

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
ACCREDITATION REVIEW (PILOT 1)

To Mount St. Mary's College

September 24-27, 2013

Dr. Judith Maxwell Greig, President, Notre Dame de Namur University, Team Chair
Dr. Patricia L. Prado-Olmos, Director, the Alliance/Professor of Education, CSU San Marcos,
Assistant Team Chair
Dr. Marguerite Browning, Vice President for Students Affairs and Dean of Students, Harvey
Mudd College, Team member
Dr. Alice Knudsen, Director of Institutional Research Planning and Academic Assessment, Mills
College, Team member
Espí Sanjana, Chief Operating Office, San Francisco Art Institute, Team member
Dr. Maureen Maloney, WASC Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC 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. 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 WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process	3
B. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	5
C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission actions and Reviews	6
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	6
A. Essay 2.1) Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring their Quality and Rigor	7
B. Essay 2.2) Achieving “Graduation Proficiencies”	11
C. Essay 2.3) Defining and Promoting “Student Success”	16
D. Essay 2.4) Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future, and Planning for the Changing Environment for Higher Education	20
E. Essay 3. Optional Essay on Institution-Specific Themes	22
F. Essay 4. Integrative Essay	22
SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO	23
A. Compliance Checklist	23
B. Self-Review under the Standards	23
C. Required Data Exhibits	24
D. Response to Finance Review, and Retention/Graduation Review	24
E. Continued Momentum in Assessing Student Learning and Program Review	26
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	26
APPENDICES	
A. Compliance Checklist	30
B. Credit Hour	44
C. Student Complaints	46
D. Distance Education	48
E. Marketing and Recruiting	52

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

Mount St. Mary's College (MSMC) is an independent, Catholic, liberal arts college that provides a values-based undergraduate education for women, as well as innovative programs for professional men and women on two historic campuses in Los Angeles, CA. Founded in 1925 by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet (CSJ) as a women's only school, the College mission statement is:

Mount St. Mary's College offers a dynamic learning experience in the liberal arts and sciences to a diverse student body. As a Catholic college primarily for women, we are dedicated to providing a superior education enhanced by an emphasis on building leadership skills and fostering a spirit to serve others. Our measure of success is graduates who are committed to using their knowledge and skills to better themselves, their environments, and the world.

Currently housed at two campuses in the Los Angeles basin, MSMC offers a traditional baccalaureate degree program for women at the Chalon Campus and a range of graduate degree programs (8), traditional and nontraditional associate degree [associate in arts (AA) and associate in science (AS)] programs (10), education credential program and nontraditional adult baccalaureate programs [Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Science (BS)] at the Doheny campus. Aside from the traditional AA program, all other programs at the Doheny campus are offered in evening and weekend formats. The culturally diverse college has 2352 undergraduate and 663 graduate students in attendance. The college website reports student ethnicity as African American 9%; Asian/Pacific Islander 16%; Hispanic 46%; White 15%; Multi-racial/Other 14%). MSMC has an overwhelmingly female population (90%), which is in keeping with the historical mission of MSMC. MSMC is also designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI).

Mount St. Mary's College was granted initial accreditation in 1952. Since that time, MSMC has maintained a consistent schedule of review visits and has been reaffirmed for accreditation. In December 2001, the Senior College Commission confirmed the earlier October 2001 Substantive Change Committee action to approve the MSMC proposal to offer the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT). The Commission further confirmed that in approving the DPT it was not granting the institution general doctoral degree level status. A Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) occurred in October 2002 and an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) occurred in March 2003. The Commission acted to Reaffirm Accreditation in June 2003 and to require a Progress Report in August 2006. The Commission further acted to schedule a Capacity and Preparatory Review for fall 2012 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in fall 2013. In June 2005, the Commission acted to calculate the date of the next review from the date of the Educational Effectiveness Review. The MSMC Capacity and Preparatory Review was scheduled for spring 2013 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in fall 2014. The Interim Report was received in August 2006. In February 2012, MSMC agreed to change to the new visit process. The previously scheduled CPR and EER were changed to an Offsite Review in spring 2013 and an Accreditation Visit in fall 2013. Additional Substantive Change Committee actions occurred in 2012 including approval of an AS in Computer Science and AS in Pre-Health Science (Distance Education) and interim approval for an AA in Business Administration and AA in Liberal Arts (Distance Education).

MSMC includes two campuses but neither is considered an off-site location. The team verified during the Accreditation Visit that the Portmont College at MSMC program has not yet been launched. They are now planning to actually enroll students in January 2014. The information the team was able to gather is presented in Appendix D.

B. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

The MSMC Reaccreditation Report was organized around the requirements of the Pilot 1 review process. The report was well written, descriptive and accurately portrayed the condition of the institution. The report preparation process was integrated into the thinking and strategic planning process at the College. A WASC Self-Study Steering Committee consisting of the President, the Provost, the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Planning and Research, the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management, the Director of Assessment, who was a full-time faculty member, and the Assistant to the Provost were centrally involved in coordinating institutional data and drafting the narrative for the essays. Standards were assigned to different groups across the institution including the President's Cabinet, Chair Deans Committee, Curriculum Committee, Provost's Office, and Provost's Council. A draft of the self-study report and the Self-Review under the Standards were placed on the College Portal and all stakeholders were invited to read the report and offer input. Faculty members were included in the Reaccreditation Report development through the Curriculum Committee and open comment opportunity. The review was a rigorous inquiry with searching questions, appropriate methodology and effective use of evidence. The data and evidence generally supported the claims made by the institution. Through the self-review the institution has clearly identified areas of strength and areas of need in regard to effectiveness, systems of quality improvement and student learning.

MSMC provided an update in response to the Offsite Review summary that generally addressed the team's questions. Some responses provided additional clarity while other responses helped the team to hone questions for the Accreditation Visit.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews

The Interim Report Committee recommended that the Commission receive the interim report “with the understanding that the linkages between the budget and planning should be the subject of an examination as part of the next regularly scheduled WASC review.” The MSMC Response to Previous Reviews and Commission Actions notes that planning guides resource development at MSMC. The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan Report serves as evidence that MSMC devotes resources to achieve strategic goals. Additionally, the 2005 Master Plan guided a 5-year comprehensive campaign, *Invest in the Mount*, which surpassed its fundraising goal ahead of schedule so that the capital projects were completed and paid for in total.

The MSMC Reaccreditation Report described the visioning and strategic planning process that occurred in 2012 and led to the 2013-2018 Strategic Plan, *Innovation for Excellence*. Evidence gathered through interviews during the Accreditation Visit indicates the College community believes the process was inclusive, thoughtful, extensive and built on the mission and values of MSMC.

Since the last Interim Report (2006) MSMC welcomed a new President, Dr. Ann McElaney-Johnson in 2011 and Dr. Wendy McCredie as Provost in July 2013. Another major change at MSMC is the development of Portmont College that is a partnership with the non-profit MyCollege Foundation. Portmont College is designed as a cohort-based, fully online educational delivery system and will offer four Associate degree programs (AS in Pre-Health Science and Computer Science, AA in Liberal Arts and Business Administration). (A short face-to-face orientation and skills building course is designed for the beginning of the program.)

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

The team considered all the available evidence to conduct its evaluation of the institutional essays. Evidence included the MSMC Reaccreditation Report (Report), Response to

Offsite Visit Summary (Response), Compliance Checklist, WASC Required Data Exhibits, Self Review under the Standards, Compliance Supplemental Material, Reaccreditation Supplemental Material, Response to Previous Actions, 2013-2018 Strategic Plan, Remarkable Service Reports, Alumni Report, a Campus Showcase and other materials provided to the team. In addition, team members interviewed numerous individuals and groups including the President, the Provost, the WASC Self-Study Steering Committee, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Vice President for Information Support and Enrollment Management, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, the Assessment Task Force, Program Assessment Liaisons, Remarkable Service Advisory Committee, Enrollment Management Director, Student Life, Curriculum Committee, Committee on Academic Planning, faculty, staff, and students.

A. Essay 2.1) Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring Their Quality and Rigor

The team takes the meaning of a degree to comprise the institution's mission, the character of its academic program, and its approach to student development. For an institution like MSMC, the mission is the most important of these. A living mission guides the institution at every level, from setting strategic goals to creating course assignments to organizing co-curricular activities. Every generation of faculty, staff, and students must engage with the mission in ways that are appropriate to the social and historical context of their time, thereby revitalizing and reconstructing the meaning of the degree. Assessment provides a means of ensuring that the core values expressed in the mission permeate the academic program and the daily business of the College. It also ensures that the quality and integrity of the education delivered is maintained while creative engagement with the mission evolves.

The MSMC mission is clearly alive and well. Evidence of ongoing engagement with the mission can be found in the Five Pillars of Distinction that are at the heart of the 2013-18 Strategic Plan. The founders' goal "to educate women to reach their full potential and to address the needs of all, as 'the dear neighbor,'" has led the College to commit to a strategic plan that includes cultural fluency and global awareness, the advancement of women in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math), community engagement for social justice, and mobilization of technology to support innovative pedagogy, all based on values that would be instantly recognizable to the founders. Indeed, an explicit commitment to the charism of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet is not only a key element of the Strategic Plan, it was voiced repeatedly by the President, members of the President's Cabinet, the trustees, the faculty and the staff during the Accreditation Visit (CFR 1.1, 1.2).

Faculty, staff, and trustees spoke enthusiastically of the extent to which they were included in the process of developing the Strategic Plan and, more importantly, the extent to which they see their concerns and ideas reflected in the plan. MSMC's leadership, and in particular, President McElaney-Johnson, have modeled an inclusivity and commitment to community that exemplifies the mission (CFR 1.3). Through this process, the College leadership has set the bar high for inclusivity, transparency, and communication. The community clearly expects the leadership to continue as they have begun, especially since achieving the goals of the first three years of the Strategic Plan will require significant effort from all MSMC constituents.

The Report and Response both document the efforts of the College to ensure the quality and rigor of its degrees, that is, to ensure that in both the General Studies (GS) curriculum and in the departments, the mission is being enacted through the academic program. Across the GS curriculum, Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) are assessed using shared rubrics that are themselves assessed and refined in an ongoing fashion (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4). Program Learning

Outcomes (PLOs) and assessment plans have been developed for all academic and seven co-curricular programs. Course learning outcomes, for courses not in the GS curriculum, are based on PLOs and stated in the course syllabi (CFR 2.3, 2.4). Assessment efforts are coordinated by the Assessment Task Force (ATF), supported by Program Assessment Liaisons (PALs), reported to the faculty on a regular basis in a variety of ways, and incorporated into program reviews (CFR 2.4, 2.7).

At the broadest level, these efforts are intended to assess whether the mission is being carried out within the undergraduate curriculum and co-curriculum. In order to know whether this is working correctly one needs to answer two questions:

- I. Do the ULGs (Undergraduate Learning Goals) flow from the mission and the ILOs/PLOs flow from the ULGs?
- II. Do the assessments of the ILOs/PLOs demonstrate that the ULGs are being achieved within the context of the mission?

Table 1-S in the Response models the bi-directionality of these relationships.

Question 1 may be answered simply by examining the mission, the ULGs, and the ILOs/PLOs. In other words, Question 1 asks whether the College has operationalized the mission meaningfully. Both the Reaccreditation Report and the Response describe how the ULGs flow from the mission. Table 1 on p. 10 of the Report shows the links between the ULGs, the ILOs, and the components of the General Studies curriculum. MSMC has clearly operationalized its mission meaningfully.

Question 2 is more complex. To quote the Response "upward arrows reflect that the learning outcomes at the course and program levels support the college mission." This should be true not only of the formulation of the learning outcomes (i.e., are they formulated so as to accurately reflect the content of the college mission?) but of the results of assessing the learning

outcomes (i.e., are MSMC's students actually learning what the mission says they will learn?). The latter can only be evaluated by examining student performance. Essay 2 of the Report describes undergraduate student performance in Quantitative Literacy, Critical Thinking, and Written Communication. That essay will be discussed in detail in the next section, but it should be noted that assessments in these three areas had two different types of results, both of which yield valuable information.

Result 1: In the case of Quantitative Literacy, 2011 assessment results show that the outcomes are being achieved, but faculty observations suggest otherwise. It is noted that faculty "are considering a redesign of the assignment to be assessed." This is essentially the same outcome as a 2008 assessment of Critical Thinking in the departments of English, Nursing, and Philosophy. Examining student learning led to a realization that assessment tools apparently are not measuring what the College intends to measure.

Result 2: A 2012 assessment of Critical Thinking in English and Philosophy courses showed students were not achieving learning outcomes to the desired level. This led to revising the rubric, revising one of the courses assessed, and expanding learning support services. This is similar to the results of a 2011 assessment of Written Communication performed by the English department, which led to examining placement, considering standardization across courses, and exploring new pedagogies. Examining student learning led to the realization that courses were in some ways not achieving outcomes and resulted in substantive changes to those courses (CFR 3.2, 4.6, 4.7).

In both cases, the College used the results of examining student learning outcomes productively, either to modify the assessment process (Result 1) or to modify educational practices (Result 2). This is exactly the kind of process one would expect to find in an institution committed to ensuring the quality and integrity of its degrees.

MSMC has made a significant commitment to maintaining the quality and rigor of its degrees by instituting widespread, ongoing assessment practices. The Report claims that the assessment process is faculty driven and on the Accreditation Visit the team found that assessment efforts are led by faculty committees, faculty across all departments are involved in assessment, and many faculty reported that they had seen the beneficial effects of MSMC's assessment efforts. Although some faculty reported having difficulty in matching the prevailing model of assessment used by MSMC with their department's practices, they were nevertheless eager to learn more about best practices in their fields and spoke hopefully about the Provost's commitment of resources to make this possible. Many faculty also expressed a desire to learn how to focus their assessment efforts more strategically and to understand more clearly how their assessment practices connect with the goals of the Strategic Plan.

B. Essay 2.2) Achieving “Graduation Proficiencies”

In its essay “Achieving Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation,” MSMC introduces their General Studies Program, describes the linkages between it and courses taken at the upper division and graduate levels, and presents the assessment of three of the core competencies: Quantitative Reasoning, Written Communication and Critical Thinking. The overall assessment process, rubrics and standard of performance are discussed, as well as the reflection on and communication of the assessment results.

WASC Standards (those effective prior to the recent approval of the 2013 Handbook) delineate the set of core learning abilities and competencies that provide the breadth and depth necessary to prepare undergraduates for “work, citizenship, and a fulfilling life,” serving as a guideline for baccalaureate programs. These learning abilities and competencies are clearly embedded in the General Studies Program at MSMC, which is delivered at the lower division level. The relationship of all existing General Studies goals/outcomes to the WASC learning

abilities and competencies are presented succinctly in the “Comparison of WASC Core Competencies with MSMC Core Competencies” table. An exception is Information Literacy, which, while described as being previously “infused across the undergraduate curriculum,” is included as a newly added General Studies outcome (New Outcome 12). These, considered Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) at MSMC, are assessed at the lower division level on a regular basis by faculty from across the disciplines. The standards of performance for each outcome at each degree level are delineated on the rubrics used to evaluate student work and on the curricular maps (CFR 2.2a, 2.3, and 2.4).

Ensuring that student achievement for the ILOs at graduation is regularly and systematically assessed relies on the learning in the General Studies areas being infused in the learning taking place within all of the individual academic programs at the upper division level. While some of the connections between these abilities and competencies on the lower division and upper division levels were identified at the time of the writing of the Report, MSMC recognizes the “crucial” role that program goals play in relation to the ILOs and the need to complete a thorough examination of these linkages. The College has purchased a software program TK20 to provide such a structure and to facilitate this process. The intent is for all academic programs to “map” their program objectives to the General Studies objectives within this system so that the connections are established and clear to all responsible for determining their students’ level of achievement at graduation. At the time of the writing of the report TK20 was to be implemented in fall 2013. The visit to the College confirmed that this was the case; however, there was evidence to suggest that the rollout of the system was not widely known nor the purpose completely understood (CFR 2.3 and 2.4).

According to MSMC’s self-review in the appendix, “competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.” Guidelines

for course syllabi do contain a directive to include goals and objectives for the specific course. These were present on the syllabi reviewed and students appear to be aware of them. However, it is not clear that these objectives specifically include the ILOs and/or the goals established by each major program (CFR 2.2).

In terms of the demonstration of student achievement, the assessment of student learning at MSMC is taking place at a robust pace for the General Studies outcomes, overseen by the Chair of the Assessment Task Force. With three of the goals assessed each semester, a full assessment of all eighteen general studies goals is accomplished in three years. While a comprehensive summative assessment is not evident in the Report, thorough summative assessments have been completed for three core competencies: Critical Thinking, Quantitative Literacy, and Written Communication. The Report provides ample evidence, mostly direct and some indirect, of the results of these assessments that indicate students on the lower division level “do not achieve at the desired level,” for the competencies assessed, but that at the upper-division level, “students generally are achieving proficiency at desired levels.” In the Response, MSMC makes it clear that “steps are being taken to increase the learning of lower division students particularly in the areas of critical thinking and written communication.” In addition, TK20 is identified as being able to provide information on the development of these competencies as students progress through their courses. Therefore, still needed is for MSMC to complete its mapping of outcomes for undergraduate students via TK20 and to begin the comprehensive assessments that will assure them that these students are meeting all of the key learning outcomes by the time they graduate. A redesign of the General Studies Program is under discussion, and the institution hopes that this discussion will both simplify and make clearer the connections between the GS competencies and the program objectives (CFR 2.6).

It is clear that the institution is committed to building and continuously refining its assessment processes, and within those processes providing continuous communication with and among the faculty, and including a process of continuous evaluation of the assessment processes themselves at the program level. In addition, the assessment processes are faculty driven, from groups of faculty establishing the standards applied in the evaluation of student learning to the assignment of faculty PALs who are responsible for the coordination of assessment work at the program level, and the Data Retreats and Rubric Scoring Parties where faculty gather to reflect on assessment results and prepare action plans to improve teaching and learning (CFR 2.4).

There are always challenges, e.g., assuring the proper alignment of the assignments with the measures being assessed, controlling faculty bias, obtaining an adequate sample size, etc. It is clear that faculty members are paying attention to such issues and mitigating them where possible.

Any discussion about improving learning depends on the benchmarks established. Both internal and external benchmarks are essential to draw appropriate conclusions from the data on student learning. In the case of MSMC, external benchmarks have been provided in the past through their use of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to measure students' critical thinking and writing skills. In addition, in the future the institution is planning to engage in joint research projects that will provide external benchmarks going forward, at least for learning goals that will be the subject of these studies.

Internal benchmarks are present, but not accompanied by a clear rationale. For example, there are different benchmarks established for the measures of Critical Thinking, from the goal of 85% of students being proficient or above in the ability to recognize assumptions, and develop and assess an argument, to only 50% being proficient or above in "recognizing the values that form the basis for assumptions." The benchmark for written communication, on the other hand,

is that 75% of students will be proficient or above. In some cases, the internal and external benchmarks conflict, such as in the case of the Critical Thinking assessments.

Where the results warrant, actions for improving student learning are delineated. For example, MSMC is examining course placement, considering more standardization in coursework and assignments, and exploring pedagogical approaches to developing writing proficiency in response to the assessment results that indicated less than desired student achievement in written communication. In addition, the program assessment report guidelines include the question, “How have you used assessment data to transform your curriculum, pedagogy, and faculty teaching in support of student learning?” While the answers to this question in the documents provided are not always indicative of thorough reflection on the part of each department, the obvious intent is to identify gaps in student achievement and to “close the loop” at the department level as well as the General Studies level.

On the graduate level, all programs “confirm that their students have achieved an acceptable level of learning prior to graduation” through their capstone experience. There is ample evidence of the assessment activities taking place on the graduate level; however, each assessment appears to be an annual report of one specific learning goal, and of the reports examined, none indicated that a capstone experience was used to confirm the overall proficiency of the students (CFR 2.2b).

In conclusion, MSMC has created assessment practices that include the identification and publication of measures of student learning, the assessment of those measures, and the reflection on and communication of the level of attainment of their students. The best practices, however, are seemingly mostly on the lower division level, thus limiting the degree to which MSMC can be clear about the level of attainment of its students at graduation. However, methods have been identified to strengthen assessment at all levels, particularly at the upper division level. The

implementation of these measures and the ongoing training of faculty to refine their assessment practices will facilitate quality assessment at all levels.

C. Essay 2.3) Defining and Promoting “Student Success”

The College’s mission also serves as a guidepost for student support services designed to enhance student success. As reviewed and evaluated in the Team Report sections 2.1 and 2.2., MSMC’s Report articulates expected student learning outcomes at the undergraduate and graduate levels (CFR 2.13).

MSMC promotes student success through institutional programs, initiatives, offices and activities. Specifically, MSMC engages in what they refer to as their Student Success Initiatives. These initiatives support transition to college, academic advising, early identification and warning of at-risk students, academic intervention, and institutional support services for mental and physical health. MSMC also utilizes several federally funded grant initiatives. MSMC provides a Title IV TRIO program, a STEM initiative targeting female, low-income students, and two Title V funded projects. The Title V projects address student engagement and academic needs for undergraduate and graduate Latino and low-income students. Each project is focused on critical retention and persistence challenges and provides support mechanisms to surmount the potential barriers to academic success. Except for the TRIO program, the other federally funded projects began between 2009 and 2011. The programs are in the implementation phase, though the College reports there are early indicators that these programs are having a positive impact. The team endorses MSMC’s plans to closely monitor, assess, and evaluate the Student Success Initiatives’ outcomes (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan included a goal for remarkable service across MSMC. To achieve this goal, the College created the Remarkable Service Committee. The committee developed a new, streamlined cyclical review process for student and college services. This

college wide process uses core measures to evaluate all the services, and sets a college-wide performance standard (80% “good” to “remarkable” ratings). The review process was approved in 2008 and a pilot phase was completed in 2008-2009. Students at both MSMC campuses provided anonymous feedback using an online survey administered by Institutional Planning and Research (IPR). The review process was expanded to include 28 functional areas that directly or indirectly serve students. Comprehensive reports with goals and objectives from each area are submitted to the Remarkable Service Committee. Results from the review process indicate that 19 of 28 areas met or exceeded the remarkable service performance standard. While not every area met the standard, some areas improved their remarkable service ratings (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13).

Interviews revealed that the Remarkable Service Committee evaluation and assessment process is now an integral part of how MSMC supports student success. The multi-year review calendar is designed so that common areas of service are evaluated at the same time. For example, offices in the finance area are scheduled for assessment in the same cycle. This strategy creates a comprehensive view of services (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13).

The Remarkable Service Committee works closely with departments undergoing review to implement the evaluation, analyze the data and develop conclusions and goals for the future. The Committee described examples of “closing the loop” with the evaluation process. For example, Food Services completed a review in 2010 and found that “friendliness” and “knowledge” were problematic at the Chalon campus. The College provided intervention and training and the next review indicated that these issues were remedied.

The Remarkable Service Committee also supports evaluation efforts of the Student Success Initiatives described above. Interview evidence revealed the Initiatives have been able to

improve delivery and student support as a result of the collaborative relationship with the Remarkable Service Committee (CFR 2.10, 2.11).

MSMC utilizes a comprehensive course evaluation process to “ensure a high quality learning environment.” Course evaluations are administered online by the IPR, and responses are anonymous. Response rates are about 50% with some departments and courses achieving higher rates. Instructors, department chairs, deans and the Faculty Status Committee routinely review course evaluations. Course evaluation items cover the content, organization, and delivery of course content. MSMC provides evidence that average instructor evaluation ratings for items relating to the learning environment are consistently above 6 on a 7-point scale (CFR 2.10).

MSMC administers a national survey designed to help MSMC monitor students’ self-assessments of growth in academic skills. IPR annually administers the College Senior Survey (CSS) and yields response rates ranging from 30% to 45%. The CSS items do not correspond directly to MSMC student learning outcomes. To address this gap, MSMC added items to “capture insight into our students’ perceived growth in terms of the SLOs established at MSMC for the General Studies Curriculum.” MSMC reports that results are positive and most MSMC students feel they have strong abilities and understanding in a Liberal Arts education. As a measure of student success, the CSS serves as indirect evidence of student learning that supplements the systemic evaluation of student learning conducted by faculty through course rubrics (CFR 2.10).

MSMC’s report on retention and graduation was comprehensive and detailed with deep analysis and reflection that clearly linked to actions. Interview data revealed that MSMC personnel carefully evaluated the data and outcomes of the retention and graduation report. The 2013-2018 Strategic Plan also shows that MSMC is working on ways to improve retention and graduation results (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

During team interviews related to the institutional analysis of the retention and graduation report, MSMC staff expressed concerns with African American student retention and graduation rates. As the team explored this concern, broader issues arose. The team revealed problems with the mentoring and retention of faculty of color, and the nature and tone of some classroom interactions. Students expressed a keen interest in having an Ethnic Studies minor at the College. The team learned that MSMC does not have a designated Diversity Officer. MSMC reported that responsibility for addressing diversity issues and goals has been infused across the campus under a model of shared responsibility. This model has led to a degree of inattention to diversity by the institution. MSMC would be well served to actively engage the community in discussion about these issues. The discussion should include the study of new curricular and pedagogical practices, and best practices in supporting students, faculty, and staff of color, as well as other groups that experience some degree of disenfranchisement from the MSMC identity (CFR 1.5, 2.10). MSMC has tremendous resources (diverse student population, dedicated faculty, historic commitment, supportive administration) to engage diversity issues in meaningful ways (CFR 1.5). As MSMC implements the Strategic Plan, increased student success should be supported and achieved.

MSMC promotes student learning in the classroom and through support programs across the campus. The initiatives and programs described in the Report, and supported by interviews, target the broad student population at MSMC while also attending to small sub-group needs and individual students. The effectiveness of these programs is demonstrated by student satisfaction results, course evaluations and the CSS. These measures provide evidence of program effectiveness of student success as defined by MSMC. Evidence indicates MSMC has the framework of a systematic assessment system for supporting student success. It is critical for

MSMC to continue to engage in assessment and review and to clearly utilize the data to improve program quality, content, and delivery (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

D. Essay 2.4) Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future, and Planning for the Changing Environment for Higher Education

MSMC has been issued unqualified audit reports. Years of surpluses have resulted in MSMC being in a strong and stable financial position. This has been further complemented by the endowment reaching the \$100 million goal laid out in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, an achievement considering that this period included the meltdown of financial markets in 2008 – 2009, which had a devastating impact on endowments. Operating Surpluses have allowed MSMC to move significant amounts – \$4.4 million in 2011-2012 and \$5 million in 2012-2013 – into the endowment. MSMC will utilize its financial strength to meet its growth objectives, presently limited by space constraints (CFR 3.5).

The November 20, 2012 letter from the WASC Financial Review Committee states that "enrollment efforts be highlighted as part of the Institutional Reaccreditation Report." The Report discusses Enrollment Management in detail on pages 51 throughout 56, the section on Institutional Capacity. Institutional Capacity involves much more than enrollment management and some of this is discussed in the Response.

Space constraints are an issue, especially at the Chalon campus. During interviews, space constraints arose repeatedly across campus groups. Faculty reported lack of lab and instructional space, while staff noted constrained office space as well as instructional space. MSMC is currently following a Campus Master Plan that will be completed by spring 2014 and will address some of the evident space issues.

MSMC must continue to address the growth of faculty to support Institutional Capacity and the changing educational environment. As described in the Response, MSMC appreciates

some of the changes taking place and plans to address them in the 2013 –2018 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan objectives and Key Performance Indicators did not address growth of faculty. MSMC believes strongly that MSMC's commitment for their students to "think deeply and critically and communicate thoughts with clarity and confidence" will continue to meet the needs of the changing educational environment (CFR 3.2, 3.3).

Instructional technology (IT) capacity and growth is critical for all educational institutions. MSMC hired an IT consultant to evaluate the present status of technology at MSMC. The consultant identified "four main thrusts." As stated in the Response and confirmed in interviews, the President and the Cabinet are planning its implementation. Implementation should be considered a foundation for the new Strategic Plan. The new Campus Master Plan will address the IT infrastructure needs that result from the new Strategic Plan. MSMC is fortunate in having a Trustee with significant technical expertise at a strategic level and willing to support the technical needs of MSMC (CFR 3.6, 3.7).

The structure under the Vice President for Information Support and Enrollment Management needs to be rationalized. The Vice President has been given responsibility for areas where there are issues to be resolved, which, after resolution, are moved to a rational place within the organization structure. For example, a significant portion of IT support personnel and functions were outsourced in the mid-1990's in a contract that met the needs of the College at that time. Changing technology needs have gone beyond the services specified in the outsourced contracts. At this juncture the College will move many IT services back in house.

The Portmont initiative will allow for increase in capacity without additional space.

MSMC's report includes goals for their marketing and recruiting practices. The team urges MSMC to articulate specific action plans with timelines to achieve these goals.

E. Optional Essay on Institutional-Specific Topics

MSMC did not include an optional essay.

F. Integrative Essay

During the same time that the MSMC community was preparing for the WASC reaccreditation process, it was concurrently undertaking a strategic visioning process leading to a new Strategic Plan. In the words from many across the campus, that visioning process has revitalized the campus. The Five Pillars of Distinction are widely acknowledged as capturing the core values of the community for a new generation. All constituencies were enthusiastic about the inclusiveness of the visioning process and were impressed to see their thoughts and ideas integrated into the plan and the objectives for the first three years. Those objectives, which serve as the framework for an implementation plan, include overall Key Performance Indicators and specific initiatives with timelines for each of the three strategic goals. The backbone of the plan includes the development of five Centers or Institutes, one for each of the Five Pillars of Distinction. The team was struck by the mission alignment of the plan, the inclusive process of development, the campus enthusiasm for the plan, and the attention to specificity of detail. At the same time the team wonders about the capacity of an institution that views itself as understaffed and under resourced to implement the plan, especially five centers, in the stated timeline. Because the centers will be launched by amalgamating and streamlining what already exists, the leadership of MSMC believes the plan is feasible (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

Student support services to ensure student success represent a core attitude and commitment of virtually every person at MSMC. The student is considered and served as a whole individual, mind, body, and spirit. Student growth and transformation motivates and inspires the daily work of faculty and staff and the guidance of the trustees.

SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

A. Compliance Checklist

A review of the MSMC Compliance Checklist by the WASC liaison and by the team assured that MSMC fully complies with all required policies and documentation. While MSMC has no specific document labeled as an academic plan, the team concluded that significant academic planning was taking place.

B. Self-Review Under the Standards

Appropriate personnel conducted an institutional Self-Review under the Standards; the President's Cabinet had particularly strong involvement in the review, with academic administrative personnel involved in the review of Standards 2 and 3 as well. The full report was posted on the campus portal for additional comment and contributions. The team concluded that sufficient attention was given to this review outside the senior administration. MSMC has a healthy evaluation of its own strengths and areas for improvement. The commitment to mission and longtime investment in educational assessment are self-identified areas of strength, which are affirmed by the team. The institution recognizes need for ongoing progress in the consistent measurement and benchmarking of student learning outcomes at the various levels and across the various programs; as in most institutions there is significant variability. There is the self-identified need to develop an information literacy institutional outcome and an interest in getting employers and other external stakeholders more involved in assessment. They are currently undertaking a review of the General Studies curriculum. There is a recognized need to have the number of faculty and staff personnel keep pace with the recent growth in enrollment and increased demands in areas such as institutional research. It is acknowledged that faculty and staff development are also important, particularly in more effective use of instructional technology and information resources. Other specific areas for growth noted by MSMC include

ongoing attention to faculty diversity, a review of the faculty handbook, and an upgrade of IT functionality for degree audit.

C. Required Data Exhibits

MSMC presented the Required Data Exhibits in thorough, standard fashion. Too many programs are identified as not making use of the results of assessment data and processes, particularly programs that are not housed in a single academic unit. Secondly the target performance for students does not appear to be consistently identified for all programs.

D. Response to Previous Reviews, Including Commission Actions, Finance Review, and Retention/Graduation Review

MSMC shows ongoing attentiveness to WASC Commission concerns and has demonstrated positive intent to issues of importance, including enrollment and financial growth and student success.

The analysis of graduation and retention was presented in the document, “Student Success at Mount St. Mary’s College.” This document was a comprehensive review of one year retention, 4 year, 6 year, 8 year and later graduation rates, and elapsed time to degree disaggregated by level, degree, program (traditional or nontraditional), student type (e.g. first year, transfer), gender and race/ethnicity. In the context of these data, MSMC has gone into detail about what they have learned from the metrics, particularly at the undergraduate level, how these metrics compare to those at similar institutions, and the initiatives in which the College has engaged to support their students toward being retained and to ultimately graduate.

On the undergraduate level, the analysis is precise and detailed, and includes a lengthy list of initiatives, including “intrusive” academic advising, special services, special courses and programs, a learning resource center and an academic enrichment institute. These initiatives are each described in detail with their purpose clearly stated. In several cases, data were also

provided which illustrated the positive effects of the intervention. For example, in reporting on the Counseling and Psychological Services, data were collected that provided clear evidence that the service was perceived by the students as support that helped them stay enrolled at the College.

Graduation and time-to-degree for graduate students is also described in detail, along with the challenges faced by MSMC in determining and responding to the data, such as the lack of traditional “in residence” periods for some programs. In addition, given the “subtle but important differences in the way...degree programs are structured across institutions,” comparative data on graduation rates and time-to-degree was apparently challenging to find. What was available, however, is included in the report, and MSMC is focusing efforts to improve their data collection and reporting capabilities in this area. The data for graduates are presented by degree; however, after discussions about the meaning of the data on the graduate level, it was determined that providing the data by discipline would facilitate more meaningful discussion and planning. Both program and institutional initiatives to improve the graduation rates of graduate students are included in the report.

The report is not comprehensive, however, in its analysis of the connection of the myriad initiatives directly to the retention and graduation rates. In other words, the data are not disaggregated in such a way as to identify the relative merits of each initiative in terms of its ability compared to others to increase the rates. However, a start to this process is presented in the document, “Proposed Strategies to Enhance Retention and Graduation at MSMC.” This document presents a list of strategies, those involved in following through with each strategy, the population served, and the metrics used to measure the success of the strategy. In addition, the Accreditation Visit revealed that each initiative is regularly assessed and these assessments

monitored by the Remarkable Services Committee thus ensuring continual improvement in the level of their effectiveness in supporting students through to graduation.

E. Continues Momentum or Assessment of Student Learning and Program Review

Evidence submitted in the electronic exhibit portfolio indicates MSMC has a robust assessment and program review culture. MSMC has an Assessment Task Force that oversees assessment of student learning, and the Curriculum Committee oversees program review. Summary evidence submitted for the 2011-12 academic year indicates programs fall along a continuum of development for learning outcomes articulation and assessment. The program review cycle is established and sustained throughout the institution. The MSMC Assessment Handbook provides a helpful roadmap for all curricular programs.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

The comprehensive review process at Mount St. Mary's College and the strategic visioning and planning process which happened at the same time have served to accomplish the purposes of reaffirming the College's core commitments to institutional capacity, to educational effectiveness, to its own historic mission re-envisioned for the women in 21st Century Los Angeles, and to the growth and transformation of students' lives.

The team was impressed by the depth of commitment to students articulated by faculty and staff across both the Chalon and Doheny campuses and experienced by students on a daily basis. Specific commendations are as follows:

- The mission of the College, as created by its founders, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, and recently reinterpreted in the Five Pillars of Distinction, is widely discussed, broadly accepted, and deeply held by the members of the campus community (CFR 1.1, 4.1).

- The strengthening of the fiscal resources of the campus over the past decade is remarkable. Significant enrollment growth, strong operating returns, and conservative budget and endowment management have contributed to a vastly improved financial base. Trustees and management in particular are to be commended for their stewardship of assets (CFR 3.5, 3.9).
- There is strong support for the current leadership. The recent strategic visioning and planning process appears to have captured the imagination and excitement of the campus. The inclusive nature of the process was noted repeatedly by trustees, faculty, and staff. The objectives and timeline for the first three years give considerable specificity and concreteness to the broader initiatives. The administrative cabinet members work together as a team to shape a unified approach to campus challenges (CFR 1.3, 2.8, 4.1, 4.2).
- The academic administration and faculty of MSMC are clearly engaged in assessment of student learning and program review and using those efforts to improve academic programs. The faculty PALs have shown leadership in ongoing assessment efforts. The new Retention and Graduation Report produced by MSMC for WASC demonstrated deep analysis and reflection which is clearly linked to action (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10).
- Support staff take pride in serving students well. Mount St. Mary's has developed a unique approach to reviewing support services to ensure ongoing improvement in support for students across the campus with its Remarkable Service Committee. The metrics appear to be effective in assisting programs in improving perceptions of service, the cycle is timely and manageable, and the process is supportive of the variety of services that are evaluated (CFR 2.13, 4.4).

The team appreciates the commitment to ongoing improvement at Mount St. Mary's and in that spirit makes the following recommendations:

- MSMC should continue to provide ongoing assessment training for faculty and student affairs personnel. Assessment efforts can be focused to be more strategic and meaningful in nature, to provide information to faculty to help better understand student learning in a way that matters to the faculty. The capacity and rationale for the TK20 system needs to be broadly understood; in addition, technical training in the TK20 will be necessary as the implementation is rolled out to the broader campus (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 4.7).
- Because space is a serious concern, acknowledged for both campuses, especially Chalon, the College must complete its current master planning process, particularly in light of the anticipated continued increase in campus enrollments over the next five years (CFR 4.2).
- Campus leadership, trustee, administration, and faculty, must monitor the Portmont at Mount St. Mary's College project. Lack of student enrollments have pushed out the launch date an entire year from initial plans; primary recruitment strategies have moved from high schools and agencies to employers and students experiencing challenges in other online environments. The team could not reconcile the challenging new college enrollment targets with the claim that the project is not about student enrollments. The team recommends continued monitoring to ensure that the project achieves the primary stated goal of building institutional capacity in innovative online pedagogies to position the College well for the changing ecology of higher education (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

- MSMC needs to reaffirm its historic commitment to diversity. Relative inattention to concerns of pedagogy, curricular offerings, hiring practices, and organizational practices have led to some dissatisfaction, evidenced particularly among faculty and students of color. Students expressed interest in an Ethnic Studies minor. African American faculty and staff see a need to mentor the next generation of African American students. The campus diversity statement is not evident on the website. Perhaps because past diversity efforts on the campus utilized an infusion model, there is currently a lack of ownership and thus leadership for ensuring a welcoming academic environment for all students (CFR 1.5).

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Checklist
- B. Credit Hour
- C. Student Complaint
- D. Distance Education
- E. Marketing and Recruiting

Compliance Checklist**Name of Institution:** Mount St. Mary's College**Offsite Review Date/Accreditation Visit:** May 28/September 24-27 2013**Instructions to institution:**

Please provide a link to each document designated below. Be sure that the reviewer will be able to see where this document is published. If you do not have the exact document that is specified but have some comparable document, please provide a link to that document.

We expect to conduct this initial compliance checklist for all accredited institutions once. In subsequent reaccreditation reviews, you will be asked to update the documents if they have been revised.

Instructions to team:

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report as appropriate.

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
1.1	Mission statement	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/mission-statement.asp		OK
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/provost/assessment.asp In addition, each department has an "Assessment" page to indicate Goals and Outcomes.		OK
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention/graduation, student learning)	WASC Student Success and Achievement Report posted on Institutional Planning and Research Webpage and Portal sites http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/institutional_planning_and_research/Student-Success_Retention-Graduation-and-Time-to-Degree-in-Context.pdf	We have also published a new report on alumnae achievement at: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/institutional_planning_and_research/Academic%20Achievements%20of%20Recent%20Alumnae.pdf	OK: page 7 of the printed 2012-2014 with supplements catalog, under the mission statement.
1.3	Organization chart (Also see 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	WASC Document 1.3		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
1.4	Academic freedom policy	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-resources/Documents/Academic%20Freedom-Fair%20Use%20Policy.docx	Original link was to a Portal location. This is the link to it on the website (see p. 81): http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDF/files/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf	OK
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; procedures for accommodations re disabilities	http://www.msmc.la.edu/disabilityservices		OK
1.6	Documents setting forth the authority of a corporate, governmental, religious organization or system that is affiliated with the accredited institution	<u>WASC Document 1.6 Articles of Incorporation</u>		OK
1.7	Catalog (online) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	http://www.msmc.la.edu/campus-resources/college-catalogs.asp		OK
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm	Correct Link to Student Handbook: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDF/Files/student-life/msmc-student-handbook-2012-2013.pdf pp. 62-66	OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
1.7.2.1	Grade appeals policy	http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/student-life/msmc-student-handbook-2012-2013.pdf (Page 63) This links to the current location of the Student Handbook, but it will eventually move to a future "Policies & Handbooks" page on the Portal.		OK
1.7.2.2	Records of student grievances	Locked storage in Student Affairs Office (H200)		OK
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFfiles/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf Section 2.2.5.1		OK
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	Provost's Office		OK
1.7.4	Staff grievance policy	http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/human-resources/staff-employee-handbook-2012-2013.pdf	Correct Link: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/human-resources/staff-employee-handbook-2013-2014.pdf Section 2.4 p.3 and Section 5.1 p.17 Page numbers provided are printed at the bottom of the document	OK
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances	<u>WASC Document 1.7.4.1 Records Retention Policies</u>		OK
1.7.5	Employee handbook, if available	Staff: https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/human-resources/Documents/Staff%20Employee%20Handbook.pdf	Correct Link: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/human-resources/staff-employee-handbook-2013-2014.pdf	OK
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	<u>WASC Document 1.7.6.1</u>		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	Graduate Admissions Drawer in Imagenow		OK
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p.46 http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/college-handbooks.asp p.183	This information is published in the Catalog and Student Handbook, but difficult to provide a direct link to a specific section of the online document. Please see Grading Policy and Grade Change Form on Compliance Audit flash drive.	OK
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/business-office/tuition-and-fees.asp		OK
1.7.6.5	Tuition refund policy	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p.32		OK
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit; processes for review of assignment of credit; review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p.35		OK
1.7.6.7	Policy on human subjects in research, if applicable	http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/research-with-human-subjects.asp		OK
1.8	Independent annual audits of finances (also see CFR 3.5)	<u>WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2011;</u> <u>WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2012</u>		OK
1.9	Policies to ensure that WASC substantive change policies are followed	Faculty Handbook, Section 2.2.3.3 (Curriculum Committee) http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/college-handbooks.asp (Faculty Handbook)		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
1.9.1	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation;	<u>WASC Document 1.9.1</u>		OK
1.9.2	List of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation	<u>WASC Document 1.9.2</u>		OK
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (also see CFR 1.7)	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm</u> p. 49 (associate), p. 61 (baccalaureate), and p. 83 (graduate)		OK
2.2	Syllabi for all courses offered	<u>http://msmc.angellearning.com/</u>	See sample syllabi on the Compliance Audit Checklist flash drive.	OK
2.2.1	For associate and bachelor's degrees: General education requirements (Also see CFR 1.7)	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm</u> p. 51 (associate), p. 37 and 63 (baccalaureate)		OK
2.3	Student learning outcomes for every program	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/provost/assessment.asp</u> In addition, each department has an "Assessment" page to indicate Goals and Outcomes.		OK
2.4	Grading standards	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm</u> p. 40		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
2.5	Class participation policies if available	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p. 34; https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx	Original link was to a Portal location. This is the link to it on the website: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFfiles/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf see faculty HB Section 3.3	Class participation policies at the institutional level are not relevant to MSMC; they have attendance policies and leave participation policies to each instructor and class
2.6	Placement data if available	WASC Document 2.6 (Placement Criteria)		OK
2.7	Program review process/guidelines	WASC Document 2.7: Program Review Guidelines		OK
2.7.1	Schedule of program review (including reviews of non-academic units)	WASC Document 2.7.1		OK
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 1.3; 1.5	Original link was to a Portal location. This is the link to it on the website: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFfiles/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf	OK
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, overall and disaggregated (link to the standard templates for retention/graduation reports)	Standard data templates available on Institutional Planning and Research website at http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/institutional_planning_and_research/Retention-Graduation-and-Time-to-Degree.pdf		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	Institutional Planning and Research has developed dynamic web reports which are available at the course, department, and degree program level, and updated each term. These are iStrategy reports which may be made available via a guest log-in, or reviewed on-site		OK
2.10.3	Policy on student evaluation of faculty	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/institutional-planning-and-research.asp	See p. 7 Status Procedures Manual on flash drive.	OK
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/institutional-planning-and-research.asp	This link does not provide the form. See the Course Evaluation Form on the flash drive	OK
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/student-life/Pages/default.aspx Student Affairs is moving many of their services to the portal – this is an ongoing process, but should be done by the end of November. Hopefully, we can be more specific at that time. http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p. 74 (Chalon); p. 54 (Doheny)		OK
2.11.1	Financial aid policy and procedures	http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/tools-for-academic-career-success/student-financing.asp WASC Document 2.11.1		OK
2.12	Academic calendar (also see CFR 1.7 catalog)	http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/registrars-office/academic-calendars.asp		OK
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year, including scripts for recruitment	Traditional undergraduate publications on request at: S:\Universal\Admissions\Publication PDFs		The institution's provided evidence of their recruitment and advertising materials; they do not use scripts

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
2.13.1	Procedures for students to register	https://webadvisor.mount.msmc.la.edu/WebAdvisor/WebAdvisor?TYPE=M&PID=CORE-WBMAIN&TOKENIDX=824768177 Web Advisor is also available via the Portal.		OK
2.14	Policy on transfer of credit	http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm p. 43		OK
3.1	Staff development policies	http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/college-handbooks.asp (Staff Employee Handbook)	See flash drive for: Summary of Staff Development Resources.	OK
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program (link to relevant data exhibit)	<u>WASC Document 3.2</u> Master list in Provost's Office: Rank History document		OK
3.3	Faculty hiring policies if available	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx		OK
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures (Also see CFR 2.10)	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 1.5 https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-resources/Pages/default.aspx Status Procedure Manual	1. See Section 1.5 of the Faculty Handbook at this location: http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFiles/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf 2. See Status Procedure Manual (separate document) on Compliance Audit Checklist flash drive	OK
3.3.2	Faculty handbook or equivalent	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Documents/Faculty_Handbook_Sep_2011_Revised%20edition.pdf		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
3.4	Faculty development policies	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 1.5.1	Not correct information. See Program Enhancement Grant and Professional Development Grant Applications on Compliance Audit flash drive	OK
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-resources/Pages/default.aspx	Good link, but it is a Portal site. There is also information on the website at: http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/provost/faculty-resources.asp . See also: http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/provost/faculty-resources/new-faculty-orientation-materials.asp	OK
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 1.2.2	http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDF/files/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf Faculty Handbook Sections 1.2.2 and 1.5 on pages 1 and 8-11	Responsibilities documented on page 3; institution is updating section 1.6 of the faculty handbook and will include PT instructors
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 3.3 https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-resources/Pages/default.aspx Status Procedure Manual p.5		OK
3.5	Last two years audited financial statements (Also see CFR 1.8)	WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2011 ; WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2012		OK
3.5.1	List of financial records maintained	WASC Document 3.5.1		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
3.5.2	Last two years' financial aid audits	<u>WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2011;</u> <u>WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 2012</u> WASC Document 1.8 and 3.5 (Financial Aid is part of Financial Audit)		OK
3.5.3	Last federal composite score if applicable	<u>WASC Document 3.5.3</u>		OK
3.5.4	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates	<u>WASC Document 3.5.4: 2 year</u> <u>WASC Document 3.5.4: 3 year</u>	This would take you to documents provided on the original flash drive, but team indicates the links don't work. See duplicates on new flash drive.	OK
3.5.5	Campus maps	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/our-campuses/driving-instructions.asp</u>		OK
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	<u>https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/support-services/information-technology/Pages/StudentTechnologyResources.aspx</u> <u>https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/support-services/information-technology/Pages/default.aspx</u>	See Technology Inventory on the Compliance Audit flash drive.	OK
3.6.1	If online or hybrid courses, information on delivery method	<u>http://msmc.angellearning.com/default.asp</u>		OK
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	<u>http://www.msmc.la.edu/academics/libraries.aspx</u> Library information is also on the Portal – and will eventually move exclusively to the Portal.		OK
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	<u>https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/support-services/information-technology/Pages/default.aspx</u>	See Technology Inventory on the Compliance Audit flash drive.	OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
3.8	Organization chart (Also see CFRs 1.3 and 3.1)	WASC Document 1.3		OK
3.9	List of governing board members	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/board-of-trustees.asp		OK
3.9.1	Governing board member biographical information	WASC Document 3.9.1		OK
3.9.2	List of governing board committees with members	WASC Document 3.9.2		OK
3.9.2.1	Minutes of board meetings for last two years	WASC Document 3.9.2.1		OK
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	WASC Document 3.9.2.2		OK
3.10	CEO biographical information	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/presidents-welcome.asp ; WASC Document 3.10		OK
3.10.1	CFO biographical information	WASC Document 3.10.1		OK
3.10.2	Other senior administrators' biographical information (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	WASC Document File 3.10.2		OK
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	Sent annually – forms built and hosted on the external website.	See President Evaluation document on flash drive.	OK
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority if applicable	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx faculty HB Section 2		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
3.11.1	Faculty governance organization chart if applicable	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/faculty-resources/Documents (Chapter 2)	http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDF/Files/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf See Chapter 2 for description. There is no faculty governance org chart.	Not applicable
3.11.2	Minutes of the last year's faculty meetings	S:\Universal\FacultyAssemblyMinutes\	See Faculty Assembly Minutes on flash drive.	OK
4.1	Strategic plan	http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/strategic-plan-2007-2012.asp		OK
4.1.1	Operations plan			As a part of their master plan, which is currently being developed for the next cycle.
4.1.2	Academic plan	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/personnel-services/provost-office/Pages/default.aspx		The institution does not have a written academic plan, albeit CAD and interviews with other constituents confirmed that academic planning is happening
4.1.3	Technology plan	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/organizations/org-oitt/default.aspx This is the IT Team Site – it requires specific access credentials.	See Technology Plan on flash drive.	OK
4.1.4	Facilities plan	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/support-services/facilities/Pages/default.aspx		As a part of their master plan, which is currently being developed for the next cycle.
4.2	Description of planning process	<u>WASC Documents folder 4.2</u>		OK

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	Updates	WASC Liaison Review
4.2.1	Process for review and monitoring of strategic plan/metrics	For the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan, the Vice Presidents provided status reports annually to the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Planning and Research. These updates were compiled in a comprehensive Strategic Plan Status Report (see http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFFiles/institutional_planning_and_research/strategic-plan-status-update-final.pdf)		OK
4.4	New program approval process	WASC Document 4.4		OK
4.4.1	Program review process (Also see CFR 2.7)	WASC Document 2.7		OK
4.5	Description of institutional research function and staffing	https://portal.mount.msmc.la.edu/faculty-staff-resources/institutional-planning-and-research/Pages/default.aspx http://www.msmc.la.edu/about-msmc/institutional-planning-and-research.asp		OK
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (Also see CFR1.2)	Retention and Graduation Rate data presented to all faculty (at Convocation), President's Cabinet, Board of Trustees, Education Affairs Trustee Subcommittee, Chairs and Deans, Graduate Council, and Retention Committee		The IR research calendar reflects the systematic review and analysis of data
4.8	List of major industry or other advisory committees	WASC Document 4.8		OK

Team Comments:

Accuracy and Availability of Records: Team Only		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	Yes
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	Yes, access and availability can be improved
	Records are accurate and up to date	Yes

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Mount St Mary's College

Date: 25 September 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? Yes. Where? In catalog and on course syllabi	Yes
	Where is the policy posted? In the catalog and on the course syllabi.	
	Comments: 100% of the syllabi reviewed contained the federal definition of a course credit	
Process(es)/ periodic review	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)? No evidence of this was found.	No
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? N/A	
	Comments: The reviewer was unable to find any indication that the institution has such a procedure.	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	Yes
	Comments:	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online	Yes
	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4	
	What degree level(s)? AA/BA	
	What discipline(s)? Sociology, Religious Studies, Spanish	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? Yes	
	Comments: The federal definition of a credit hour is present on all syllabi.	
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)	What kinds of courses? Nursing Practicum	Yes
	How many syllabi were reviewed? 1	
	What degree level(s)? Baccalaureate	
	What discipline(s)? Nursing	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? Yes	
	Comments:	
Sample program	What kinds of programs? Undergraduate, ADN Undergraduate, Accelerated Nursing Undergraduate, Weekend Format, Graduate, MSN & ADN to MSN, DPT	

information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? All	
	What degree level(s)? All	
	What discipline(s)? All	
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? Yes	Yes
	Comments:	

C. STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Mt. St. Mary's College

Date: September 26, 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	No
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>1) Unlawful harassment and discrimination are defined on the website: http://www.msmc.la.edu/catalog/2012-2014/index.htm. Students are instructed to report grievances to grievance officers listed there.</p> <p>2) A separate policy for discrimination under the ADA is located here: www.msmc.la.edu/disabilityservices. A separate grievance procedure exists: http://www.msmc.la.edu/student-life/disability-services/disability-grievance.asp</p> <p>3) Information on how academic grievances are handled is found in the faculty handbook starting on p. 59. http://www.msmc.la.edu/PDFfiles/provost-office/faculty-handbook-2011.pdf</p> <p>Although these policies and procedures are on the website, they are not located in one place and are not easy to find. Procedures for 2 and 3 are spelled out in detail. Procedures for 1 are less clear.</p>	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: See above.	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Records of complaints related to harassment and discrimination, as well as student conduct issues, are maintained by the Dean of Students office. Complaints related to academic grievances are maintained by the Provost's office.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	In progress

	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The Division of Student Affairs has recently purchased Maxient, a case management and tracking software. This will be used to record and track student complaints along with other information.</p>	
--	---	--

Rev 9/2013

D. DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Mt. St. Mary's College

Name of reviewer/s: Maggie Browning

Date/s of review: September 26, 2013

The team verified during the Accreditation Visit that the Portmont College at MSMC program has not been launched. They are planning to launch the program in January 2014. The team was therefore unable to report on most of the topics listed below. The information the team gathered is presented below.

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

III. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Portmont College at MSMC

IV. 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)

Associate degrees in four majors are planned. Platform developed by MyCollege Foundation.

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

Program described in Report; meeting with MSMC leadership, provost of Portmont, CEO of MyCollege Foundation.

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

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	MSMC believes that Portmont College will allow them to deliver a high quality education at a lower price point to their target constituencies. Contract with MyCollege allows MSMC to approve all courses, course content, and faculty hiring. MyCollege was chosen because of fit with mission. Program will be supported by tuition (\$275/credit) paid to MSMC.	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	The plan is that students of Portmont will not be integrated into the life of the residential college.	
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Unknown - the program is not yet operational. The plan is for it to include student access to faculty and a success coach.	
<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Unknown.	

<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Any MSMC faculty may teach in the Portmont program. In addition, adjuncts may be hired specifically for that program. Answers to other questions unknown.	
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	MSMC faculty. MSMC. Unknown.	
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	Data do not exist because program has not been launched.	
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Unknown.	
<i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i> ?	Yes - MyCollege. Unknown.	

<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>Unknown.</p>	
--	-----------------	--

Rev 8/2013

E. MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Mt. St. Mary's College

Date: September 26, 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Y
	Comments: Many institutions recruiting in Asia use agents who are paid on an incentive basis. MSMC has not decided how MSMC will address this issue.	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Y
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Y
	Comments: On Website and on application – length of time to degree. May change when student changes major when in senior division. Cost information on site.	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Y
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Y
	Comments: On web site. Each department also provides the information. Career Services also provides that information.	

*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.