regard to the rights of the student (CFR 1.3).

FIDM’s mission statement indicates that students embrace cultural diversity. Their admission and hiring processes support diversity. From FIDM’s enrollment and completion data, FIDM enrolls and graduates students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds at comparable rates. During the on-site visits, the team met with a diverse group of students and alumni, including international students, veterans, and students returning to college after working in other fields. These students all provided positive feedback about their experiences. As a note, the student body is approximately 90% women (CFR 1.4).

FIDM is a privately-owned, autonomous institution. FIDM is not associated with political or religious groups. Governance and oversight is provided by an 11 member governing board that meets four times per year. The owners of FIDM are part of the Governing Board (CFR 1.5).

Through its website, FIDM presents to students and the larger public its academic goals, programs of instruction, faculty, admissions processes, academic services, grading and ancillary policies, and costs, consistent with CFR 1.6. FIDM is encouraged to review the accuracy of the information. For example, the team noted an inconsistency with regard to the size of the student body. Although the fall 2018 enrollment is approximately 2,700, the current website states a “student body of 4,200”. This later number reflects the unduplicated headcount of students enrolled in any quarter of the academic year 2017-18 and not the size of the student body at a given point in time.

Grading policies are included in syllabi and course outlines. All grading rubrics and assignments are posted on eLearning sites. Policies regarding student conduct are also available on the website and in the catalog. The FIDM “Student Policies” website lists processes for grade appeal, student grievances, student educational records, directory information, and rights of expression. This website also notes that questions or unresolved problems should be directed to the FIDM Vice President for Education. On a separate website for “Consumer Disclosures”, FIDM lists its policies for refunds, FERPA, disabilities, along with other documentation on financial aid. FIDM does not have an Institutional Review Board since FIDM faculty are not conducting research. During the site visit, the team inquired with regard to the records of student complaints and the processes to resolve complaints (CFR 1.6).

With regard to integrity and transparency in its operations (CFR 1.7), FIDM has an annual independent financial audit. The 2016-17 audited financial statement was reviewed by the team. During the visit, the team was also provided with information regarding the 2017-18 fiscal year and projections for the 2018-19 fiscal year. In reviewing the minutes of the Governing Board, the team did not find any record of the full Board’s approval of the budget or of the audited financial statements. In the team’s discussion with the Board, Board members indicated that the financial documents are reviewed by the Board’s finance committee and not the full board, which is not consistent with best practices. The results of the audit are not shared with the community. Although FIDM is not required to post the audited financial statements, institutions are required to make the information available upon request. During the on-

site visit, the team inquired with regard to complaint and grading processes. The team was satisfied with the information that was provided about the complaint process (CFR 1.7).

FIDM has fully participated with WASC and has open and honest communications. FIDM has been proactive in communicating substantive changes. FIDM has not received a warning nor sanction from its accrediting agencies (CFR 1.8).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

FIDM's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, and rigor (CFR 2.1), with the programs included in "Credit Hour and Program Length Review" conforming to accepted practice in higher education. The institution has both a coherent philosophy that guides the meaning of its degrees, and processes that ensure degrees' quality and integrity (CFR 2.2): on FIDM's guiding vision of "career-relevant education" see Component 3; regarding the strength of FIDM's assessment processes, see Components 3–5, below. Undergraduate programs prepare students for work (CFR 2.2a). FIDM's commitment to prepare its students for job-readiness is seen throughout its curriculum, including industry partnerships, internships, and external evaluation of student assignments.

CFR 2.2b states that "The institution's graduate programs [should] establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs"; FIDM was asked to provide program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the MBA program and discuss how these outcomes differ from or relate to those elsewhere in the institution. The PLOs received (including Global Economics, Financial Understanding, Management, and Entrepreneurship) make sense within the context of the degree, but were not differentiated from PLOs in the undergraduate programs.

Learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and institutional level (CFR 2.3), and include systemically aligned rubrics, student learning outcomes (SLOs), PLOs, and institutional learning outcomes (ILOs). SLOs are reflected in the course syllabi (CFR 2.4) and integrate PLOs and ILOs. The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning (CFR 2.5), manifesting an impressive degree of hands-on engagement with real-world challenges, and developing skills that have immediate professional application.

The report affirms that graduates consistently achieve the institution's stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The assessment infrastructure is adequate to assess student learning (CFR 2.6): not only do FIDM assessments "capture a wealth of data about student learning and performance, and about student perceptions of their own learning" (Self-Study, page 41), but the "ILO Meta-Analysis Report ILO 2" concludes that "Over the past six years, FIDM students have achieved all [ILOs] and [WSCUC] core competencies at the expected performance level" (2.2.2). The programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review (CFR 2.7).

In terms of defining expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and faculty (CFR 2.8), FIDM's vision for "authentic" research at the undergraduate level includes hands-on curricular and co-curricular projects that "typically culminate with the presentation of design solutions, portfolios, or business/marketing plans for critique to peers, faculty, industry adjudicators, and/or project sponsors ... [emphasizing] applied research and creativity within real-world constraints" (17). As regards students' progress toward the completion of their degrees (CFR 2.8), see Component 5 on FIDM's use of disaggregated data and discussion of graduation rates.

While it is clearly in evidence for its students, expectations, recognition, and promotion of faculty scholarship and creative activity is not apparent. FIDM clearly values the connection its faculty has, or had, with industry, but there are no policies by which faculty professional development is either encouraged and/or rewarded (with the exception of the \$1,000 faculty development grant implemented last year). Given that there is no tenure, and department chairs are permanent, staff positions, many faculty feel there is insufficient recognition given to their teaching, scholarship, and service (CFR 2.9), and no opportunities to advance within the institution financially or administratively.

The institution offers and assesses co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals (CFR 2.11). Complementing its industry-focused curriculum, FIDM offers internships, study tours, special projects, and scholarship competitions. In terms of students' understanding of the requirements of their academic programs (CFR 2.12) through adequate academic and other student support services (CFR 2.13), FIDM seeks to promote student success through structured pathway advising, a focus on full-time attendance, "intrusive" advising, and career-relevant co-curricular and learning (Self-Study, pages 34–35).

Finally, FIDM has worked to develop formal policies or articulation agreements with feeder institutions (CFR 2.14). FIDM is actively seeking articulation agreements with community college districts. It should be noted that many of these agreements have not been fully enacted yet, so their effectiveness in increasing enrollment remains to be seen.

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

FIDM's faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity to achieve the institution's objectives (CFR 3.1). Many faculty take ownership of the curriculum and remain committed to the institution even without the opportunity to achieve tenure. The faculty at the branch campuses are less confident than their Los Angeles colleagues that they can effect change within the curriculum since most curriculum decisions are made through the Los Angeles campus. Faculty are also concerned about the possibility of shifting between part-time and full-time status under the new quarterly contract agreements, which may affect their commitment to the mission of the institution. When hiring, FIDM seeks out faculty and staff who embody the institution's mission (CFR 3.2) to "develop graduates who become leaders in the industries of global design and business" (Self-Study, page 5).

Development opportunities to improve teaching, learning and assessment of outcomes (CFR 3.3) include "closing the loop" sessions with FIDM's Institutional Effectiveness (IE) department. Academic department resources are made available to support faculty when requested, including learning support staff based out of the San Francisco campus. FIDM faculty have requested additional development opportunities (CFR 3.3) to which the institution responded by creating a more informative faculty in-service event. While the Faculty Council appreciated the efforts made to date, their requests for expanded faculty development opportunities, improved employment packages, and increased governance and planning remain open. The team notes that the Faculty Council surveyed FIDM's faculty (with responses from 109 individuals). Approximately 70% of respondents rated the professional development program as fair or poor, 61% indicated that they were unsatisfied or extremely unsatisfied with their employment package and benefits, and 69% indicated that they were less confident or worried about FIDM's long-term planning.

The institution reported a net operating loss in each of the last two fiscal years, which is the result of nearly a decade long decline in student enrollment to a level that is approximately 50% lower than 2008-

09. FIDM expects to post net operating losses in the next two fiscal years, based on the financial model provided by their CFO during the site visit. While the institution reduced expenses throughout the student enrollment decline, the Governing Board has not yet taken steps to improve the institution's financial position in light of the decline in cash reserves. Investments in large scale information technology projects, like Salesforce CRM, have been completed, but non-essential upgrades to classroom hardware have been delayed as they finalize their institutional IT infrastructure plan (CFR 3.5).

The leadership team at FIDM have addressed the multiyear declining enrollment trend (CFR 3.6) by prioritizing investments in new programs while making staffing reductions to ensure financial viability. Although the institution describes their organizational decision making process as distributed governance, or matrix, model (CFR 3.7), FIDM successfully embarked on a new, re-imagined strategic planning process involving a number of internal and external constituencies to "meet the needs of our students and stakeholder industries in the coming decades" (Self-Study, page 5).

FIDM was founded by Tonian Hohberg in 1969 and she continues to serve as the institutional President/CEO (CFR 3.8); she also serves as a voting member of the Governing Board. The VP of Finance and CFO is Tess Stolzer and she oversees the Finance, Accounting, Information Technology and Facilities departments. The Governing Board has been expanded to include four new members over the last three years. However, the Board does not have members with experience in post-secondary education, as suggested in prior accreditation reviews. The Board also does not have members with legal or financial management experience. The team is concerned about the Board's ability to ensure that it is providing appropriate oversight of the institution; that oversight should include the hiring and responsible evaluation of the CEO (CFR 3.9).

Standard 4: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

FIDM has Quality Assurance (QA) processes in place to collect, analyze, and interpret data. FIDM has these QA processes in place and promotes a strong "sufficient IR capacity...", which can be a strength at FIDM. While FIDM shows an evidence based, data-driven commitment to improvement, and a systematic assessment of teaching and learning, the data provided was not complete or transparent. The team requested numerous times for more clarity on data. FIDM should continue to strengthen this area and put more emphasis on accurate reporting of data (CFRs 4.1-4.3).

CFR 4.4 refers to ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment. Assessment is alive and strong at the program level. FIDM shows evidence of assessment of co-curricular and support services; however it is unclear how the data from these assessments is being used for improvements. Co-curricular and support services assessments need to be widely distributed to all campuses and departments, reviewed, discussed, and included in planning processes in order to fully assess the success of the institution and its overall effectiveness.

At FIDM, appropriate stakeholders are involved in regular assessment and planning primarily at the program and strategic planning levels (CFR 4.5). The FIDM strategic plan is aligned with its mission and future directions of the institution. However, FIDM does not provide any evidence of assessment and review of the strategic plan, nor is there any evident linkage of the strategic plan to the budget process. FIDM needs to continue to make the connections between planning, budgeting, resource allocation, and assessment (CFR 4.6).

CFR 4.7 asks that institutions anticipate and respond to “...a changing higher education environment”. FIDM is looking to the future and aware of the landscape within its niche. In recent years, FIDM has added several bachelor’s programs and the master of business administration program. These additions are a result of FIDM’s view that the fashion and design industry supports and needs professionals with advanced degrees. To this end, FIDM is establishing agreements with other colleges, including California State Universities and surrounding community colleges, to facilitate the transfer of students into FIDM’s bachelor programs.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees

FIDM has a clear focus: providing “career-relevant education” (Self-Study, page 17). It actively seeks out and listens to industry advice to shape its curriculum and designs student assignments with real-world needs in mind, while facilitating critique from external professionals. The combination of industry-experienced faculty, industry advisors, and hands-on experiences means that the skills required at graduation are immediately applicable in the workplace (CFR 2.2), and has shaped the curriculum into a “rich, coherent, and challenging educational experience” (WSCUC Handbook, page 29).

In 2014, FIDM introduced several new bachelor's degrees in response to "growing demand among employers for bachelor's degree holders" (Self-Study, page 19). This was confirmed during the Accreditation Visit session with industry adjudicators, who cited the need for employees who can "think critically" and apply a broad base of knowledge and understanding to their work. For example, having an understanding of anthropology may help address issues of cultural appropriation in fashion design.

While FIDM is to be applauded for its "career-relevant education," the team worked to explore and understand how a FIDM graduate differs qualitatively from another vocational-preparation institution in this industry. Besides being competent and job-ready, the team asked what makes a FIDM graduate unique among its peer institutions and what are the "distinctive experiences and learning outcomes". The team focused on the meaning, quality, and integrity of a degree (MQID) from FIDM (WSCUC Handbook, page 30).

In addition, given FIDM's decision to identify as a degree-granting school, the question arises as to why there is a "growing demand among employers for bachelor's degree holders" (Self-Study, page 19). The team asked FIDM to further delineate what is it about bachelor's degrees that employers value and how that is reflected in the curriculum. Through this, the team found the meaning of a FIDM degree to be embedded in the teaching, classroom, and field experiences, as well as through application of the broader business applications related to the students' field of study. The quality of a FIDM degree is grounded in students mastering the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective in their field. This is assessed through course work, final projects, and summative data on outcomes. Outcome data and student success measurements show the integrity of a FIDM degree.

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

The introduction of more degrees, including an MBA in 2017, means that FIDM has had to expand its course offerings, and increase the rigor of its upper-level coursework. The AA degrees, which constituted the bulk of degrees offered until 2014, focus on "applied skills," as well as the five core competencies. Following the two-year AA, students are eligible to continue into a bachelor's degree, all of which require advanced skills, "more extensive research, greater analytic and communicative ability" (Self-Study, page 24), as well as the holistic understanding and critical thinking skills mentioned above—for example, through courses such as "Mapping Your World: an Introduction to Global Production" and

“Issues in Contemporary Society” from the Bachelor of Arts in Design. In keeping with its focus, industry adjudicators are involved in the assessment of capstone projects.

The new MBA program graduated its first cohort in the summer quarter. While PLOs were provided for the program and samples of student work were available for review, the team was unsure how the program differentiates itself from the undergraduate degrees (CFR 2.2b). In addition, the rigor of the admissions process was questioned by several faculty, who feel that the quality of students in the MBA program is below what it should be. This may be due to the pressures on enrollment throughout the institution.

FIDM has fostered an impressive culture of assessment and systemically-aligned assignment rubrics, SLOs, PLOs, and ILOs (CFR 2.3). PLOs are evaluated annually using data from faculty and external adjudicators, and “periodically outcomes will be revised to account for changes in technologies or industry practices or to better reflect skills/skill levels needed by graduates” (Self-Study, page 25). “Calibration sessions” are used routinely to “resolve differences across campuses or individual instructors,” and courses are revised in light of their findings (29). In short, “assessment and program review are embedded into the overall curriculum review process at FIDM” (Self-Study, page 30). The industry-adjudicated capstones are particularly effective in this regard and tie in well with the emphasis on “career-ready skills.” As the Self-Study states, “assessment is not just something done by ‘Institutional Research’ at FIDM.” The team saw numerous examples of syllabi and rubrics connected to SLOs, which in turn connected to PLOs and ILOs (CFR 2.4). The format and language for assessment is consistent across the institution.

Program review is done on a summative basis every quarter, alongside both quantitative and qualitative results from student course evaluations. (It should be noted that many faculty voiced concerns that they do not have easy access to the results of these evaluations and desire more transparency with this data.) Annual assessments “provide a collection point for discussions that may have occurred at multiple points across the year,” while comprehensive program reviews are on a six-year cycle (CFR 2.7). According to the Self-Study, FIDM’s ILOs explicitly address the core competencies and expand on them to address mission-centric areas, including “career readiness, leadership and interpersonal skills, and the capacity to integrate the academic into industry-relevant applications” (Self-Study, page 24; CFR 2.2a).

The core competencies are primarily covered by the General Studies program. However, FIDM's curricular learning maps are unclear regarding the *development* of core competencies in the General Studies program between the AA and bachelor's degrees (CFR 2.2a). The map lists nine ILOs, covering 26 courses in the AA and 21 at the bachelor's level. Each assessment point is labeled with a letter from the following legend: "I = Introductory, D = Developing, C = Competent, A = Accomplished." Of the 234 (9x26) assessment points in the AA, only eight (3%) are marked as "Introductory," and none after the third quarter. 73 are marked "Competent" (31%), including four in the first quarter, and 28 (12%) as "Competent/Accomplished." Rather than a progression, the map indicates that Competency in all of the ILOs is expected by the end of the fourth quarter, with some ILOs, such as Communication, being Introductory, Developing, and Competent all within the same first quarter.

Although the learning maps do not capture the development of the core competencies, the General Studies coursework is organically integrated into the rest of FIDM's curriculum, such that connections between the subject matter and the industry-focused coursework are continually reinforced. For example, Principles of Chemistry analyzes the use of chemical dyes in clothing production, and the geography course, "Mapping Your World," "explores the history of raw materials, manufacturing, and labor through the lens of the worldwide apparel industry supply chain" (Self-Study, page 32). This approach seems to encourage student buy-in, as General Studies courses score a student satisfaction rating of 3.6/4, compared to 3.4/4 for applied degree courses.

As mentioned in prior sections, learning outcomes at all levels are well defined and distributed among faculty, students, staff, and stakeholders. Standards of performance are described through rubrics and syllabi, particularly regarding the capstone projects. FIDM's Institutional Effectiveness team works closely with faculty and department chairs to assess student learning and adjust as necessary (CFR 2.6). The culture of assessment is consistent throughout the institution, from senior leadership to staff and faculty, and regularly informs decision-making within the curriculum (CFR 4.3).

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

The Self-Study uses disaggregated data to discuss graduation rates and retention rates (CFRs 2.3 and 2.10–2.14). The report indicates which programs are particularly effective, showcasing those with the highest completion rates and positing explanations for their difference. A clear picture of programs across the board would have been valuable, however. In terms of degree completion rates, the report

notes that Digital Media, Fashion Design, and Interior Design have the lowest graduation rates among FIDM's AA programs. While FIDM monitors these students and has seen improved rates when students are given extra time to complete their studies, such programs merit attention. While FIDM has paid careful attention to their disaggregated graduation rates, and the all-FIDM graduation rate of roughly 60-65%, which is described by FIDM as high, FIDM is encouraged to look at objective comparisons. How do graduation and retention figures compare with comparable institutions in WSCUC's Comparison Group and with FIDM's own short- and long-term goals? It would benefit FIDM to understand at a deeper level as to why some students do not complete their degrees.

Regarding the role program review plays in assessing and improving student success (CFRs 2.7 and 4.1), assessment is an area of strength for this institution. Multiple times a year, FIDM collects both quantitative data (time to degree and achievement of learning outcomes) and qualitative data (alumni perceptions of learning and external perceptions of student work). The number of participants in the alumni survey was low, but getting such information is a normal challenge. One highlight is FIDM's use of predictive analytics (or, as the report calls it, "Intrusive advising"): "students' grades are monitored by academic advisors, who then work with faculty to do outreach when the GPA drops below 2.0 at the close of any quarter". Student services are encouraged to evaluate their effectiveness in ways that mirror the academic side of FIDM, which happens in some programs, such as the career counseling services.

Far less evidence was presented about the extent to which graduates get jobs in their desired fields. The report indicates that FIDM collects data regarding employment multiple times a year. However, despite multiple inquiries, the team only received anecdotal feedback from the FIDM administration. The team was given a list of recent graduates and post-graduation employment information; however, there was no summative analysis of the data or comparative statistics. The team also requested any presentation that describes the employment statistics of FIDM graduates, such as a presentation to the Governing Board; however, no additional information was provided. FIDM's mission statement includes the college's goal to educate students to become leaders in the field. The website and other supporting materials highlight how FIDM's graduates are job-ready and how the FIDM partners with industry experts. Although the team does not have numbers, the team's conversations with alumni, students, and faculty members suggest that FIDM has a strong story to tell regarding the career prospects of its recent graduates. FIDM is encouraged to develop more quantitative tools to track recent graduates so

that FIDM can use data to demonstrate FIDM's effectiveness in educating professional ready for employment.

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

FIDM has implemented QA processes and a program review assessment structure that works well for the institution. These are both driven by data and on cycles that help build improvement. The IR function is alive and well and supports all assessment activity. The development of the "closing the loop" sessions is an innovative way to help ensure there is a full cycle to assessment at FIDM.

FIDM claims that, "Program review is embedded in all phases of educational decision-making"; however, there was no real discussion to help the team understand the whole process and how it loops. While the development of the "closing the loop" sessions is admirable, it is unclear what the outcomes of these are and how are they driving future assessments. Overall, the process is unclear as to where it starts and ends, and as to what data is being used and how. FIDM reports that all but two programs were reviewed in October of 2017; with this in mind, FIDM would be advised to review the process and create a timetable to the cycle that allows programs to be spread out in reviews, so that it does not get overwhelmed by reviewing all programs at once. Again, while FIDM collects and uses specific student data for assessment purposes the data are not always transparent and seem to be reported, at times, with errors. It is recommended that FIDM strengthen the data reporting by using multiple checks and balances to ensure the data is accurate, transparent, and communicated throughout the campus.

Additionally, there are no consistent assessment activities in place for academic support areas, without these FIDM is unable to assess its overall institutional effectiveness.

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

The institutional leadership understands that it must take action to "ensure its long-term financial stability" (Self-Study, page 44) and that just cutting expenses and staff is not the only step for them to take. FIDM made several changes to their existing educational programs and launched their first graduate program, Master of Business Administration, in 2016. At the core of these changes was FIDM's

desire to maintain its “mission driven focus on rigorous, career-relevant degree programs” (Self-Study, page 45) to their students.

The Program Review process integrates feedback from multiple outside constituencies, including advisory boards, industry partners, and associations, rather than just relying on the perspective of faculty, staff and the data provided by Institutional Effectiveness (IE). It was evident during the site visit that faculty believe that the institution is adapting its curriculum and instruction to keep pace with ever-changing technology advancements, while not overlooking the basic skills that their graduates will need to be successful in their field of study.

The Governing Board and Board of Administration have not formally documented their plans to increase their working capital should student enrollment or net tuition and fees not stabilize as shown in their draft multi-year financial plan. While having confidence in the ability to navigate successfully a challenging business environment, as FIDM has been facing since 2010, it is important that the Governing Board openly discuss what actions will be undertaken to bolster their balance sheet. Unlike other privately held proprietary colleges that may have few options, FIDM can investigate strategies to increase its cash reserves without having to take on debt or adversely impact their faculty, staff and students through further expense reductions.

Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes – N/A

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

As FIDM approaches its 50th year, the college is reaching a critical juncture regarding its future. As found in component 9 of the Self-Study, “In discussions across the institute, at every department and branch campus meeting, in working with the Faculty Council and in extensive conversations with individual faculty, the theme that emerged from the process of preparing for this self-study was *sustainability*.” To increase sustainability, the report goes on to indicate that FIDM needs (i) to strengthen the infrastructure that supports the mission of the college, (ii) provide support to the Faculty Council and incorporate it into the governance structure, (iii) develop programs that meet the current and emerging needs of the industry, and (iv) continue to direct resources towards FIDM’s students and educational mission.

The team agrees with FIDM's need to focus on sustainability and agrees with the four areas highlighted in the concluding pages of the Self-Study. The team strongly recommends that FIDM move beyond acknowledging these areas and develop an action plan to guide the institution into its next 50 years.

In addition, FIDM must focus on concrete steps to improve the financial outlook for the college in the current fiscal year. During the team's visit, the team did not hear any turn-around plans to offset the projected deficit. Instead, the team heard that FIDM's leadership anticipates that the enrollment numbers will begin to stabilize in a year or two, which would provide some relief to the budget. In the team's conversation with the Governing Board, the Board did not show a deep understanding of FIDM's enrollment or fiscal challenges. When asked, the Board did not put forth a plan to ensure FIDM's sustainability into the future. The Self-Study report concludes: "FIDM is well-positioned to move into the coming decades." The team agrees with this statement, provided that FIDM begins immediately to engage in the challenging process of closing the budget deficit. FIDM needs strong leadership from the Board and the management team to ensure a sustainable future for FIDM.

The team thanks FIDM for its hospitality and openness during the visit. In particular, the team extends its appreciation to Lisa Schoening, ALO, for her help with all aspects of the visit. FIDM thoughtfully approached their comprehensive review as an opportunity to showcase its progress in student learning, program review, and assessment.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)

Additional Locations.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations:

1. The faculty and staff conveyed a true commitment to student education and the mission of the institution. FIDM's dedication to its students was evident throughout the reaffirmation process.
2. FIDM's mission and strategic initiatives are clearly defined and supported by the institution. FIDM is to be applauded for its attention to industry needs in tailoring programs for its students. To this end FIDM has a clear focus: providing career-relevant education and actively involving industry in shaping the curriculum, building partnerships, and evaluating student projects.
3. The faculty is to be commended on developing the Faculty Council and preparing a comprehensive self-study for the visit.
4. FIDM has used a thoughtful and collaborative process to develop the current strategic plan.
5. FIDM has fostered an impressive culture of assessment. They have systemically aligned assignment rubrics, student learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes with one another and with their mission. The program learning outcomes are evaluated annually using data from faculty and external adjudicators, and outcomes are revised to account for changes in technologies or industry practices, or to better reflect skills/skill levels needed by their graduates.
6. FIDM's facilities, unique learning environment, and curriculum prepares students for careers in the industries represented.

Recommendations

7. FIDM has experienced a multi-year decline in enrollment that has been accompanied by reductions in revenue and net income. The team is extremely concerned about the sustainability of the institution. FIDM is advised to create a concrete turn-around plan based on realistic actions that can be immediately implemented by the Governing Board and Board of Administration (CFR 3.4).
8. Since the last accreditation review, FIDM has developed a set of bylaws for the Governing Board. As found in the bylaws, the responsibilities of the Board include review of academic programs, legal counsel, succession planning, and review and oversight of operating budgets to ensure fiscal sustainability. In the team's view, the Board does not appear to be fulfilling its charge. The team recommends that the Board be expanded to include members with diverse qualifications who can provide leadership suited to the mission of the college and the challenges that it faces (CFRs 3.9).

9. The team recommends the institution increase transparency and communication to all its constituents. FIDM is advised to adopt best practices in financial and enrollment reporting, administrative decision making, data reporting, and changes to institutional policies and procedures (CFR 1.7).
10. FIDM depends on the expertise and commitment of faculty. FIDM needs to expand the role of the faculty in institutional governance, academic oversight, and decision making (CFR 3.10).
11. The educational objectives are recognized through the college and are consistent with FIDM's mission. However, the team recommends that FIDM generate, evaluate, and make public accurate data about student achievement, job placement, and enrollment (CFR 1.2).

APPENDICES

1. Federal Compliance Forms
2. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
3. Marketing and Recruitment Review
4. Student Complaints Review
5. Transfer Credit Review
6. Off-Campus Locations Review, as appropriate
7. Distance Education Review, as appropriate

Federal Compliance Forms

Credit Hour and Program Length Review

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	<p>Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Where is the policy located? http://fidm.edu/en/about/policies+disclosures/Academic+Policies/</p> <p>[box.net >] FIDM - Institutional Report for Reaffirmation S18-F18 > Appendices > Federal Compliance worksheet appendices https://app.box.com/file/279065224429</p> <p>Comments: FIDM’s assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.</p>
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	<p>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</p> <p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: See for example “02.01.Meetings log self-study planning”</p>
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	<p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: See “02.compliance.CLASS HOURS AND BREAKS policy.pdf”</p>
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 2</p> <p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online</p> <p>What degree level(s)? 200- and 300-level undergraduate courses</p> <p>What discipline(s)? Marketing; History (General Education)</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Files reviewed (all that were provided by FIDM): “02.compliance.Online Course Syllabus SMED 2750.pdf”; “02.compliance.Online course syllabus GNST 3000.pdf”</p>
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>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 2</p> <p>What kinds of courses? Internships</p> <p>What degree level(s)? 200- and 300-level undergraduate</p> <p>What discipline(s)? Social Media; Beauty Management</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Files reviewed (all that were provided by FIDM): “02.compliance.Internship Syllabus SMED 2950.pdf”; “02.compliance.Internship Syllabus COSM 3950.pdf”</p>

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 2
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Degree completion
	What degree level(s)? BA
	What discipline(s)? Interior Design, Social Media http://reader.mediawiremobile.com/FIDM/issues/201344/viewer?page=109 http://reader.mediawiremobile.com/FIDM/issues/201344/viewer?page=113
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Marketing and Recruitment Review

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Confirmed with Tess Stolzer, CFO, that FIDM complies with Section 487 (a)(20) and does not provide any incentive compensation for staff directly connected to the recruitment of potential students.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: As a private, for-profit institution, FIDM is required to publish the following statistics on their website for all programs which are eligible for Title IV funds under the Gainful Employment regulations: On-time graduation rates, program costs, average debt for graduates including monthly loan payment, and graduate job field information</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments: The visiting team recommends that FIDM more broadly publishes their in-field placement information for graduates to enhance transparency for all students including applicants.</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.

Student Complaints Review

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? http://fidm.edu/en/about/Policies+Disclosures/Student+Policies/ ; see also: https://elearning.fidm.edu/access/content/group/439e3ef3-5464-4b08-804d-18bfc2dabf4d/DL_complaints.html and http://fidm.edu/wps/wcm/connect/75abbbe5-8d2b-4e53-8ea5-9475c61ddb46/FIDM+Sexual+Misconduct+Grievance+Policy+and+Procedures.pdf?MOD=AJPERES
	Comments: FIDM’s complaints policy conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Informal procedure includes mediation by designated campus representative; formal procedure involves investigation process and possibility of appeal.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where?
	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: Student complaints begin with the program chair and are addressed as needed by administration. The team received a list of student complaints.
	Comments:

Transfer Credit Review

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input 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? http://fidm.edu/en/admissions/transfer+students/transfer+credit+polices/ See also http://reader.mediawiremobile.com/FIDM/issues/201344/viewer?page=217
	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: All transfer policy components are publicly disclosed in the catalog and on the website. There are specific transfer agreements with over 300 institutions. General Policy states: <i>Coursework taken at another accredited college will be considered if there is an equivalent course at FIDM that is required for a specific major and the grade on a course already completed elsewhere is a pass ("C-" or better). Students must request a transfer credit evaluation from the Education Department before or during the first quarter of attendance at FIDM. Applicants for Veterans benefits must be evaluated prior to attending the first class. All documentation of transferred work must be submitted and evaluated prior to the start of the student's second quarter so the student can select the correct classes. Transcripts must be official (stamped and signed by the Registrar of the college previously attended). They become a part of the student's academic file and are not returned or copied for distribution. If a course was transferred in to FIDM but the student enrolled in that class, once brought to the attention of the college, a grade of "W" will replace the grade earned and the transfer class stands. Students currently registered in a class for which the prerequisite course was waived, or equivalent units were transferred from another institution, must go to their Department Advisor (LA) or Director of Education (SF, OC, SD) for approval to receive necessary books (if applicable) distributed in the prerequisite course through College Services. Corresponding supplies may be purchased.</i>

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies.

Off-Campus Locations Review, as appropriate

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

Institution: FIDM Orange County
Type of Visit: reaffirmation of accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Dr. Aaron J Kleist
Date/s of review: 7 September 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. 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

FIDM
17590 Gillette Ave
Irvine CA 92614
949-851-6200

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 regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

Degrees offered: none (first year of the following Associate of Arts programs only)

- Apparel Industry Management
- Beauty Industry Marketing & Product Development (formerly Beauty Industry Merchandising & Marketing)
- Fashion Design
- Interior Design
- Merchandising & Marketing
- Merchandise Product Development
- Visual Communications

Faculty: 6 FTE (variable; includes staff who teach)

- FIDM requires an appropriate academic degree and five years relevant experience in the field for faculty teaching in the majors.
- Length of Service:
 - Nearly all staff, and the majority of faculty, had been with the OC campus for 10-20 years.
- Highest Degree Level:
 - Campus Director:
 - 2-year BA in Communications/Advertising from CSU–Chico
 - 2-year BA in Advertising from CSU–Fullerton

Enrollment: 71 (Fa17)

- 103 in 2016; 32% drop from 2016 to 2017
- 3.3% of total FIDM student population in 2016; 2.6% in 2017
- OC admissions does help recruit and process students for FIDM as a whole; it thus has a greater impact on FIDM than the above numbers suggest.

Established 1981

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

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

- Campus director, Ms. Lynne Stroner
 - FIDM: 10y2m
 - Director of Education & Career Services, 1y5m
 - Content Manager, 1y3m
 - Career Development Advisor, 7y8m
- 5 Education and Student Support staff (4 full-time, 1 part-time)
- 11 Faculty (10 part-time, 1 full-time)
- 7 Admissions and Financial Services staff (2 administrators, 5 line staff)

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The OC campus has a strong sense of self-identity. They distinguish themselves from the LA campus in terms of culture (“flip-flops and longboards” versus “piercing and leather”), “vibe” (relaxed versus formal), and industry (the OC having an emphasis on beach and sport businesses).</p> <p>There were concerns that LA does not recognize these differences, value them, or work to tell OC’s story so as to attract students who would be a good fit for this campus.</p> <p>A universal refrain from staff and faculty alike, however, is their desire to hear directly from the LA executive team.</p> <p>Lines of Inquiry: “3.a. FIDM has developed a comprehensive and responsive strategic plan; in this regard, the team would like to understand how this plan is being operationalized and how it is linked to budget. We would also like to see the sources for funding key strategic initiatives and better understand the assessment and evaluation or process used to modify the plan.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FIDM may more effectively articulate (market) OC’s story and value in its own right. • Executive leadership can more clearly communicate its strategic plan to branch staff and faculty, and include OC leadership more actively in planning.
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>See “Fit with Mission” above.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)</p>	<p>The campus building is sharp, with little obvious sign of deferred maintenance.</p> <p>The environmental space is welcoming, with an open-air plan and spaces dedicated for collaboration, which is reflective of OC culture and surrounding industries.</p> <p>They consistently make their facilities available to surrounding businesses and members of industry, giving students increased networking opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address issues of Wi-Fi, lack of Macs, industry equipment, and perhaps facility staffing.

	Both staff and faculty reported that students' work is hampered by [1] poor Wi-Fi, [2] the lack of Mac workstations, and [3] industry equipment.	
<i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)	Staff report that their career center is a real strength, as they do an excellent job staying connected with the industry. They regularly are asked by companies to refer good alumni to them for employment; as a result, they get insight from industry as to what students need. They also bring industry representatives in to talk about what they look for in job candidates, take students on tours of various businesses, help them assemble professional portfolios, and work with them rigorously to prepare them for interviews. Industry and alumni love FIDM, staff attest; they know that FIDM will produce good candidates for jobs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address overextension of staff; executive team should directly praise their industry and achievement. • Move toward closed-loop assessment of support services practices.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are 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, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)	<p>The faculty have a number of points of concern.</p> <p>Lines of Inquiry: "2.b. How is the Faculty Council working? What progress has been made in the last 8-10 months?"</p> <p>Faculty Council members are full-time faculty who volunteer in LA (even driving up from San Diego to do so). Faculty would love to have a faculty senate and consequently a voice—IF that voice is heard.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty contracts, pay, benefits, advancement, governance, professional expectations and development, training and support, and morale are all serious concerns.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	<p>Lines of Inquiry: "4.d. How does General Studies fit into the larger, industry-focused, curriculum, both culturally and academically? Who assesses the qualifications of General Studies?"</p> <p>In principle, administrators, staff, and faculty echo what FIDM's report suggests: that the alignment of ULOs, PLOs, and CLOs across disciplines and campuses is an important part of institutional culture. Administrators also note that the department of curricular effectiveness in LA can help faculty design learning outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of branch faculty in curricular design is questionable, if existent; consistency of assessment may (understandably) vary in practice between departments.
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	While FIDM has provided WSCUC with information that has been collected (by the main campus, one assumes) on retention and graduation, the OC branch only works with first-year students; consequently, its focus is on the students it has for any given year. It is uncertain to what extent data is kept on the percentage of students that successfully transfer to LA.	

<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)</p>	<p>See "Curriculum and Delivery" above.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)</p>	<p>"Areas for improvement are identified at the institutional and branch campus levels based on data results. What was less clear from the institutional study was the decision-making process across divisions (education, marketing, financial) and across campuses (Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, Orange County) to address improvements. Campus conversations, however, convincingly demonstrated how faculty and staff are active in cross-collaborative discussion about those data including how improvements will make a difference in improving student achievement" ("WASC Pathway B Team Report: Fashion Institute of Design & Merchandising July 16-19, 2013," pp. 13-14])</p> <p>Collaboration between OC and other campuses (particularly LA) regarding strategic planning is not evident. See "Fit with Mission," Lines of Inquiry 3.a above.</p>	

SAN DIEGO

Institution: FIDM San Diego
Type of Visit: reaffirmation of accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: M. Fields & J. Smith
Date/s of review: September 4.

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed². 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.

4. Site Name and Address

FIDM
350 Tenth Ave, 3rd Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
619-235-2049

5. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

Degrees offered: one

- Associate of Arts in Merchandising & Marketing

First year of Associate of Arts programs in:

- Beauty Industry Marketing & Product Development (formerly Beauty Industry Merchandising & Marketing)
- Fashion Design
- Merchandise Product Development
- Visual Communications

Faculty: 7 FTE (variable; includes staff who teach)

Enrollment: 65 (Fa17)

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

SD Campus Leadership – Denise Baca [Campus Director], Linda Eldridge [Director of Education]
SD Student Support Staff – Bethany [Social Work], Kyle [Career Svcs], Jesse Negrete [Library], Robert Opliger [Adjunct Faculty] and Joanie [Advisement]
FIDM San Diego Students
SD Faculty – Susan Nelson-Spencer [FT], Chris Williams [FT], Judith [PT], Teri [PT], Roberta [PT], Robert Opliger [PT]

Campus Tour including Library, Classrooms, Student Submissions with Grading Rubrics

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------------

² See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The FIDM San Diego Campus embraces the mission of the institution by providing an inspirational environment for student learning. The Campus Director [Denise Baca] owns the San Diego Campus budget although final approval of hiring and other investments must be received from Los Angeles Campus.</p>	<p>We should further understand the true autonomy of the Campus Director to own their Budget based on the feedback received during our site visit.</p> <p>There is a top down (from LA main campus) on planning and budgeting activities. The SD campus needs to be included as they know the “culture”</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>From the moment that you exit the elevator and walk into the FIDM San Diego Campus, you no longer feel like you are inside a large office building. The flowing layout, bright colors and unique textures provide a creative background for students, faculty and staff. Co-curricular activities are provided to FIDM San Diego Campus students but they also have the option to attend events for the main Los Angeles Campus as well.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)</p>	<p>The FIDM San Diego campus has a number of different classroom configurations given the breadth of learning outcomes that student will experience as part of their 1st year programs. Each classroom was well designed and was stocked with the appropriate equipment / technology / materials to facilitate student learning.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)</p>	<p>The Library at the FIDM San Diego Campus was well thought out with places for individual and collaborative studies, periodicals and books along with computer workstations. Financial Aid and Student Advising offices were well marked and provided locations where potentially sensitive conversations could be held in private.</p>	<p>How are technology upgrades & support for the SD Campus identified / prioritized?</p> <p>Satisfaction surveys are completed but the campus only sees minimal reports back. The co-curricular areas need to develop specific surveys for their campus/areas.</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are 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, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)</p>	<p>There are currently 2 FT Faculty assigned to the FIDM San Diego Campus with the remainder of instructors being PT / Adjunct Faculty. An independent Faculty Council was established in August</p>	<p>How are PT / Adjunct faculty included in curriculum development, assessment and Program Reviews?</p>

	2015 although no San Diego FT are on the executive committee of the Council.	Faculty did not seem to understand the PR process and their role.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	Based on the feedback from the panel of FT and PT Faculty, the curriculum for the 1 st year students at the FIDM San Diego campus is owned by the main campus in Los Angeles.	Faculty are given everything for a course, the students requested that faculty have more control on the presentations and assignments.
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	The 12 month retention for summer 2017 students for the San Diego campus was the lowest of the four FIDM campuses. The drop rate for this cohort had tripled from the rate of the previous two summer cohorts.	Was the recent change to offering only the 1 st year of instruction at the San Diego campus driving the increase in student drops? How will this be assessed for success? Students expressed a desire to stay at SD to complete their program and not move to LA or SF.
<i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)		How are student learning outcome achievement compared between the different FIDM campuses? Are there material differences in SLO performance amongst the 4 campuses?
<i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)		Again these processes are top down.

No COLA or increases for over 8 years, although the tenure of staff and faculty is admirable (most being there 5-10+years). Faculty and staff are over extended, need to replace positions (i.e. learning specialist, and IT). These positions have not been filled and are needed.

More collaboration from the campus is needed for program development, strategic planning, co-curricular assessments, hiring and replacing staff and faculty, and budgeting.

SAN FRANCISCO

Institution: FIDM SF

Type of Visit:

Name of reviewer/s: Melany Hunt and Ryan Brown

Date/s of review: September 6, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed³. 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

FIDM 55 Stockton St., San Francisco, CA

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

62 part time faculty. 4 full time directors.
332students in 2016; 279 students in 2017.
Campus opened in 1973.

- AA Apparel Industry Management
- BS Apparel Technical Design
- AA Beauty Industry Merchandising & Marketing
- BS Business Management
- AA Fashion Design
- AA-PD Fashion Design
- AA Graphic Design
- AA-PD Graphic Design
- AA Interior Design
- AA-PD Interior Design
- AA Merchandising & Marketing
- AA-PD Merchandising & Marketing
- AA Merchandise Product Development
- AA-PD Merchandise Product Development
- AA Visual Communications
- AA-PD Visual Communications

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

Tour of campus. Meetings with campus director, education senior staff, faculty members, students, student support staff, admissions staff, and concluded with an examination of student work.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	Site established in 1973.	

³ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The SF campus offers AA, BA, and BS degrees at this campus. Students can start and complete their degree at this campus or they can do some of their coursework at another campus. An on-site director oversees the site. This site would like to see more interaction with tech industries in addition to SF clothing industries.</p> <p>The faculty welcome the addition of BA/BS programs to SF campus. There is also discussion of adding evening extension courses; this suggestion is welcomed by SF faculty but initiated by LA.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>This site is significantly smaller in student population than LA site. The faculty do not have regular contact with their counterparts in LA or other campuses; some of the staff have more contact. The faculty indicated that the changes in courses start in LA and then are distributed to branch sites. Students can take classes at other sites, but most do not. Information flows from LA to this site.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The facilities are well maintained and appear to be sufficient for student education (there are no housing facilities at this site).</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>There are many on-site services, such as the Idea Center (for tutoring), a library, an onsite career center, a counselor, and advisors. Students were positive about the level of support.</p> <p>Students would like to have affordable housing nearby; some commute up to 3 hours/day.</p> <p>Hours that building is open have decreased; however, faculty indicated that students don't use space in the evenings.</p>	

<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>The faculty indicated that everyone is part time. Some faculty member teach just one course per year. Many of the faculty have taught at FIDM for many years. They indicated that they are not involved in the development of curriculum that is used over multiple sites; they are very involved in the assessing student learning at their site. Faculty are only hired on a quarter-to-quarter basis, which makes it very difficult to plan.</p>	<p>We need to ask about support for faculty.</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>Faculty at the LA site design programs. They do not see the LA-based program directors.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>The enrollment at SF continues to drop. SF aims to enroll approximately 225 new students each year; currently at 150 students.</p>	<p>Need retention and grad rates by campus. They do not seem to have a plan to increase enrollment.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>In many classes students do presentations associated with their projects. The courses use grading rubrics.</p>	<p>We should ask about comparable grading at different campuses. Are the same rubrics used across campuses?</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The faculty indicated that they used to interact across campuses with regard to curriculum and assessment.</p>	<p>We should also about quality assurance at different sites.</p>

Distance Education Review, as appropriate

Distance Education Review-Team Report

Institution: FIDM

Type of Visit: AV

Name of reviewer/s: M. Fields & R. Brown

Date/s of review: October 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs⁴ 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)

Business Management Program (Bachelors)

Reviewed three courses:

Writing for Business Professionals

Applied Statistics

Studies in Leadership

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)

80% of students take courses on campus only, 16% take "some distance classes," and 4% pure-online. About 10% of those are part-time. These numbers are consistent with previous quarters.

The following degrees are offered online:

1. Associate of Arts (Professional Designation) in Merchandise Marketing
2. Bachelor of Science in Business Management
3. Bachelor of Arts in Social Media (authorized, but not yet offered online)

Last quarter there were 34 "pure online" students, all of whom are BS in Business Management majors. ELearning sections as a whole have 778 students registered; the vast majority of those are on-campus students, almost all of which are fulltime.

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

Accreditation Visit; also reviewed the MyFIDM ePortal, with an example account set up by the FIDM ALO, which includes registered courses, grades, and transfer credits.

⁴ See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>The distance learning program is a fit with the FIDM mission. The curriculum focuses on relevant business management issues for the fashion industry focused student. The program is planned, funded and offered as on-ground programs are.</p>	
<p>Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Distance Ed students attend an orientation and meet with the Education Department can to obtain personalized academic counseling to complete the program. Resources are available to the students, such as library, etc.</p>	
<p>Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>The learning platform is appropriate and academic infrastructure of the site is effective and conducive to learning interaction.</p>	
<p>Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>All services are available to distance ed students.</p>	<p>FIDM does not collect service support data that is relevant to effectiveness of services. FIDM is encouraged to start doing so.</p>
<p>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and</p>	<p>Like on-ground classes, these are primarily taught by adjunct faculty. FIDM employs industry professionals. FIDM department chairs ensure that faculty are oriented and</p>	<p>Development for all faculty is a recommendation.</p>

<p>assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>understand the curriculum they teach. Faculty have a voice through the faculty council, and are highly involved in program review, curriculum design and assessment.</p>	
<p>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>Department chairs, in coordination with the eLearning Education Coordinator and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Comparable to on-ground courses (B.S. Business Management is 91 credits with A.A. as prereq., same as on-ground B.S. Technical Apparel Design).</p>	
<p>Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>FIDM reports an 83% completion rate.</p>	<p>No retention data or other comparable data is provided. FIDM should begin to expand the data used for reporting, as it will help in decision-making.</p>
<p>Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>Assessment of student learning is a strength at FIDM. The program goes through the FIDM program review process and learning is assessed in the same manner as the on-ground programs.</p>	
<p>Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?</p>	<p>No. Everything is developed in-house.</p>	

<p>Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>The Office of Institutional Effectiveness reviews distance education as thoroughly as on-ground courses and majors, specifically through the eLearning Education Coordinator staff position, who acts as the primary liaison, and advocate for, the online student body.</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--