

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

Pilot 1

To Concordia University Irvine

March 26 - 28, 2014

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Jonathan Parker, Provost,
California Baptist University
(Team Chair)

Alexander Granados, Vice President for Academic Affairs,
The Master's College and Seminary (*most recently*)

George Latter, Vice President for Finance Administrative Services,
Point Loma Nazarene University

Nancy Lecourt, Vice President for Academic Administration
Pacific Union College

Seri Luangphlinith, Chair of Humanities,
University of Hawaii at Hilo

Richard Osborn, WASC
(staff liaison)

The team evaluated the institution under the 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. The report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and the Reaccreditation Process
- B. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor
- C. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission action and Reviews

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Essay 2.1: Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their quality and rigor
- B. Essay 2.2: Achieving “graduation proficiencies”
- C. Essay 3: Defining and promoting “student success”

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

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Audit
- B. Federal Compliance Checklists
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist
 - 3. Student Complaints Checklist
 - 4. Transfer Credit Policy Checklist
- C. Offsite Locations
 - 1. CUI Arcadia Branch Campus
 - 2. CUI Temecula Regional Center

SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

Concordia University Irvine (CUI) was founded in 1972 as Christ College, Irvine, a liberal arts college affiliated with The Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. Receiving WASC accreditation in 1982, its name was changed in 1993 in response to a decision by the sponsoring denomination to unite its ten colleges into the Concordia University System.

Today, CUI serves over 4,000 students and offers an associate of arts degree, twenty-nine majors for its bachelor's degrees, six master's degrees with ten emphases, and a doctorate in education. CUI is organized into five schools: the School of Arts and Sciences; the School of Business; the School of Professional Studies; Christ College, its school of theology and church professions; and the School of Education. Its largest undergraduate major is business administration.

The main campus of CUI consists of seventy hilltop acres in Orange County overlooking the Pacific Ocean, and provides a home to over 1,000 residential students. CUI has offered adult degree-completion programs since 2001; its largest master's programs, in Education and in Coaching and Athletic Program Administration, are offered both on-line as well as in face-to-face modalities. CUI offers degrees at eight regional centers and serves many students through on-line and blended programs. The University has 137 full-time faculty, more than 200 adjunct faculty, and more than 200 full- and part-time staff.

The mission statement of CUI is as follows:

Concordia University Irvine, guided by the Great Commission of Christ Jesus and the Lutheran Confessions, empowers students through the liberal arts and professional studies for lives of learning, service and leadership.

CUI's recent accreditation history begins in February of 2006 with a Commission letter reaffirming reaccreditation and requesting a Progress Report in spring 2010, to review steps taken related to "institution-wide implementation of strategies for assessment of student learning and linkage of performance data to institutional curriculum and resource planning." A Capacity and Preparatory Review was scheduled for fall 2012 and an Educational Effectiveness Review for Spring 2014.

At essentially the same time, the Commission approved a Systems Review, authorizing Concordia to implement off-campus and distance programs until February 2010. Over the next four years, CUI received approval for a variety of new degrees, new regional centers, and new on-line programs. In May of 2010, the Interim Report, including a financial update, was received and approved.

In January 2012, CUI agreed to become a pilot institution for the new visit process, scheduling an off-site review for spring 2013 and an on-site review for fall 2013 (since changed to spring 2014 at the institution's request).

Between 2011 and the present, CUI has successfully received approval for six regional centers and two on-line master's degrees in theology. A request to add a first doctorate, in Education, was approved by WASC in July 2013.

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

The report from CUI was clearly written and presented, with helpful organization and accessible electronic materials. The candor of the report was commendable, and the institution presented itself honestly.

The University Educational Effectiveness Committee took the lead in preparing the report, though many other faculty and staff across campus were also involved. The report represented a careful review of the institution's mission, strategic initiatives, assessment practices, and financial status. Evidence was provided to support claims, either electronically or on site.

Response to Issues Raised in Prior Reviews

The accreditation team finds that there are no issues trailing from the 2010 Interim Report that have not been addressed in the current report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Essay 2.1: Meaning, Quality, and Rigor of Degrees

CUI has a clear sense of mission and purpose, reflected in core documents. The university has spent considerable institutional time and effort defining its identity and mission through a strategic planning process. The resulting identity statement articulates key concepts, including vocation, responsible citizenship, co-curricular activities in harmony with the mission, and a commitment to face-to-face, online and blended instruction, distance education, and several degree levels (CFR 1.1).

This initial work was then translated into institutional student learning outcomes and a new core curriculum for baccalaureate degrees. Outcomes have recently been defined for general education, associate's degree, and graduate programs, and assessment plans are in place. Rubrics defining expectations of graduates have been developed in many areas, while more are in development. The first part of the essay focuses on the meaning of the bachelor's degrees, as CUI was founded as a bachelor degree-granting institution (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3).

Undergraduate Learning Outcomes (ULOs) comprise eight outcomes which, taken together, represent the meaning of a bachelor's degree from CUI. These new learning outcomes include the core competencies expected of all undergraduate programs, defined using Lumina's Degree Qualifications Profile and the AAC&U's VALUE rubrics, while also describing expectations specific to CUI's Lutheran mission "to prepare wise, honorable, cultivated citizens," including "Christian Literacy and Faith" and "Service to Society and Church." A survey of first-year students revealed a relatively high level (68%) of

familiarity with the mission and undergraduate learning outcomes, attributed to the required Freshman Seminar (CFRs 1.2, 2.4).

The “new” (now in its fourth year) core curriculum is both rigorous and effective, employing interdisciplinary approaches to foundational questions and providing integration by means of linked pairs of courses. The fact that students must “earn” a withdrawal, by demonstrating a serious attempt to engage with the course, is also indicative of rigor. A considerable amount of tutoring is available to students who need help meeting the challenges of this “great books” curriculum based on close reading and analysis. The new curriculum seems to have caught the imagination of students, who are invited into a dialogue about epistemology, faith, and responsible citizenship. The core effectively structures the student experience and prepares students in their first two years for the rigors of disciplinary knowledge and systematic inquiry in upper-division courses in the major fields of study (CFRs 2.2a, 2.5).

The growth of distance, on-line, adult, and graduate programs has meant that CUI must work to ensure that all students meet appropriate learning outcomes. For example, the planned online AA degree is based on newly formulated General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) and assessment is being built into the degree from the beginning. Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) are also in place and an assessment plan has been created, with the first GLO (Scholarly Research) to be assessed in 2014-15 (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b).

New faculty and staff are integrated into the CUI mission and community by means of the Faithfulness and Excellence seminar, which is adapted yearly depending on the participants. The purpose of the seminar is for new and established colleagues to

“examine faithfulness to our church-related identity in harmony with excellence” in their various roles on campus. The Lutheran mission, historic contexts, liberal arts formation, and the CUI focus on “wise, honorable, and cultivated citizens” are explored and discussed, and participants are asked to articulate their own perspectives through a poster presentation. Adjunct faculty are given a formal orientation to the university in fall. In general, the adjunct faculty feel supported with campus resources and included in a variety of planning and assessment activities (CFR 3.3).

Essay 2.2: Achieving “Graduation Proficiencies”

The Commission letter of March of 2006 issued to the institution identified “Assessment of Learning” as an area of “continuing progress” that had spurred “intense interest” that was “overshadowed by a ‘last minute quality’” (“Commission Action letter,” p. 2). The current team finds that the implementation of annual assessment of program learning outcomes (or APLO) reports addresses this concern by imbedding such processes into the actual working culture of the institution. The annual reporting is now in its third year, with marked improvement in both the quality of data collection and in the attitude of faculty, who appear to be much more honestly engaged with the process and with assessment results in AY 2013-2014. Many departments, to their credit, transparently reported disappointing results and thoughtfully engaged in “closing the loop.” One outstanding example was the Theatre Department, which reported that only 2 of 8 senior papers scored above a 2.5 (on a scale of 1-4), meaning that majors were exhibiting poor skills in locating, analyzing, and synthesizing information. This finding led to a recommendation to improve the curriculum in lower-level classes, where more time would

be devoted to “teaching students deeper thinking and in creating and synthesizing information to generate original thought” (CFRs 1.9; 4.4; 4.7).

What was not initially clear from the reports was the relation of sampling sizes (N) to graduating numbers within a major; however, discussions with the Theatre and Business Departments indicated that sampling sizes were at 90% or better for these programs. This indicates a commitment to assessing as many exiting students as possible. Such annual gathering of exiting seniors will be very helpful in making the overall Program Review process more manageable for programs, which can compile these annual reports to look at student performance over time. Other helpful suggestions in this regard include to begin looking at entry “points,” such as gateway courses within their disciplines (e.g., Management 201) and to facilitate longitudinal tracking of student performance once programs have built confidence and aptitude for more sophisticated levels of assessment. This last suggestion will help the institution move toward benchmarking work identified by CUI as one of the next steps in the overall long-term plan for the campus (“Institutional Report” 19-20). It may also be helpful for the institution to start thinking about how this data collection could be compiled to see if it produces a profile of student performance across the institution—a move that would align with WASC recommendations in the 2014 Handbook regarding assessment “at a point close to graduation” and whether exiting students are meeting the expected level of performance set by the institution (28) (CFR 2.7).

In terms of co-curricular assessment, the institution has done a remarkable job in setting up methods of assessing SLOs that are actually tied to academic ones (ILOs). Of specific commendation is the assessment report provided by the Center for Student

Leadership and Development, which mapped the activity called Concordia Cares to “students’ ability to carry out Concordia University’s mission in service to the community.” This linkage between the academic and the co-curricular arms of the institution carries the potential for a fully integrated level of assessment that is exceptional. The rather low populations and response rates across the board for many co-curricular assessment activities, including Concordia Cares ($N = 5$) suggests more work may be needed to attain statistical validity; however, a strong base has been established for this work (CFR 2.11).

One area of concern that the institution has done exceedingly well in addressing is the “marginalization of the Assessment Committee,” which was cited as functioning “more as a consultative body than a driving leadership force within the larger University setting” (“Commission Action Letter,” p. 2). In 2007, the institution established the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC), which combined the Assessment Committee with the Accreditation Steering Committee into one body that reports directly to the Office of the Provost. As of AY 2013-2014, the Committee includes the Director of Human Resources, the Dean of Student Affairs, a Data Analyst from the Registrar’s Office, the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, several faculty from a variety of departments, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Provost. This broad range of representation from across the campus, including individuals from outside the academic division, is commendable. The Committee has provided strong leadership in terms of revamping and streamlining the Program Review Guidelines and the Program Review Handbook to make the process more meaningful for faculty. It has also developed core ILOS clearly linked to both the institution’s unique mission and identity and to the five core competencies required by WASC (CFRs 2.2a, 2.7, 4.6).

While this group is tasked with the (1) monitoring of SLOs and recommendations made by accreditation agencies, and (2) establishing cycles of assessment for levels of student attainment and of degree programs, some faculty noted that the body itself did not provide much feedback on the data collection apart from a simplified summary of findings. In addition, concerns were expressed over the sometimes very short notice of changes to assessment designs (including the sudden dropping of the ETS) and target goals that made assignments and artifacts appear off-base from the “intended” assessment. As the university continues to become more confident and capable in its methodologies, more inclusive long-term communication and planning with departments may alleviate what can be seen as arbitrary decision-making by administration to “get things right,” though it is clear that standardizing of key competencies and metrics (including rubrics) are commendable goals as noted in the institution’s report (“Institutional Review” p. 20).

The university has also taken strides in providing resources for assessment leadership. In 2008, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness consisted of a director and an assistant with some support provided by the Registrar’s Office. With the director’s retirement, the office was dissolved and functions split between the Registrar’s Office, the Chair of the EEC and the Provost’s Office. Since AY 2011-2012, an institutional researcher was hired to restore that data collection under one entity; this individual was sent to the Assessment Leadership Academy in AY 2012-2013 to help further spur the development of authentic assessment on campus. In addition, the university regularly sends various members of the EEC to assessment-related conferences and workshops (including the ARC) to ensure more than just one “Assessment Champion,” creating a better chance for momentum to continue (CFRs 2.4, 4.5).

Some faculty expressed the need for data to be reported back to them in a more timely and useable fashion. One individual noted that sometimes data is sent in “raw form” and that the department had to then spend time inputting that data into spreadsheets and then running analyses, which fell outside of this person’s area of expertise and comfort. Given the more rigorous data reporting that will be required by WASC on retention and graduation in addition to assessment and other needs on campus, it may be in the best interest of the institution to expand the capacity of IR so that it can meet the growing data needs of the campus.

Lastly, while the institution’s report made no mention of distance versus face-to-face assessment, evidence was found in the MAED APLO report for AY 2013-2014 that comparisons were being done on theses of students in MAED 580/581 and 605 courses. Overall, online courses did not show a marked difference from face-to-face; however, disaggregated data did show poorer performance by distance learners on evaluation criteria 2.2 (literature review analysis and synthesis) and 2.7 (compare and contrast theories of literature) and better performance on evaluation criteria 1.7 (purpose, intervention outcomes) and 4.4 (triangulation results, combine data sources, logical conclusions). In this aspect, the institution has already laid the foundation for addressing what will be a major assessment challenge in the future: the further development of such studies as more and more programs begin to emerge in different modalities (CFR 4.4).

Overall, the university has made considerable improvements since 2006 and is to be commended for moving towards a culture of meaningful assessment. Sustaining such a high level of performance may prove challenging given some faculty perceptions that

“avoiding fatigue” is one concern for the future. Settling into a sustained and predictable habit of inquiry in the near future now seems both possible and desirable in this regard.

Essay 2.3: Defining and Promoting “Student Success”

At the time of the accreditation review, the evaluation team observed that the university “has long engaged in a wide variety of activities designed to enhance student learning in and out of the classroom, to improve retention and graduation rates, and to coordinate academic and co-curricular activities.” The university’s 2010 strategic plan focuses on four major themes; “The Student Experience” is one of them. The strategic plan was updated in 2012 to include a focus on enhancing the graduate and adult student experience. The university revised its institutional learning outcomes and submitted its first-ever retention and graduation rate reports to WASC in 2012. Various members of the faculty and staff developed a collaborative student success plan that previously had been difficult to coordinate. In fall 2012, the university effectively crafted a definition of student success that focuses on the achievement of student learning outcomes within the framework of the university’s mission emphasizing learning, satisfaction, persistence, and graduation.

The university reports that it has a retention rate for full-time freshman of 75% and a six-year graduation rate of 52%. The institution has not set an official target for its full-time freshman retention rate, but senior leadership regularly mentions 80% as a goal. As part of the 2010 strategic plan, the university has committed to an aggressive goal for improving its six-year graduation rate to 63%.

After reviewing all the information provided by the university, members of the evaluation team met with personnel from the university and listened to presentations in which they described their process for identifying students at risk and the many programs and services that they make available to students. The team concluded that the university is seriously committed to the success of its students.

The university has created a sustainable infrastructure system for the enhancement of student success. The ability of an institution to embed the processes of assessment into its on-going, daily activities adds assurance that the institution will sustain a culture of assessment over time. It also represents an institution's commitment to improvement whether or not the institution is undergoing accreditation review (CFRs 1,2, 2.7, 2.13).

The university has an exemplary commitment to student success. The administration, faculty, staff, and students verbalize and demonstrate a genuine belief that curricular and co-curricular assessment not only improve student success but also improve faculty pride in their work in curriculum development and redesign, administrative decision-making about strategic planning, and communication across departments and between administration and faculty. These explanations of their commitment to student success were repeated consistently in all interviews the evaluation team conducted with all constituents (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13).

Evidence of the understanding of learning and service assessment was observed and recorded by the evaluation team in interviews with faculty, students, administrators, and staff. In addition, evidence of the logistical systems and protocols for assessment was demonstrated by reports generated, plans and instructions for assessment protocols,

program review templates and rubrics, timelines and schedules, learning outcomes, and specific curriculum changes in courses and programs (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14).

Of particular interest was the work of the Office of the Dean of student success. The student success plan incorporates the following improvement initiatives:

1. Enrollment – a vastly expanded close advisement program (Wings I) was created for incoming students who are at high risk for attrition because they barely meet the university's admission standards. A program (Wings II) was created for students on academic probation, dismissed/reinstated dismissed. Another new bridge program (Wings III) was created for incoming students who are first-generation college students and therefore at high risk for attrition.
2. Academic support – a Student Success Committee was created that focuses on identifying and removing obstacles to student completion, enhancing tutoring programs, improving quality of service to students, and finding new approaches to improving retention and graduation rates while maintaining the university's commitment to academic rigor and high-impact educational practices.
3. Research, training and education - key faculty and staff are engaged in research and education (retention research and theory, student development theory, and student engagement theory) to improve their understanding of student success and the factors that influence it. In collaboration with the Dean of Student Affairs a set of living learning communities in the residence halls were launched in fall 2013. The Office of Residential Education and Services, in consultation with the Student Affairs Office, the Dean of Student Success, the Director of Core Curriculum and the Associate Provost, developed a detailed plan for living learning communities, each of which are

led by a faculty or staff member who lives in the residence halls near the students and who lead a variety of activities designed to foster greater student interaction around academic topics: the Holos House, which serves students who support each other in making a holistic set of wellness and healthy lifestyle choices; Wings, which serves students who marginally meet the university's admission standards; Global Village, serving both international students and domestic students interested in study abroad and international travel/learning opportunities; and CUI Bono, which draws its members from an existing student organization of the same name, devoted to academic excellence and rigorous intellectual inquiry. Two more living learning communities will be added in 2014-15.

4. Student persistence – in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research, retention and graduation rate data is being gathered, analyzed and distributed in greater detail to stakeholders in order to develop strategies to serve students more effectively. A major part of this work focuses on disaggregating and analyzing retention and graduation data with respect to gender, ethnicity, and first-generation student status, in order to develop a predictive model that identifies populations of students at high risk for attrition.
5. Student satisfaction – a coordination of all surveys and focus groups (i.e. co-curricular, school, student status) provides a comprehensive assessment strategy.
6. Non-completers – an advising plan for non-completing seniors was designed in an effort to help them finish their final remaining graduation requirements.

The evaluation team found sufficient convincing evidence of sustainability in both the commitment to assessment and in the logistical systems/protocols developed by the university. The team encourages the continual commitment of the university to support and enhance student success (CFRs 2.6, 4.3-4.7).

Essay 2.4: Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future, and planning for the changing environment for higher education

Fiscal sustainability

The university's significant enrollment growth during the past six years has permitted it to move from the largest financial deficit in its history to a growing annual surplus. This has resulted in steady improvements in the university's key financial ratios while also allowing it to fund the growth in staffing and other resources that are part of implementing the strategic plan. The evaluation team commends the university for taking the needed steps to improve financial results and the discipline to grow cash reserves while still funding the increased operating expenses that have accompanied the growth in enrollment. The university should continue its efforts to improve its financial ratios, particularly its Viability Ratio (which measures the ability of the institution to meet its total debt obligation with expendable assets). It needs to be noted that the significant jump in first time freshmen in fall 2013 (373 compared to 301 in fall 2012) was accompanied by an increase in the new student discount rate from 38.9% to 43.3%. Assuming this level of discount continues for each successive freshman class, this will drive the overall discount rate over 40% within 2 years. This factor must be built into the financial forecast. In addition, if current undergraduate enrollment targets are met, the university will hit its

externally-mandated enrollment cap within 4-5 years, which will bring at least a portion of the healthy revenue growth of the past few years (and which has driven much of the recent financial recovery) to an end, and put greater pressure on continued growth in graduate and adult degree completion programs to keep the university on solid financial footing. There is also a tendency for the resource (primarily personnel) costs related to growing programs to lag the growth of those programs, so that when enrollment (and related revenue) eventually levels out, expenses continue to grow as those resources try to catch up and achieve a level of right-sizing with respect to the enrollments. These factors should all be included in the multi-year financial forecast of the university, a forecast that ideally should have a time horizon of 5-7 years. In the university's case, that horizon should extend at least two years past the year in which the enrollment cap is expected to be attained. With respect to cash reserves, it is suggested that the university now establish specific categories of reserve funds and include needed additions to these funds in the annual operating budget. An example of one such reserve fund is a Renewal and Replacement Fund for major renovations and replacements of facilities in the future. The annual contribution to this fund should be 2.5%-3.5% of the total replacement cost of the university's facilities. (CFRs 1.8, 3.5)

Strategic planning

In 2010, the university adopted a strategic plan that had been two years in the making and had involved more than 40 faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and board members. That strategic plan was quite extensive and ambitious and reflected the numerous areas for improvement identified by the participants in the midst of a financial crisis. The 2010 strategic plan was developed around four major themes: academic

enterprise, institutional identity, student experience, and institutional operations and finance. That plan was updated in early 2012, and while the same major themes were maintained, the list of goals was narrowed significantly, partly because some of the 2010 goals had already been accomplished. In December 2013, a list of Prioritized Strategic Initiatives for 2013-2015 was compiled in an attempt to update, clarify, and prioritize the strategic initiatives of the university. However, these initiatives were not referenced back to the major themes and neither the Strategic Planning 2012 Update nor the Prioritized Strategic Initiatives 2013-15 contains any progress or status reports on the previously adopted strategic goals. Given all of the effort and expense that went into the 2010 strategic plan, the evaluation team suggests that the strategic plan, goals, and initiatives be maintained as a living document that tracks progress against past goals and initiatives while also adding (or deleting) others (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

Institutional Sustainability and Resourcing

In the past few years, the university has added a number of people and other resources to support the implementation of the strategic plan. The number and type of positions added appears reasonable given the specific initiatives the university is pursuing. However, as mentioned previously, the increased costs associated with increased staffing must be carefully monitored going forward in the context of the eventual enrollment cap. Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) have been adopted relating to the four strategic themes. While these KPI's are regularly reviewed with the Board of Regents at their meetings, as of the time of the team's visit the university has not yet established a list of comparator institutions (peer and aspirant) to benchmark against. In a meeting with the Strategic Planning Committee, the university president indicated that a list of comparator schools

was in the final stages of development and would be finalized in the next several weeks.

The evaluation team encourages the university to complete this task as soon as possible and begin utilizing the resulting benchmarks in the KPI's and other ongoing work (CFR 3.1).

Sustainability of Educational Effectiveness Initiatives

See comments on Essay 2.2.

Planning for the Changing Environment for Higher Education

The university's 2013 Institutional Report makes it clear that the leadership is aware of the changing landscape in higher education generally as well as with the increased competitiveness and changing demographics in its own marketplace.

SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE IRR

Commendations

The university is commended for:

1. Taking the necessary steps to improve its financial results and the discipline to grow its cash reserves while still funding increased operating expenses that have accompanied growth in enrollment;
2. Developing and successfully implementing a distinctive core curriculum that provides a coherent, interdisciplinary student experience based on foundational questions, classic texts, and integrated instruction in close reading, critical and creative thinking, and effective communication skills;
3. Addressing all major concerns from the 2006 action letter related to assessment and creating a rigorous and meaningful culture of assessment;
4. Providing exemplary co-curricular services to students that support and enhance the mission of the institution.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the university:

1. Extend the time horizon of the university's financial model forecast to 5-7 years and incorporate the impact of 1) reaching the enrollment cap on the main campus; and 2) the 2013-14 increase in the new student discount rate and the resulting impact on the overall discount rate in future years.
2. Continue the improvements made in the key financial ratios in order to reach appropriate levels of health in each. While the Primary Reserve Ratio and Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio are approaching acceptable levels, the Viability Ratio (which measures the ability of the institution to meet its total debt obligation with expendable assets) has farther to go. Continued additions to cash reserves along with the scheduled annual payments of debt will achieve this.

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Audit
- B. Federal Compliance Checklists
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist
 - 3. Student Complaints Checklist
 - 4. Transfer Credit Policy Checklist
- C. Offsite Locations
 - 1. CUI Arcadia Branch Campus
 - 2. CUI Temecula Regional Center

PILOT 1
COMPLIANCE AUDIT CHECKLIST
FOR REACCREDITATION

Name of Institution: Concordia University Irvine

Review Date: March 27, 2014

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 audit 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	WASC Check
1.1	Mission statement	X
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	X
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention/graduation, student learning)	X
1.3	Organization chart (Also see 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	X
1.4	Academic freedom policy	X
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; procedures for accommodations re disabilities	X
1.6	Documents setting forth the authority of a corporate, governmental, religious organization or system that is affiliated with the accredited institution	X
1.7	Catalog (online ___, hard copy ___) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	X
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	X
1.7.2.1	Grade appeals policy	X

1.7.2.2	Records of student grievances	X
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	X
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	X
1.7.4	Staff grievance policy	X
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances	X
1.7.5	Employee handbook, if available	X
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	X
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	X
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	X
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	X
1.7.6.5	Tuition refund policy	X
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	X
1.7.6.7	Policy on human subjects in research, if applicable	X
1.8	Independent annual audits of finances (also see CFR 3.5)	X
1.9	Policies to ensure that WASC substantive change policies are followed	X
1.9.1	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation;	X
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	X
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (also see CFR 1.7)	X
2.2	Syllabi for all courses offered	X
2.2.1	For associate and bachelor's degrees: General education requirements (Also see CFR 1.7)	X
2.3	Student learning outcomes for every program	X
2.4	Grading standards	X
2.5	Class participation policies if available	X

2.6	Placement data if available	X
2.7	Program review process/guidelines	X
2.7.1	Schedule of program review (including reviews of non-academic units)	X
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	X
2.9	-	
2.10	-	
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, overall and disaggregated (link to the standard templates for retention/graduation reports)	X
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	X
2.10.3	Policy on student evaluation of faculty	X
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	X
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	X
2.11.1	Financial aid policy and procedures	X
2.12	Academic calendar (also see CFR 1.7 catalog)	X
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year, including scripts for recruitment	X
2.13.1	Procedures for students to register	X
2.14	Policy on transfer of credit	X
3.1	Staff development policies	X
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program (link to relevant data exhibit)	X
3.3	Faculty hiring policies if available	X
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures (Also see CFR 2.10)	X
3.3.2	Faculty handbook or equivalent	X
3.4	Faculty development policies	X
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	X
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	X

3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	X
3.5	Last two years audited financial statements (Also see CFR 1.8)	X
3.5.1	List of financial records maintained	X
3.5.2	Last two years' financial aid audits	X
3.5.3	Last federal composite score if applicable	X
3.5.4	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates	X
3.5.5	Campus maps	X
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	X
3.6.1	If online or hybrid courses, information on delivery method	X
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	X
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	X
3.8	Organization chart (Also see CFRs 1.3 and 3.1)	X
3.9	List of governing board members	X
3.9.1	Governing board member biographical information	X
3.9.2	List of governing board committees with members	X
3.9.2.1	Minutes of board meetings for last two years	X
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	X
3.10	CEO biographical information	X
3.10.1	CFO biographical information	X
3.10.2	Other senior administrators' biographical information (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority if applicable	X
3.11.1	Faculty governance organization chart if applicable	X
3.11.2	Minutes of the last year's faculty meetings	X
4.1	Strategic plan	X

4.1.1	Operations plan	X
4.1.2	Academic plan	X
4.1.3	Technology plan	X
4.1.4	Facilities plan	X
4.2	Description of planning process	X
4.2.1	<i>Process</i> for review and monitoring of strategic plan/metrics	X
4.3	-	
4.4	New program approval process	X
4.4.1	Program review process (Also see CFR 2.7)	X
4.5	Description of institutional research function and staffing	X
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (Also see CFR1.2)	X
4.7	-	
4.8	List of major industry or other advisory committees	X

Team Comments: **None**

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLISTS

OVERVIEW

There are four checklists that WASC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 - Credit Hour and Program Length Review Checklist
- 2 - Marketing and Recruitment Review Checklist
- 3 - Student Complaints Checklist
- 4 - Transfer Credit Policy Checklist

During the Accreditation Visit, teams complete these four checklists and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of the matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulations, WASC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

- (i) It reviews the institution's
 - (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
- (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

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? In the online Faculty Resource Center, in the section labeled "University Policy Manual," available to all faculty via Blackboard.</p> <p>Comments: Concordia Policy 466.1 adopts the US Department of Education definition of the credit hour, as quoted on p. 1 of WASC's Federal Compliance Checklists document.</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: Deans, division chairs, department chairs, and program directors are tasked with ensuring that their programs' syllabi comply with the credit hour policy. Syllabi are expected to include a brief paragraph describing the credit hour requirement as it pertains to student assignments and contact hours. The program review process provides opportunities for review of syllabi, curriculum design and program expectations both by program faculty (Program Review Guidebook, p. 10) and external reviewers (pp. 20-21).</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: Please see master course schedules labeled "Fall 2013 Active," "Spring 2014 Active," and "Spring 2014 MED-Credential" showing meeting times for non-hybrid, on-ground courses.</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? 5 (see attachments)</p> <p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both</p> <p>What degree level(s)? Undergraduate, Master's, Doctoral</p> <p>What discipline(s)? Business, Education, International Studies, Coaching & Athletic Administration</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:</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? 7 (see attachments)</p> <p>What kinds of courses? Internship, Practicum, Independent Study, Action Research, Clinical</p> <p>What degree level(s)? Undergraduate, Master's</p> <p>What discipline(s)? Business, Communication, Education, Nursing</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:</p>
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other	<p>How many programs were reviewed?</p> <p>What kinds of programs were reviewed? Face-to-Face, Online, Hybrid</p> <p>What degree level(s)? Undergraduate/Master's/Doctoral</p>

program materials)	What discipline(s)?
	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: The traditional undergraduate program requires 128 semester hours; the adult degree program requires 120 semester hours. The traditional Associate of Arts degree requires 64 semester hours. Master's degree programs require 30-58 semester hours, depending on the program. The Doctor of Education program requires 50 semester hours. Program-by-program information is made available in the university's 2013-14 online catalog, and in the PDF versions of the 2012-13 undergraduate and graduate/adult catalogs; all are available at http://www.cui.edu/studentlife/registrar/index.aspx?id=4252 .

Review Completed By: Nancy Lecourt, Assistant Chair of Evaluation Team

Date: April 16, 2014

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation*, WASC 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.	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</p> <p>Comments: Concordia University policy and practice are absolutely in line with Section 487 (a)(20). University enrollment counselors are typically given an annual salary adjustment, just like the rest of the university community. Other exceptions are made based on criteria such as years of service and increases to job responsibility.</p>	Yes
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?</p> <p>Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?</p> <p>Comments: The university's Dean of Student Success meets with parents and students in the enrollment process to educate families related to a typical length of time to degree. Once a student enrolls the academic advising office builds a graduation plan for each student.</p> <p>Concordia University has recently updated its financial aid website. It provides the necessary information. The Director of Financial Aid also provides presentations for incoming families. (http://www.cui.edu/admissions/undergraduate#slide-6)</p>	Yes
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</p> <p>The office of Career Development Services provides career and job information to students throughout their time at Concordia University and upon graduation. Career Services has career counselors to advise students on career paths, educational requirements, specific job families, job titles, duties, salaries, and employment outlook relevant to their particular major and areas of interest. Students are also provided with resources such as <i>What Can I Do With This Major</i>, U.S. Bureau of Labor occupational information, employment outlook, salary statistics and salary calculators.</p> <p>To complement the career counseling and the resources provided to students, Career Services has a robust employer relations program. Relationships are developed in order to identify relevant internship and job opportunities. On Concordia's internship/job posting site, www.cuicareers.com, students can find a plethora of opportunities, including part-time jobs, internships and career positions; posting employers are invited to interview students on campus.</p> <p>Job information and opportunities are not limited to the job postings. Career Services conducts on-campus employer and recruiter events and panels. Panels of professionals are invited for specific fields such education, the behavioral and social sciences, business, etc. Many of the panelists attend not only to provide career information, but also because they are interested in recruiting Concordia University students while they are still in school.</p>	Yes

	<p>Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</p> <p>Concordia University conducts a one-year-out survey to identify the job outcome for its graduates. Please see the attached document for the most recent survey results. Please see also the employment data related to the university's nursing programs, which has been submitted to the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education in preparation for an April 9-11, 2014 accreditation visit.</p> <p>In summer 2014, an initiative is being implemented to identify the best tools to enhance the statistical tracking in order to more accurately reflect the career outcomes of Concordia University graduates. Participating in this initiative are the office of Career Development, the Office of Alumni Relations, and the Office of Institutional Research.</p>	Yes
	<p>Comments: Pending further clarification from the US Department of Education through its negotiated rule-making procedure, Concordia will follow the guidelines resulting from that procedure in providing information regarding employment of its graduates.</p>	

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By:

Date:

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation*, WASC 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.)	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?	Yes
	Comments: The policy and procedure are available in the Student Conduct section of the university website at http://www.cui.edu/studentlife/student-conduct/index.aspx?id=24900 ; they also appear on pp. 71-72 of the Student Handbook, available on the website at http://www.cui.edu/uploadedFiles/StudentLife/Student_Handbook_2013-14.pdf . The student academic grievance policy and procedure appear on pp. 68-71 of the Student Handbook.	
Process(es)/procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: As described above, the policy and procedure are available in the Student Conduct section of the university website at http://www.cui.edu/studentlife/student-conduct/index.aspx?id=24900 ; they also appear on pp. 71-72 of the Student Handbook, available on the website at http://www.cui.edu/uploadedFiles/StudentLife/Student_Handbook_2013-14.pdf . The student academic grievance policy and procedure appear on pp. 68-71 of the Student Handbook.	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where?	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	Yes
	Comments: Records are maintained in the Office of Student Affairs and/or the Office of the General Counsel, depending on the nature of the complaint. The Office of Student Affairs documents student complaints using the PAVE software program; please see the attached spreadsheet for a log of such complaints. Detailed records related to these complaints are available in the Office of Student Affairs. Similar records are kept in the Office of General Counsel. Student complaints involving faculty are recorded in faculty personnel files in the Office of Human Resources and the Office of the Provost.	

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By:

Date:

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulations*, WASC 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.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?</p> <p>Is the policy publically available? If so, where?</p> <p>Concordia summarizes its policies on transfer credit on the Registrar's webpages (http://www.cui.edu/studentlife/registrar/index.aspx?id=21994) and (http://www.cui.edu/studentlife/registrar/index.aspx?id=24125).</p> <p>The full policies can be found in the Faculty Resource page in Blackboard. The policies are 484.31 Undergraduate Transfer Credit, 484.32 Undergraduate Transfer Credit: Adult Degree Programs and 484.34 Graduate Transfer Credit.</p>	Yes
	<p>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?</p> <p>Concordia strives to be a transfer-friendly institution. To that end, we recognize all baccalaureate-level coursework taken at any regionally accredited college or university. Additionally, we provide the ability for students to transfer in other types of coursework; Credit-by-exam, Prior Learning Assessment, non-regionally accredited, etc. We do limit the number of units a student can transfer in from these experiences.</p>	Yes
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>For any additional questions, please feel free to contact the Office of the Registrar at registrar@cui.edu or 949-214-3079.</p>	

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that~

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By:

Date:

Team Report Appendix
OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Institution: Concordia University Irvine
Kind of Visit:
Date: April 11, 2014

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

Concordia University Irvine
Arcadia Branch Campus
512 W. Duarte Rd
Arcadia CA 91007

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)

Current MAED cohorts (students)

Arcadia Branch Campus

- Arcadia Admin #2 (10)
- Arcadia C&I #2 (10)
- Arcadia C&I #3 (8)
- Arcadia PPSC #1 (9)

Satellite Location

- Culver City Admin #4 (14)
- Glendale Admin #4 (10)
- Glendale C&I #4 (5)
- Hawthorne Admin #4 (6)
- Hawthorne C&I #1 (11)
- Hawthorne C&I #2 (9)
- Hawthorne PPSC #1 (6)
- LaVerne Admin #4 (11)
- LaVerne C&I #1 (7)
- North Hills Admin #1 (22)
- North Hills PPSC #1 (8)
- Norwalk Admin #7 (20)
- Norwalk C&I #5 (11)
- Norwalk PPSC #1 (7)
- Norwalk PPSC #2 (10)
- Norwalk Tech #1 (16)
- Ontario Admin #4 (7)
- Ontario C&I #2 (6)

- Rosemead Admin #1a (18)
- Rosemead C&I #1 (11)
- Rosemead PPSC #1 (6)
- Rosemead Tech #1 (11)
- South Gate Admin #4 (7)
- South Gate PPSC #1 (12)
- Van Nuys PPSC #1 (6)

FTE of faculty

Currently there are 4.5 FTE faculty/staff assigned to the Arcadia Branch Campus. The Arcadia Branch Campus is the responsibility of Executive Director of Regional Development, David Burgdorf.

Email: david.burgdorf@cui.edu Phone & Fax: 951-505-4593

History

Opened Fall 2007 with 2 MAED cohorts
As of Spring 2014 - 29 MAED cohorts

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

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)	See below.	None required.
<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)	See below.	None required.
<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)	See below.	None required.
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	See below.	None required.

<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, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>See below.</p>	<p>None required.</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) [Also submit credit hour report.]</p>	<p>See below.</p>	<p>None required.</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>See below.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: 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>See below.</p>	<p>None required.</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? EER: What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>See below.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)

Branch and Satellite campuses help Concordia University to fulfill its mission of bringing quality education to students for lives of learning, service, and leadership. Each site is chosen to provide programs in areas where there are few Christian universities available to create cohorts in area schools for the convenience of students. They maintain the same administrative structure on their off-site campuses as they do on the main campus. A Regional Directors are responsible for maintaining the quality of the programs, along with hiring qualified instructors who keep the university's mission in mind as they guide their students. Instructors who were interviewed at the Arcadia center were able to clearly articulate the university's mission. Regional Directors meet regularly to discuss operations and strategic planning and report to the Dean of the School of Education.

Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)

Satellite Campuses are typically classrooms at local high, middle and elementary schools, both private and public, and some local churches. Thus the institution's "presence" is manifested through the physical and virtual presence of university staff and faculty. The Branch Campus Executive Director of Regional Development and Assistant Directors physically visit each cohort at least once each 8-week term and frequently communicate via email and Blackboard announcements. Other university personnel, particularly academic advising staff, have frequent contact with students. As was mentioned in the previous section, adjunct faculty are able to represent the university's mission and values to students.

Students in the Educational Administration program are required to visit the Irvine campus for certain 1-unit academic courses. The university strives to find ways to integrate off-campus students into the life of the institution by informing them of and inviting them to events on the Irvine campus, giving them paraphernalia to display in their own classrooms (university pennants), providing them with university ID cards, and being very intentional about providing them with IT and other services. Finally, graduates of Branch Campus programs are invited to participate in the university's graduate commencement exercises held at the University of California, Irvine.

Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)

The administrative team is responsible for ensuring that the physical environment fosters learning and faculty-student contact at both the branch campus and the satellite campuses. When problems are reported they are quickly resolved. Adjuncts and students reported that the administrative team has developed strong relationships with school site personnel where classes are held.

Student Support Services. CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

The administrative team is in contact with University staff which ensures that all student services are provided for off-site students. Library orientation is conducted during the first term by either library personnel or a member of the administrative team. Academic advising is conducted remotely by two academic advisors. Both advisors are available to the students via phone and email. The Writing Center at the Irvine campus has two staff dedicated solely to working with graduate students, most of whom are instructed at the satellite campuses. The Career Center is available via email and phone.

IT services are available through Blackboard requests, e-mail, and phone communications. These services are provided during the day, weekends, and evening hours. Students were particularly complimentary of the level of services from the IT department. Both counseling and student disabilities services are available upon student request. Contacts for student support services are provided in handbooks, syllabi, and in Blackboard course sites.

Faculty. 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, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)

Most courses at both the Arcadia Branch Campus and at the Satellite Campuses are taught by adjunct faculty. Adjunct faculty orientations are held on the Irvine campus in August of each year for new and returning faculty. Periodic meetings throughout the year are held to bring both full-time and adjunct faculty together to discuss curriculum development and assessment.

Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]

At this time, the program offered at all of Concordia's Branch and satellite campuses is the MAED program, which has several emphases. This program, its emphases and courses are designed with state and credential standards in mind. Curricula for all programs are developed in coordination with full-time faculty, subject matter experts, and program standards. Program approval happens at several levels beginning with departmental committees. Once a program is approved by a departmental committee, it is presented to the school for approval and then moves to Academic Council. Academic Council approval is needed before a program can be presented to Plenary faculty and finally the Board of Regents. Program evaluations are written to coincide with assessment avenues already established and ongoing throughout Concordia University. All parts of the programs, courses, syllabi, and signature assignments are required to be followed in all branch and satellite sites in order to maintain rigor and consistency of the programs. In short, the programs are offered at branch and satellite campuses in the same format as the same programs offered at the main campus in Irvine. An analysis of credit hours is provided in a separate report.

Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

Retention and graduation data can be gathered from the Banner System for all MAED students attending classes both at the branch campuses and satellite campuses. Data shows that retention and graduation rates in this program are high, with the most recent class graduating at 93%. There are no discrepancies among the regions and none between the main campus and branch campuses.

Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: 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)

Student learning is assessed on a regular basis using formal and informal data collection from all off-campus sites. Signature Assignments are collected for formal assessment through the university's regular assessment program. Each course has student evaluations deployed and analyzed for program, course, and instructor improvement. Assessments are evaluated for learning effectiveness across the off-campus sites.

Team Report Appendix
OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Institution: Concordia University Irvine
Kind of Visit: Accreditation Review
Date: March 25, 2014

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

Concordia University Irvine
Temecula Regional Center
28780 Single Oak Drive
Temecula CA 92590

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)

Number of Programs and Degree Levels

Currently running Master of Arts in Education Cohorts.

- MAED: Administration (19 students)
- MAED: Curriculum and Instruction (8 students)
- MAED: Pupil Personnel Services (5 students)

This center also supports off campus cohorts in Perris and Vista, California

Perris Cohorts

- MAED: C&I offered at Citrus Hill High School (13 students)
- MAED: Administration offered at Val Verde High School (19 students)

Vista Cohorts

- MAED: Administration offered at Grapevine Elementary (10 students)

FTE of faculty

Currently there are no full-time faculty assigned to this Center.

There is 1 full-time staff member – the regional center director, Dr. Barbara Howard.

Email: barbara.howard@cui.edu Phone & Fax: 949-214-3381

History

Opened Fall 2004
2004-2011 BA Degree Completion programs
2006 began running Teacher Credential Program
2007 began running MAED programs
2011 Phased out BA Degree completion

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

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

Team member George Latter met with the center director, three adjunct faculty, one FT faculty from the main campus who teaches a class at the Temecula Center, three current students, and one recently graduated student. A tour of the facilities also took place.

Observations and Findings (see below)

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<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)		
<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)		
<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)		
<i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)		
<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, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)		
<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.]		
<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)		
<i>Student Learning.</i> CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: 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)		
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? EER: What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)		

Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)

Institution's Response: Our Branch and Satellite campuses help us to fulfill our mission of bringing quality education to our students for lives of learning, service, and leadership. Each site is chosen to provide our programs in areas where there are few Christian universities available with our unique ability to create cohorts in area schools for the convenience of our students. We maintain the same administrative structure on our off-site campuses as we do on the main campus. A Regional Director in each area is responsible for maintaining quality of the programs, along with hiring qualified instructors who keep our mission in mind as they guide their students. Regional Directors meet regularly to discuss operations and strategic planning and report to the Dean of the School of Education.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.

Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)

Institution's Response: While the Temecula Branch Campus office and classrooms have the look and feel of the main campus as well as the presence of university personnel, the Satellite Campuses are actually classrooms at local High, Middle and Elementary Schools. Thus the institution's "presence" is manifested through the physical and virtual presence of university staff and faculty. To that end, there is great intentionality in ensuring that university personnel are in contact with the students on a regular and frequent basis. The Branch Campus Director makes an effort to visit each cohort physically at least once each 8-week term and communicate with them frequently each term via email and Blackboard announcements. Other university personnel, particularly academic advising staff, have frequent contact with students. Additionally Library, Care and Counseling, Writing Center, Financial Aid and Business Office staff all communicate with our Branch and Satellite campus students. Through all of these interactions the students feel the university's presence. Finally, and during any given term with most frequency and depth, well-qualified adjunct faculty also ably represent the university to our students.

While all off-campus students are welcome and encouraged to visit the main campus, some are actually required to visit for certain 1-unit academic courses. Whether students physically visit the main campus or not, however, the university strives to find ways to integrate them into the life of the institution by informing them of and inviting them to all events, by giving them paraphernalia to display their own classrooms (university pennants) which gives them a sense of belonging, providing them with university ID cards and being very intentional about providing them with the same services across the regions. Finally, graduates of regional cohort programs are invited to participate in the university's graduate commencement exercises, held in Irvine.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were generally consistent with the institution's response. Unlike most classrooms on the main campus, the Temecula classroom lacked a document camera/overhead projector.

Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)

Institution's Response: The Branch Campus Director is responsible for ensuring that the physical environment fosters learning and faculty-student contact at both the Branch Campus and the Satellite Campuses. To this end it is imperative that the BCD is physically present frequently at all locations and that he or she has a good relationship with the site personnel at the Satellite Campuses. When a BCD is informed of a problem with the site, he or she works quickly to get those issues resolved. The BCD must also ensure that there is adequate time before and after class for students to interact with faculty in a safe and secure environment.

In Riverside and San Diego Counties, the BCD has developed strong relationships with all of the school site personnel where classes are held. There is good communication between us. This is a critical component of maintaining a healthy learning environment.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response. Faculty and students were effusive in their praise for the center director, Barbara Howard.

Student Support Services. *CPR:* What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? *EER:* What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

Institution's Response: The Branch Campus Director in concert with University staff ensures that all student services are provided both for on-site and off-site students. Library: CUI is part of a rich online consortium. Library Orientation is frequently conducted in person by a university librarian, or by the BCD, during the first term. Students are encouraged to use both live and recorded workshops and tutorials to support their library skills and research. Academic Advising is all done remotely by two Academic Advisors, Jill Swisher and Katherine Topor. Both Advisors are available to the students via phone and email. The Writing center is a great resource for our graduate students. This year in response to the needs of our students the Writing Center brought on two staff dedicated solely to working with graduate students, and is currently in the process of hiring a third graduate tutor. The Career Center is available to our students via email and phone.

IT services are available through Blackboard requests, E-mail, and phone communications. These services are provided during the day, weekends, and evening hours. Students also have 24/7 access to automated login/password support and online tutorials for Blackboard and other IT services and software. Both counseling and student disabilities services are available upon student request. Contacts for student support services are provided in handbooks, syllabi, and in Blackboard course sites.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.

Faculty. 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, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)

Institution's Response: Currently the majority of the courses at both the Branch Campuses and at the Satellite Campuses are taught by adjunct faculty. The university involves and engages adjunct faculty in academic oversight by utilizing them as course captains or subject matter experts. Adjunct faculty orientations are held on the Irvine campus in August of each school year for all new and returning adjuncts. Periodic meetings throughout the school year are held to bring both full-time and adjunct faculty together to discuss curriculum development and assessment.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.

Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]

Institution's Response: At this time, the only program offered at most of Concordia's branch and satellite campuses is the Master of Arts in Education (MAED) program, which has several emphases. This program, its emphases and courses are designed with state and credential standards driving the style of development. Curricula for all programs are developed in coordination with full-time faculty, subject matter experts, and program standards. Program approval happens at several levels beginning with departmental committees. Once a program is approved by a departmental committee, it is presented to the school for approval and then moves to Academic Council. Academic Council approval is needed before a program can be presented to Plenary faculty and finally the Board of Regents. Program evaluations are written to coincide with assessment avenues already established and ongoing throughout Concordia University. All parts of the programs, courses, syllabi, and signature assignments are required to be followed in all Branch and Satellite sites in order to maintain rigor and consistency of the programs. In short, the programs are offered at Branch and Satellite Campuses in the exact same format as the same programs offered at the main campus in Irvine. An analysis of credit hours is provided in a separate report.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.

Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

Institution's Response: Retention and graduation data can be easily gathered from the Banner System for all MAED students attending classes both at the Branch Campuses and Satellite Campuses. Data shows that Retention and graduation rates are exceptionally high for students in the MAED programs in all regions. There are no discrepancies among the regions and none between main campus and Branch campuses.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.

Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? **EER:** 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)

Institution's Response: Student learning is assessed on a regular basis using formal and informal data collection from all off-campus sites. Signature Assignments are collected for formal assessment through the university's regular assessment program. Each course has student evaluations deployed and analyzed for program, course, and instructor improvement. Assessments are evaluated for learning effectiveness across the off-campus sites.

Observation of Reviewer: Discussions and observations were consistent with the institution's response.