WSC Senior College and University Commission

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To California State University Bakersfield

Date of Visit:
October 8 – 10, 2019

Team Roster:
Rita Cheng, Chair
President
Northern Arizona University

Melanie Booth, Assistant Chair (Accreditation Visit)
Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness
Dominican University of California

Carol Ann Gittens, Assistant Chair (Offsite Review)
Dean School of Education
St. Mary's College of California

S. Terri Gomez
Associate Vice President for Student Success
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Darrell Haydon
Former Vice President / Chief Financial Officer - Business and Finance
California State University, Stanislaus

Frances Horvath
Interim Provost
California State University, Monterey Bay

Barbara Gross Davis
Vice President and WSCUC Staff Liaison
WASC Senior College & University Commission

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of Institution and Accreditation History

About CSU Bakersfield

CSU Bakersfield (CSUB) was founded in 1965 and remains the only comprehensive four-year regional university within a hundred miles. CSUB provides academic opportunities to nearly 11,000 students at two campuses – its main campus in Bakersfield and its satellite campus in Antelope Valley – through its four academic schools: Arts and Humanities; Business and Public Administration; Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering; and Social Sciences and Education. The university offers undergraduate and master's degrees, a doctoral degree in educational leadership, teaching credentials, and numerous post-baccalaureate and post-master's certificates and other professional development programs. CSU Bakersfield is recognized as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and is a member of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). With more than 70 percent of its alumni remaining within the Central Valley, CSU Bakersfield supports the ongoing social, cultural, and economic development in the region.

The mission of the university as stated on its website is: "a comprehensive public university committed to offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. An emphasis on student learning is enhanced by a commitment to scholarship, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The university collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region's overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development." The university is guided by a set of core values that shapes its work with students, faculty, staff and the region, captured in the following six commitments: (1) developing the intellectual and personal potential of every student; (2) supporting the intellectual and professional development of all faculty and staff; (3) nurturing a civil and collegial campus environment that values the diversity of persons and ideas; (4) engaging one another with respect, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, and self-reflection; (5) promoting active and informed engagement of faculty, staff, students, and community stakeholders in shared governance; and (6) being accountable to the public, alumni, students, and one another for achieving the mission, vision, and goals of the university.

CSUB's satellite campus in Antelope Valley, as well as its distance education offerings, underwent separate reviews; the Appendix of this report contains the Distance Education Review and Off-Site Location Review reports along with the four federal compliance review forms.

Accreditation History

CSU Bakersfield has been continually accredited by WSCUC since its inception in 1970. Its accreditation was last reaffirmed in February of 2012. Since then, an Interim Report was received in February 2016 to address concerns about assessment as well as retention and graduation, and its Mid-Cycle Review took place in spring of 2016. There were two notable substantive change approvals (Approval for Joint Doctorate in Education with Fresno (7/2014); Interim Approval for Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (5/2016) during this period as well. There were no follow-up activities as part of this visit related to substantive change.

Description of Team's Review Process

The team conducted the Offsite Review (OSR) on April 22-23, 2019 by reviewing the CSUB's Institutional Report and evidentiary documents. During the OSR, the team identified several preliminary commendations as well as six lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit:

1) Assessment of undergraduate and graduate learning
2) Student success initiatives
3) General education
4) Program review
5) Faculty diversity
6) Strategic plan integration

For each of the six areas, the team requested additional documentation or examples, and also identified specific individuals and groups to meet with during the visit. The institution provided everything requested and ensured a visit schedule that allowed the team to meet with all requested participants.

Between the time of the OSR and the visit:

- The Assistant Chair for the OSR needed to remove herself from the team and a new Assistant Chair was identified. Both the original and new Assistant Chairs participated in the team call in preparation for the visit; however, immediately following the team call, the new Assistant Chair took over communications with the team and institution in preparation for the visit, as well as the responsibility for several elements of the report.
- One member of the team visited the Antelope Valley campus of CSUB and completed the Additional Locations review.
- The Distance Education review and Federal Compliance Checklists were drafted, with follow up taking place during the Accreditation Visit to be able to complete these reports.
- The ALO and new Assistant Chair confirmed the visit schedule and the ALO attended to multiple logistics for the visit with attention to detail and timely responses.

The Accreditation Visit went very smoothly and, with the exception of a few meeting time adjustments, as scheduled. The team met with and interviewed all requested participants and had access to additional documents and reports as requested; checked the confidential email account; and completed the visit without any challenges. The team would like to express its sincere gratitude to the ALO and her colleagues for their excellent communication and quick attention to the team's needs throughout the entire process.

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

The institution's reaccreditation report was well written and organized per the required format, and all required evidence requirements were provided in an accessible manner. The team noted that some sections of the report were more descriptive than analytical, and that there were some significant inconsistencies in data reporting (detailed in this report); however, the institution provided ample supporting documents for each major section. Holistically, the report accurately portrayed the condition of the institution.

It was evident to the team that the process of self-review and preparation for the visit itself engaged multiple campus departments and constituents in a reflective and collaborative process. During the visit, the meeting with the Accreditation Working Group and numerous other groups and individuals – including faculty and students – confirmed that the process was inclusive and resulted in the entire campus community having a greater understanding of its effectiveness and areas for improvement.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

As part of its self-study, CSUB analyzed its previous communications with and actions taken by the Commission, and identified two consistent themes that have been prevalent since 2010:

1) The Commission's attention to CSUB's assessment activities and outcomes, first noted in 2010. However, in response to its 2016 Interim Report detailing significant progress in this area, the Interim Report Committee noted: "CSU Bakersfield provided ample evidence of its educational effectiveness: impressive systems are in place for regularly collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and reviewing assessment data at the undergraduate and graduate levels; the institution has clear university level goals for student learning and the means to measure them; student progress in meeting these goals is carefully tracked; and General Education has its own assessment mechanisms." As detailed in Components 3, 4, and 6, CSUB is encouraged to continue to strengthen its assessment systems and activities.

2) The Commission's attention to CSUB's efforts to improve its students' retention and graduation rates, first noted in 2012. As detailed in Component 5 in this report, CSUB has taken steps to improve its graduation rates through several student success initiatives, including advising roadmaps, 15 to Finish, block scheduling, and promise programs. The team's analysis, however, has also led to noting that CSUB still needs to be able to demonstrate considerable progress toward achieving the institution's goals as set forth in the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025 first time freshman 4-year and 6-year graduation rates. (CFR 2.10).

Significant Changes

Since its last comprehensive visit resulting in the 2012 Commission Action to reaffirm accreditation, the most significant change that has occurred is the installment of the institution's fifth president on July 1, 2018, following the 2004-2018 tenure of its previous president. Additionally, CSUB became a doctoral-granting institution (with appropriate WSCUC approvals): in 2016 it established its own Ed.D. in Educational Leadership following the offering of a joint doctorate degree in Education with CSU Fresno in 2014.

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

CSUB assessed its compliance with the Standards and federal requirements and completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators as part of the reaffirmation process. All of these items were appropriately included with the Institutional Report although the numerous Appendices were, in places, difficult to follow, and consistent sets of data sometimes difficult to locate.

Review Under the WSCUC Standards

CSUB began its process of self-review under the Standards in November 2016 with the formation of the WSCUC Steering Committee as well as several working committees, which collectively collected more than 600 documents to use in its review and reflection. For each CFR, 15 "WSCUC All Team" members rated CSUB's performance as well as "importance to address." The responses were compiled and analyzed by members of the Accreditation Steering Committee along with the WSCUC All Team's qualitative comments. This ultimately led to the institution creating the "CSU Bakersfield Lines of Inquiry," which provided a summary of the eight areas for improvement the institution wished to

address prior to the visit. These eight areas were identified in the CSU Bakersfield Lines of Inquiry, which are noted in their Institutional Report (see pages 11-12) and are discussed within this report in their appropriate sections. With the CSU Bakersfield Lines of Inquiry, the university engaged participants from across campus to build a project plan, which was used to guide their continuous improvement throughout the self-study process, and which ultimately was used to inform their Institutional Report.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Consistent with the requirements of Standard 1, CSUB defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. CSUB has demonstrated a strong commitment to the educational goals of its student body and for the extensive region served by the campus. For example, in its updated mission statement (CFR 1.1), CSU Bakersfield indicates that it offers "excellent undergraduate and graduate program that advance the intellectual and personal development of all students." Moreover, it advances student learning through a "commitment to scholarship, ethical behavior, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The university collaborates with partners in the community increase the region's overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development." The team commends CSUB for its evidenced involvement and presence in the region through academic programs, student engagement, and community and workforce development partnerships.

The Institutional Report and new strategic plan illustrate that the university has created goals and objectives consistent with its mission and has shared those goals and objectives with the entire campus community. In fact, the team commends the institution for creating an inclusive, transparent process for strategic planning. Educational objectives are apparent throughout the planning processes and these objectives inform both the curricular and co-curricular experience. The Institutional Report also provides profiles of the faculty and student body (CFRs 1.1, 1.2).

CSUB has demonstrated its commitment to academic integrity and academic freedom for faculty, staff and students through established policies and practices. These policies and practices are reflected in the institution's planning processes and in their commitment to shared governance and shared decision-making (CFR 1.3).

Throughout the report and visit, it was evident that the university demonstrated a clear commitment to increasing access and diversity through its educational programs. CSUB has created innovative programs geared toward local school districts and community colleges to recruit and retain diverse students; it also has expanded efforts to engage students in service learning geared toward improving conditions in the local communities of Kern County. However, the team also noted that CSU Bakersfield will need to demonstrate substantial progress toward increasing staff and faculty diversity so that its personnel demographics will more closely align with the students it serves (CFRs 1.4, 3.1). This concern is most evident in the May 2019 Staff/Faculty/Management data: 26.39% of employees are Hispanic/Latino and 50.8% are white, while 55.77% of students are Hispanic/Latino and 20.17% are white. The Institutional Report recognizes the importance of a diverse faculty to "engage students in the classroom, improve student retention and degree completion rates, and enhancing campus pluralism" (p. 69). The report calls out the lack of Hispanic, African American, and female faculty in particular. The university has taken important preliminary steps to address these disparities. For example, CSUB appointed a cabinet-level Chief Diversity Officer who serves as the university's chief strategist in guiding efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. In 2015-16, various affinity groups were established to provide faculty and staff a place to gather around shared interests and common goals. But as noted during the visit in meetings with both administrators and faculty, developing a well-resourced, multi-year institutional

plan to hire diverse faculty requires extensive collaboration with the cabinet, college deans, faculty hiring committees, and faculty affairs. Furthermore, CSU Bakersfield's new strategic plan provides evidence that the institution intends to increase its efforts to foster diversity by addressing retention and graduation rates for underrepresented minorities (URM) and low-income students.

CSUB is affiliated with the California State University System, the governance structure of which is largely determined by state law. This system is ultimately administered by a 25-member Board of Trustees and is overseen by a Chancellor. The institution has education as its primary purpose and operates with appropriate autonomy (CFR 1.5). Institutional information about its academic goals, programs, services, and costs of enrollment is generally easy to find on CSUB's website. University publications and websites also provide detailed information for students and the public regarding policies for student complaints, grievances, and financial aid (CFR 1.6).

Finally, the team noted that CSUB demonstrated a great deal of openness and candor in both the writing of their Institutional Report and during the site visit itself. The institution has in place appropriate policies and procedures and has adopted sound business practices (CFR 1.7). Throughout the reaffirmation process, CSUB has demonstrated a commitment to open and professional communication with WSCUC. The Institutional Report also provided valuable information, as did all of the links to campus data, and information regarding resources for students and community members (CFR 1.8).

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

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

In conducting its review of Standard 2, CSUB highlighted a number of strengths including programs appropriate in content with sufficient faculty (CFR 2.1), although an increase in student to faculty ratio was also noted. At the undergraduate level, the institution conducted a complete revision of its General Education (GE) program in 2016. A meeting with the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) during the visit helped clarify questions regarding the placement of the core competency areas within GE. CSUB is working toward scaffolding both an introductory level and an upper division experience in each core area. Most programs have a capstone experience and are assessing some of the core competencies within that (CFR2.2a). CSUB has an Assessment Coordinator specifically for GE, and program learning outcomes were developed by the GECCo. Faculty Learning Communities worked for more than a year to define the core competencies for CSUB.

CSUB also has a strong and vibrant set of graduate programs which has grown slowly from eight to eighteen including an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership (CFR 2.2b). New programs are focused on community needs. Through grant funding, a graduate support center was developed to include support in admissions, technology, electronic submission of theses and dissertations, laptop lending and more. The Council of Graduate Program Directors has worked on a separate and distinct set of learning outcomes for graduate level work. Individual programs do assessment to varying degrees but there is evidence of use of assessment data to make changes to curricula and support structures. The team commends CSUB for establishing a coherent approach to graduate education, including redesigning graduate learning outcomes, developing and sustaining a Graduate Student Center, and promoting a graduate-going culture in its undergraduate students.

Student learning outcomes have been developed for degree programs and some assessment is ongoing, but it was not clear how consistently that assessment is carried out by all departments and whether

follow-up activities (closing the loop) are consistently and systematically carried out (CFR 2.3, 2.4). A related area needing considerable improvement is program review (CFR 2.7). While CSUB maintains a review schedule for all programs, a meeting with the University Program Review Committee revealed that programs only conduct review on a somewhat voluntary basis and that the practice of finalizing the review with a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP) has been inconsistent. This was confirmed in the Institutional Report (p. 12). This topic is discussed in detail under Component Six of this report.

A meeting with faculty engaged with high impact practices confirmed that research, internships, and other applied experiences are a strong and sustained part of many of the degree programs at CSUB (CFR 2.8). The institution's Retention, Tenure and Promotion policy, as shown in the University Handbook Section 305.4.2, lists teaching, scholarly or creative activity and professionally related services as criteria for faculty performance review (CFR 2.9).

The division of Student Affairs provides a number of key support structures for students (CFR 2.10, 2.11). As noted in the Institutional Report (p. 18): "Thirteen units across the division provide these opportunities, each unit having an established mission, along with advisory boards that include students, staff, faculty, and community members to provide guidance to departments." A meeting with the Vice President and directors of Student Affairs confirmed not only the establishment of mission statements, but also that many areas conduct surveys as part of their assessment work.

Advising is a critical part of student support for increasing success rates (CFR 2.12). CSUB has a decentralized model of assessment with an Advising Leadership Team meeting regularly. The team is chaired by the Registrar and consists mostly of AVPs, Associate Deans, and two or three advisors. While advising can be successfully delivered in both centralized and decentralized models, it is incumbent on CSUB to ensure that appropriate advisor to student ratios exist in all schools and that advisors receive sufficient training and development opportunities. The team recommends that CSUB ensure consistency, effectiveness, and quality of academic support services, including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and course scheduling, to foster student success for all students (CFRs 2.12, 2.13). CSUB notes in their review under the standards as well as in the Institutional Report (p. 12) that more attention needs to be given to ensuring a smooth transition from community colleges to the four-year institution (CFR 2.14). No evidence of such ongoing efforts was presented, but the campus is encouraged to identify ways to increase transfer student success.

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

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

CSUB has grown considerably since it was last accredited in 2010 with a 28.4% increase in student enrollment from 2008 to 2017. Increases in faculty, staff and students have led to growth in facilities, technology, and infrastructure.

CSUB continues to experience rapid student growth (undergraduate enrollments increased from 6,550 to 8,627, an increase of 2,077 or 31.7% between fall 2010 and fall 2017); however, growth rates for faculty positions are below student enrollment growth rates. Tenure/Tenure-Track positions grew from 179 positions in 2011/12 to 196 positions in 2016/17, an increase of 17 positions or 9.2%. During the

same time total faculty positions grew from 260 positions in 2011/12 to 296 positions in 2016/17, an increase of 36 positions or 13.8%. Tenure/Tenure-Track density dropped from 63.9% in 2010 to 51.9% in 2017, a decrease of 18.7%. CSUB currently has a lower student faculty ratio of 21:1 than many comparable CSU campuses. While adequate at this time, CSUB has announced its intention to grow enrollment to 15,000 students during the next decade. The institution may have difficulty finding qualified faculty from within their service area and may need to significantly increase their recruiting efforts outside of the Central Valley. To address this challenge, CSUB is devoting 51% of its 2019/20 budget allocation of new non-mandatory funding to new tenure faculty positions. CSUB's staff levels have also increased as student enrollment has grown. CSU Bakersfield staff increased from 505 full and part-time positions in 2010 to 582 in fall 2017, a 15.2% increase.

CSUB's student diversity has changed significantly during the last decade. The most notable demographic change was a significant increase in Hispanic/Latino enrollment since 2008. Hispanic/Latino enrollment has grown from approximately 2,800 students in 2008 to 5,463 students in 2017, a nearly 100% increase, and now represents 55.4% of the overall student body. In the more recent May 2019 data shared with the team during the visit, this percentage is again increased to 55.7%. Faculty diversity has not changed significantly from 2011 to 2017: white faculty dropped slightly from 66.2% of total faculty in 2011 to 57.4% in 2017. Hispanic/Latino faculty diversity barely changed, increasing from 9.6% to 10.5% during the same time period. The diversity of the faculty does not represent the diversity of the student body. CSUB has recently launched an effort to increase faculty diversity by sending staff to specialized training, advertising for faculty from a wider range of diverse publications and increasing diversity training for hiring committees. The team supports these initiatives, and recommends that through a comprehensive institutional strategy, CSUB demonstrate substantial progress toward increasing faculty and staff diversity (CFRs 1.4, 3.1).

CSUB has well-documented recruitment, hiring, orientation, and evaluation policies, procedures, and processes. At the core of this are the Employee Handbook (Revised 9/2017), the University Handbook (Revised 7/2019), and the Tenure Track Hiring Guide (2011). Staff training and professional development programs are available through the CSU Skillport portal and the Faculty Learning Center provides a rich assortment of support and training services to faculty as evidenced by its fall 2019 newsletter (CFRs 3.2, 3.3).

In regard to fiscal, physical and information resources (CFRs 3.4, 3.5), CSUB is one of 23 campuses in the California State University system. Funding within the system is stable and has been growing continually at a modest rate for the last seven years. Using an incremental funding model, CSUB begins each fiscal year with the same budget it ended with the previous year. Incremental funding is allocated by the CSU Chancellor's Office to cover mandatory cost increases for compensation, medical, and retirement benefits. Incremental funding is also provided as both recurring and one-time funding to support the CSU GI2025 Student Success initiatives and enrollment growth. During the most recent FY2019/20 budget cycle, CSUB received base funding to support a 5% enrollment increase. Base budget funding in the CSU system is somewhat predictable and stable. In addition, CSUB maintains a level of reserves that is adequate to cover a short-term loss of base funding. CSUB employs a collaborative budget allocation process that includes staff and faculty participation. The campus intends to align future budget allocation decisions to its recently completed strategic plan.

CSUB regularly assesses the quality and serviceability of its facilities and has established an annual process to identify new facility needs through its Master Planning update. In addition, CSUB has identified its top three new academic facilities and is currently pursuing the Energy and Engineering

Innovation Center as its top priority. This project is currently reflected on the CSU Preliminary 2020/21 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. This plan also includes nearly $8M for additional capital projects on campus to renew existing academic and faculty office space. Deferred maintenance remains an issue on all CSU campuses. CSUB has a prioritized list of deferred maintenance projects that it will work through as funding becomes available.

CSUB established a new governance process in 2015 designed to identify and prioritize their information technology needs. The current Information technology infrastructure is sufficient to meet the immediate needs of the campus and planning is underway for a host of projects, including one to increase student access to WiFi and another to evaluate transitioning to a new learning management system (LMS). The 2015 governance process established the Information Technology Committee (ITC) that was tasked with identifying the academic and administrative needs of the campus. This effort included a significant amount of faculty representation. The ITC developed an ITC Roadmap for CSUB that will provide guidance for information service projects well into the future. In addition, CSUB is moving some campus applications into the cloud and is investing in certifying faculty to teach online/hybrid courses. Over 180 faculty members had completed this training at the time the Institutional Report was issued.

The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are sound. CSUB has a strong leadership team in place, though a search for a permanent provost is underway (CFRs 3.6-3.10). The faculty led quarter-to-semester conversion effort also demonstrated the campus commitment to shared governance, with the faculty fully invested in redesigning the curriculum to make this time-sensitive transition. Shared governance is evident at CSUB with curricular and academic issues being addressed by the Academic Senate and with significant faculty engagement in strategic planning, resource allocation, and information technology planning.

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

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

CSUB, under the leadership of the new president, has demonstrated a commitment to assessment and continuous improvement. There are several quality-assurance processes in place to collect, analyze, and interpret data; however, several of these processes are in the emergent phase, including those for general education, undergraduate, and graduate programs (CFR 4.1). The institution's commitment to assessment in general education, academic programs, and the units comprising the Division of Student Affairs is evident in the materials shared with the review team (CFR 4.1). The team found little evidence beyond these areas of a culture of assessment. And, while the office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRPA) has demonstrated a willingness to provide information for planning and decision-making, the actual results of such evidence are scant (CFR 4.2). The commitment to using data to improve processes and services (CFR 4.3) was expressed in multiple sessions during the visit; however, the team noted a lack of consistency, timeliness, and breadth of data prepared by the Office. An important step for IRPA will be to coordinate and implement a data governance process so that the institution is better able to support data informed decision-making (CFR 4.2).

The team and institution also noted that CSUB needs to develop a consistent, comprehensive program review system for all academic programs, and link resources to program review recommendations (CFRs 2.7, 4.3). A stronger connection between the assessment of student learning, timely data, rigorous program review, and resource allocations is necessary to make informed decisions about program

improvement (CFR 4.3). Ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment is hard to determine because while the assessment plans are in place, there is not enough information collected, evaluated, interpreted, and communicated to ensure such an inquiry actually leads to reflection and planning in regards to strategic purposes (CFRs 4.5, 4.6). Overall, CSUB will need to further develop the capacity of institutional research to provide high quality, accurate data and analysis for use in program review, assessment, planning, student success initiatives, resource allocation, and overall institutional effectiveness (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

Over the past year, CSUB undertook a rigorous and inclusive strategic planning process, engaging a broad segment of faculty, staff, students, and external stakeholders in determining the strategic priorities and goals of the campus. As the team confirmed during the visit, the resulting strategic plan, recently ratified by the academic senate, will provide a platform on which academic, co-curricular, and administrative units can align their activities and budget allocations to support these priorities (CFR 4.6). The strategic plan references the regional significance of CSU Bakersfield, highlights partnerships and resources, and adequately addresses current educational challenges and opportunities. Implementation of the new strategic plan, with appropriate metrics to monitor progress, will give the institution the ability to anticipate and respond to future changes in the higher educational environment (CFR 4.7). The team recommends that CSUB continue its implementation of the new strategic plan by identifying key metrics of success, and aligning the plan to budget, resource allocation, and organizational structure (CFR 4.6).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that CSU Bakersfield has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness

In regard to the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI), CSU Bakersfield reviewed and finalized its IEEI in 2016, in parallel with the institution's mid-cycle review. Beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year, the council of school assessment coordinators, in close coordination with academic departments, began developing the campus's updated IEEI for submission with its Institutional Report. As detailed in CSUB's Institutional Report, the IEEI revealed that 100% of the 62 degree-granting programs listed had formal learning outcomes available for review; 100% of the 62 degree-granting programs had published learning outcomes in the catalog and on each departmental assessment webpage; and 93% (58 of 62) of the degree-granting programs had been scheduled for program review as of 2011. As discussed in Essay 6 of the Institutional Report and reviewed by the team during the OSR and confirmed during the visit through interview with the University Program Review Committee as well as program chairs, however, several program reviews had not been undertaken as scheduled, and overall, the timely and thorough completion of program reviews remains a concern (CFRs 2.7, 4.1). This concern is discussed in detail in Component 6 of this team report.

Federal Requirements

The institution also completed the initial review of compliance using the four Federal Checklists in July 2018. The team reviewed, updated, and verified the content before and during the Accreditation Visit by meeting with the Accreditation Liaison Officer to confirm policies, processes, and publication links. Based on this review, CSUB meets the federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and recruitment, student complaints, and transfer policy.

Summary of Component 2
The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that CSU Bakersfield has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standards. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees
CSUB defines the meaning of both its undergraduate and graduate degrees in terms of student learning outcomes (CFR 1.2, 2.2a, 2.2b). The faculty of CSUB have crafted distinct learning outcomes for each degree level. Undergraduate degrees are defined by a combination of major, General Education, and Co-Curricular learning outcomes. The learning outcomes of the majors are expected to align with the University Learning Outcomes. The meaning of CSUB's degrees is based in the accomplishment of these outcomes. The recent effort to convert from a quarter to a semester system allowed the campus the opportunity to review curricula and the student learning outcomes.

At the graduate level, learning outcomes express the more advanced skills including specialized knowledge and applied research that students need to achieve (CFR 2.2b, 2.3). All student learning outcomes can be found on the IRPA assessment website; however, it is not clear whether or how students are consistently informed about outcomes (CFR 2.3). A random check of course syllabi found that these documents are inconsistent in listing course learning outcomes and typically do not connect courses to program learning outcomes (CFR 2.4).

Student Affairs produces a robust series of co-curricular activities and support programs and, based on interviews with the directors, are actively engaged with their academic affairs colleagues. This includes areas such as career education and community engagement, residence life, wellness, services for students with disabilities, and the counseling center.

Quality of degree programs is traditionally established and maintained through curriculum approval processes (CFR 2.2), regular assessment (CFR 2.6), and program review (CFR 2.7). The Institutional Report outlines a thorough curricular approval process (starting on p. 22), which was confirmed in a meeting with the Academic Affairs (AA) Council. This group is responsible for academic policies and procedures as well as being the curriculum committee for interdisciplinary and new programs. Once a program is approved, quality control resides with the school curriculum committee. The AA Council noted that there is a need for data tracking and metrics development, about which faculty are not always knowledgeable.

Continuing quality and integrity of degree programs are maintained through assessment and program review. The Institutional Report (p. 24) lays out the assessment process, which uses Taskstream as a repository. Faculty Assessment Coordinators in each school are responsible for ensuring completion this reporting. The Institutional Report notes that annual assessment reporting is conducted but the website, in fact, indicates school level annual reports are mostly two to three years old. The team encourages CSUB to ensure that regular reports are completed and posted.

Assessment forms the foundation for regular program review. While the Institutional Report (p. 25) outlines a sufficient and thorough program review process, the members of the University Program Review Committee (UPRC) reported great inconsistency in the completion of program review by departments. These issues are more thoroughly discussed under Component 6 later in this report. Inconsistent completion of the Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP), the final stage of program review, was also noted. Resource determinations are not based on program review;

hence, there is little motivation for faculty to engage in this process. There is also no connection between the Assessment Committee and the UPRC, and Faculty Assessment Coordinators do not have a role in program review. Establishing and increasing this connection should be encouraged. The team recommends that, in order to foster a culture of continuous improvement, CSUB re-establish a system for completing rigorous and consistent program reviews (CFRs 2.7, 4.1).

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

CSUB has a well-defined set of University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) with each degree program creating outcomes (PLOs) aligned to the ULOs. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are in turn aligned to PLOs. In fall 2016, CSUB converted from a quarter to a semester-based calendar (Q2S). In anticipation of this, according to the Institutional Report (p. 29), approximately 90% of programs reviewed outcomes and courses, making significant changes.

Assessment of Learning in the Majors

Assessment of student learning in the majors (CFR 2.2) occurs at the department level with results uploaded into the Taskstream repository. Taskstream is monitored by IRPA, which in turn contacts the Faculty Assessment Coordinator (FAC) of the appropriate school to ensure compliance as necessary. Each school has a designated FAC member to support assessment work, and the campus process is overseen by an Assessment Leadership Team (ALT) composed of the FACs plus other key personnel, which appears to function well. However, a key connection between assessment and program review is missing despite the statement in the Institutional Report that "The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) functions as a campus-level internal accreditation body to ensure that programs perform assessment and that programs make appropriate changes based on assessment data" (p. 28).

During the interview with the UPRC, it was stated that no such connection currently exists. Other issues with program review are more fully described in Component 6 of this report, and the institution is encouraged to make more explicit and intentional a connection between UPRC and ALT (CFR 2.4, 2.7). It was also stated during a meeting with the Assessment Leadership Team that FACs receive no formal training, although there have been multiple opportunities for all faculty to attend workshops on a variety of topics. CSUB should consider whether FACs would benefit from a basic assessment training experience in advance of taking on the role. Additionally, although the provision of workshops and FACs represents resource input on the part of the campus, there is no formal assessment budget incorporating all costs, which could increase sustainability as well as make more visible what else might be needed for success in this area. CSUB is encouraged to develop such a budget in order to make assessment in all areas more sustainable (CFR 4.3).

Assessment of learning in the majors shows students to be fairly proficient (CFR 2.6). The institution provided examples of closing the loop activities for eight programs (CFR 4.3) but it is not clear whether this is representative of the degree programs generally. CSUB should continue to ensure that assessment is ongoing in all academic programs.

Assessment of Learning in Core Competencies and General Education

CSUB also used the Q2S conversion as an opportunity to review and improve its General Education program, now named Achieving Integration & Mastering Skills (AIMS). The core competencies (Written and Oral Communications, Quantitative Reasoning, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy), which are also known as foundational skills, are embedded in ULOs I, II and IV (CFR 2.2a). In developing learning outcomes for the new AIMS program, the Senate provided guiding principles and there were

faculty fora and focus groups (CFR 2.4). Faculty developed definitions for each of the core competencies over a year through faculty learning communities. A group of GE fellows together with the writing center coordinator developed rubrics by which student work samples may be assessed. The General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) developed program learning outcomes.

One of the hallmarks of the new program is the focus on both introduction and reinforcement of the core competencies through both lower and upper division GE requirements. The upper division courses are required to address and reinforce at least two different core competencies. Most programs also have a capstone requirement in the major and assess some core competencies within that course.

Consistency across the AIMS program is maintained in a number of ways. First, proposed courses must undergo an approval process by GECCo. Second, faculty teaching in foundational skills courses must participate in required learning communities during the year. The GE program also has its own dedicated assessment coordinator. Baseline data were collected in 2015-16 so that the institution could compare the old GE program with the new. Oral communication data were collected through senior seminar. Written communications through the GWAR exam. Critical thinking and quantitative reasoning were assessed through campus-designed tests. In each case a faculty group scored the student samples against a rubric. The Institutional Report notes students were most consistently proficient in written communication, but in all other areas they were less proficient and less consistent across the factors being assessed. Information literacy is currently only assessed at the First Year Seminar and capstone. Since the AIMS program is very new, evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the change has not yet been conducted. A five-year assessment plan for each of the GE areas has been developed with all core competencies completing an initial round of assessment.

One issue of concern that arose in discussion with the GECCo is that of support for introductory math. Under the CSU Executive Order 1110, all campuses including CSUB were required to eliminate remedial courses in writing and math and replace them with college credit-bearing ones. Math has been particularly challenging since the type and level of proficiency differs with the requirements of the major. This differs from writing, which is more consistent regardless of major. Faculty in the GECCo indicated differing levels of support for the two areas. Writing has a program assessment coordinator; math does not. The institution attempted to improve student success with supplemental instruction, but available funds were from one-time only sources and were not renewed. CSUB will want to consider ways to evaluate what practices lead to increased student success, particularly in math, and identify stable and continued funding for those practices.

Assessment of Learning in Graduate Programs

The Council of Graduate Program Directors is responsible for crafting a set of learning outcomes distinct from the undergraduate ones (CFR 2.2b, 2.4). These outcomes address the higher-level achievement at the graduate level including applied research, which is a hallmark of CSUB graduate programs. While it was not clear how consistently all graduate programs are engaged in assessment, many examples of closing the loop activities were provided. For example, the Education Leadership program reviewed the progress of their first cohort and as a result, re-wrote learning outcomes as well as re-organized classes based on skill sets developed. The Biology program utilized a student survey to identify writing development as a need, and it re-wrote learning objectives to include proposal writing.

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

CSUB is clearly committed to student access and success based on a myriad array of support programs as well as equity-focused programs for historically underserved populations. The system-wide CSU

Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI 2025) has placed a renewed emphasis on increasing graduation rates for both four and six year first-time, full-time freshman and two and four year transfers, and eliminating both the under-represented minority (URM) and Pell-eligible gaps. CSUB has responded with laudable efforts to build a campus culture of holistic student success. On the co-curricular side, there is discernible progress in student participation in service learning, career engagement and a host of wellness programs including mental health and the food pantry. The provost formed a Graduation Initiative Task Force (GITF) with broad representation from faculty, staff and administrators. GITF is charged with examining and designing strategies to clarify degree requirements, promote early interventions programs, reduce barriers to student progress, and help students successfully navigate the curriculum (Institutional Report, p. 38) (CFRs 1.2, 2.10).

Since 2016, graduation rates have fallen short of the GI 2025 linear goal for freshman four and six year goals but have steadily increased for transfers. For the 2014-18 freshman four-year cohort, the graduation rate was 14.7%. The campus is projecting an increase for the 2015-19 freshman four-year cohort to 17.5%. The GI 2025 four-year goal is 30%. The campus has made modest gains in the six-year graduation rate with the 2012-18 cohort at 42.1% and a projection of 42.7% for the 2013-19 cohort, still falling short of the GI 2025 linear path to achieve a 56% graduation rate by 2025. However, improvements were observed in the graduation rates of transfer students. CSUB is projecting an all-time high of 45% for the two-year graduation rate for the 2017-19 cohort and 73% for the transfer four-year rate for the 2015-19 cohort, just one percentage point below the 74% GI 2025 transfer four-year goal. The campus is encouraged to continue to disaggregate retention and graduation data as one means to assess impacts of their various efforts, and to connect demographic-based enrollment, retention and graduation rate data. More attention and funding aimed at graduation rates is critical to continue to make steady progress in improving graduation rates and completely eliminating equity gaps which have grown slightly over the last three years. The team recommends that CSUB demonstrate considerable progress toward achieving the institution's goals for GI 2025 first time freshman 4-year and 6-year graduation rates (CFR 2.10).

With respect to the WSCUC Graduate Rate Dashboard, the Institutional Report cites unduplicated headcount growth from 7,852 in 2009-10 to 11,418 in 2016-17, with 25% of that growth occurring in the last three years. Over the same three years, the Unit Redemption Rate (URR) increased from 76% to 82% while the Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR) grew from 51% to 58%, significantly above the IPEDS cohort-based graduation rate.

The campus demonstrates a clear commitment to student success and achievement through many curricular and co-curricular programs, ranging from high school and community college partnerships to ensure a smooth transition, summer bridge programs, block scheduling, 15 to finish, first year seminars, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and college-based academic advising. The prioritization, assessment, refinement, and sustainability of these efforts remain a focused work in progress. The institution is mindful of these challenges and is exploring strategies to coordinate and institutionalize these efforts to ensure consistency, effectiveness, and quality to foster student success for all students. However, many of these efforts are currently supported by one-time funding, and sustaining, coordinating and expanding these student-centered efforts was identified by multiple constituents as a key institutional challenge moving forward. The team recommends that CSUB ensure consistency, effectiveness, and quality of academic support services, including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and course scheduling, to foster success for all students (CFRs 2.12, 2.13).

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

CSUB states in its Institutional Report that it has a "broadly participatory, iterative, and comprehensive quality assurance system for academic programs, student affairs, and administrative units" (p. 52). This section of the team report discusses how each of these areas engages in annual and periodic review, as well as the use of data and evidence in continuous improvement.

Academic Programs

For academic programs, three primary processes are central to quality assurance and improvement efforts: annual assessment, annual review, and periodic program review. These will each be discussed in further detail in this section.

Annual Assessment

Annual assessment is overseen by a team of Faculty Assessment Coordinators (FACs), a team that was originally established in 2013. The FAC team consists of eight people: one representative for each of the four academic schools, one for the GE program, one for Extended Education, the AVP of Student Affairs, and the AVP for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA). Each undergraduate major and graduate program is expected to assess student achievement of at least one Program Learning Outcome (PLO) on an annual basis, with a goal of assessing all PLOs within a 5-year cycle. Similarly, at least two PLOs from the GE program are assessed on an annual basis, with the goal of assessing all ten PLO's within a 5-year cycle, as defined by the institution's GE Assessment Cycle.

In addition to monitoring assessment activity, the FAC team members provide assessment support to the faculty in their respective schools, with emphasis on promoting common discipline-based approaches to conducting assessment of student learning through workshops, attendance at department meetings, and one-on-one support to faculty and department chairs. The coordinators' support focuses on the assessment process – developing assessment plans, choosing and developing appropriate assessment tools, collecting and analyzing student learning artifacts, and closing the loop. The FACs report to the dean of their respective schools. The assistant vice president of IRPA serves as the Assessment Coordinators' team chair, and IRPA generates several assessment status reports each academic year, manages Taskstream (the assessment management system), updates the campus assessment website, and publishes a biannual campus assessment newsletter.

The institution reported that in 2016-17, 43 of 53 (81.1%) of programs developed assessment plans, collected assessment data, and reported assessment findings into Taskstream. This is a decrease over time starting from 2010-11 when 42 of 46 programs, or 91.3%, completed all tasks. The institution also reported that in 2016-17, of the 43 programs who reported assessment findings, 37 (86%) completed the full assessment process by developing action plans as a result of their assessment and reporting the status of those plans in Taskstream. This is also a decrease over time; in 2010-11, 41 of 42 programs, or 97.6%, had done so. The institution likewise noted a decrease between 2010-11 and 2016-17 in the primary use of direct assessment measures: 97% to 72% respectively. Assessment of GE learning outcomes, however, has been well attended to and is operating more smoothly than in academic programs, particularly since the GE Curriculum Committee approved the assessment of the ten PLOs for GE at the program-level instead of course-by-course.

It is unclear to the team why there has been a decrease in programs that participate in the annual assessment processes and that complete the assessment cycles. Based on interviews during the visit, constituents reported that the curricular transformation in preparation of the quarter-to-semester

system, in addition to ensuring accountability, have posed challenges to the regular and systematic process of annual assessment, as has the decentralized management structure and the lack of a specific assessment budget. It is notable that in its 2016 response to CSUB's 2015 Interim Report, the WSCUC Commission praised CSU Bakersfield for "creating a well-crafted assessment process that is faculty 'owned' and that integrates quality assessment practices into the fabric of the university." In the same letter, WSCUC also challenged CSUB to "increase consistency of measurement across departments and to emphasize direct assessment of student learning." CSUB is encouraged continue to improve and monitor its annual assessment activities – and their quality – to ensure that all departments participate in the annual assessment of learning outcomes and use assessment findings to improve student learning so as not to lose momentum and focus.

Annual Review

In addition to the expectation that all departments participate in annual assessment of student learning, at the end of each year, academic programs are expected to generate annual reports that include a summary of their assessment activities and a narrative describing and reflecting on enrollment, faculty teaching and scholarly or creative activities, and community engagement within the program. Each annual report is posted in Taskstream, and school deans comment on them. It was not clear to the team if the reporting mentioned above (data on programs' completing the full assessment process by developing action plans as a result of their assessment and reporting the status of those plans on Task Stream) is the accounting of this Annual Review process. Nonetheless, Annual Review reports are designed, per the Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures guide, to feed into periodic program review: per the Institutional Report, "a central component of periodic program review is annual assessment, summarized in annual reports – documenting curricular alignment, student learning outcomes, and adjusting teaching and learning practices in response to data" (pages 52-53).

Periodic Program Review

A significant challenge noted by the team as well as by the institution is periodic program review. Program review is overseen by the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), which meets weekly to attend to the process of program review. The process – typical of most institutions – requires that academic programs submit a self-study to UPRC every seven years. After the UPRC reviews the self-study, an external reviewer is identified to assess the program; the external reviewer completes a report and holds an exit meeting with the provost, faculty of the program, the dean, and the UPRC chair. Following the external review, the UPRC composes a letter outlining the committee's observations, comments, and recommendations, including possible areas of improvement as well as support for or reservations about program requests concerning new positions and developments. This letter goes to the associate vice president for Academic Programs, the dean, and the program. At the close of the process, the provost meets with the program and dean to develop a plan for the next seven years, including any requests for new positions. This final step is referred to as a MOUAP (Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan). Programs that have programmatic accreditation have an alternative process that excuses them from duplicating information from their accreditation in their program review process.

The Institutional Report highlighted a few key issues in addition to much description about the intended process:

- "The Academic Program Review process was particularly challenging during the quarter-to-semester (Q2S) conversion" (p. 57).
- A trend analysis completed in May 2018 revealed that the time from receipt of self- study to receipt of external report varied widely, from 1.5 to 9.5 months.

Furthermore, evidence of the impact and use of program review findings was lacking in the Institutional Report. Upon request after the Offsite Review, the institution provided three completed MOUAPs as well as some examples of changes made as a result of program reviews. Additionally, the institution provided a revised program review schedule that noted programs that were approved for an extension.

During the visit, UPRC reported significant challenges with program review, including: 1) faculty have not found the process relevant or useful; 2) a number of reviews that have not begun on schedule or are late; 3) a number of requests for extensions; and 4) a MOUAP process that "has fallen through the cracks." Furthermore, the institution prepared a poster for the team specific to program review, noting eight specific "Issues of Concern:"

1) Programs offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees should present the programs separately and clearly.
2) Student learning assessment is a crucial component of a Self-Study. Department Chairs and School Deans should stress this issue with their faculty.
3) Program sustainability needs careful attention in the Self-Study. If there are declining enrollments and increased costs, the program faculty must consider all options and strategies and justify their choice to continue the program.
4) The Program Review Template needs to be reviewed by the Academic Senate and reaffirmed if appropriate.
5) The Academic Senate and University Administration must stress timely submission of the Self-Study and Program Plan.
6) External Reviewer visits need to be planned well in advance so that completion of the Program Review process is not unnecessarily delayed.
7) MOUAPs are key to making the Program Review process meaningful and should be the basis of resource allocation. They must be completed in a timely fashion.
8) The MOUAP template needs to be reviewed by the Academic Senate and reaffirmed if appropriate.

UPRC also reported that they have not had much to do so far this year as a result of these challenges – namely because programs are not on schedule for completing the process. A meeting with department chairs revealed mixed responses about the value of having undertaken program reviews; chairs also identified specific improvements needed for the process to get back on track, including accountability at all levels to ensure the program review process results in continuous improvement and feeds appropriately into institutional decision making. To foster a culture of continuous improvement, CSUB will need to re-establish a system for completing rigorous and consistent program reviews (CFRs 2.7, 4.1).

<u>Student Affairs</u>

Annual Assessment

All Student Affairs units undertake an organized, structured process for annual goal setting and assessment, led by the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA). This process has occurred regularly since 2013, with the Student Affairs Assessment Council providing support and guidance, including sponsoring an assessment training in 2018 attended by representatives from each unit, which resulted in the identification of University Learning Outcomes that each unit supports and assesses through its programs and services. All Student Affairs units detail their assessment and accomplishments in annual reports provided to the VPSA, which are subsequently compiled, published, printed, and shared with

university constituents. Within the 2018-19 Annual Report, each unit identified its key accomplishments, key data points, and results for its goals for the 2018-2019 year, in addition to defining its 2019-2020 goals.

Periodic Review
Several units in Student Affairs undergo periodic review by accrediting agencies and national governing associations, or in some cases, the CSU Chancellor's office. While periodic review is not built into all Student Affairs units (though establishing such a process is something the university should consider), the annual assessment process and annual report demonstrate considerable attention to continuous improvement for ensuring quality and effectiveness. The 2018-19 Annual Report and other supporting documentation reviewed, as well as the interviews of Student Affairs units by the team, revealed a culture of student support, continuous improvement, and attention to quality and effectiveness across Student Affairs units, which in part has led to ensuring a coherent, holistic approach to a comprehensive university life experience, including mental health counseling, the establishment of the Dream Resource Center, the food pantry, civic engagement, and wellness programs.

Administrative Units
Annual Assessment
CSUB's administrative units collectively did not provide sufficient evidence of systematic and regular processes for data-informed continuous improvement and assurance of quality. While the Institutional Report stated that annual assessment of Business and Administrative Services "occurs at both middle management and administrative levels," and examples from Facilities Management, University Police, and ITS were featured in the Institutional Report, other departments, including the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO), which administers online programs, as well as Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), do not undertake a process of systematic assessment as a unit. Furthermore, while IRPA is the designated centralized unit for "information and data analysis in support of budgeting, operations, planning, and policy determinations" (IRPA website), its website and other documentation provided as part of this review also did not indicate consistent direct support for systematic administrative unit assessment as many of the data reports generated were ad hoc.

Periodic Review
In regard to periodic review, processes such as required external audits or the elevation of internal concerns have informed changes in such areas as facilities' policies and processes, the creation of an Information Technology Disaster Recovery plan, the development of governance for Payment Card processing, and an updated campus policy regarding Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention programs. While these developments are notable, there was not sufficient evidence that a systematic, regularized process of periodic review for all administrative units exists. The Institutional Report described the role that the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (USP-BAC) has in monitoring progress toward the university goals and providing input on budget strategy. This committee, however, is not specifically charged with regular or periodic evaluation of administrative units' quality and effectiveness.

Given the importance of the university's administrative units in the implementation of many areas of the university's new strategic plan, in addition to the regular administrative operations of the institution, the university will need to establish the process of regular assessment of administrative units, including external reviews where appropriate, to engage in continuous improvement and ensure effectiveness (CFR 4.1).

Use of Data: Reporting & Analysis in Support of Continuous Improvement and Quality Assurance
The Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) office is the designated centralized unit for "information and data analysis in support of budgeting, operations, planning, and policy determinations" (IRPA website) and "plays a pivotal role in collecting, coordinating, and analyzing data about and for the university and serves as the chief information clearinghouse for disseminating information and reports," (Institutional Report, p. 61). IRPA also oversees implementation of institutional surveys such as the NSSE, and institutional compliance reporting to federal and state agencies, WSCUC, and the CSU Chancellor's office, in addition to reporting institutional or program data to external publications such as College Board and US News & World Report.

The IRPA office is staffed with five people: the assistant vice president of IRPA who reports to the provost, an analyst/programmer, a research associate, and two research assistants. IRPA provides management and support for Taskstream, the assessment management system used by the university, and also Tableau, a self-service data visualization dashboard. Taskstream has been adopted and assessment data is populated there regularly by departments, though it was unclear to the team how much analysis occurs with Taskstream data or if it is just a reporting repository. Tableau is well populated with numerous data sets, but there is a lack of institutional knowledge about data terminology, and a lack of training for being able to use Tableau to access and analyze the data therein. Constituents indicated to the team that they were frustrated with Tableau not meeting their data needs. IRPA expressed the concern that some on campus do not understand basic IR reporting constructs such as census date (and the team did not find evidence of a widely available data dictionary), and that campus constituents frequently continue to request ad hoc data reports. Furthermore, IRPA reported that the Academic Senate requested that IRPA provide PDF reports for annual and periodic program review purposes because faculty did not find the numerous reports available on Tableau to be accessible or useful. The prevalence and culture of so many ad hoc data requests require a lot of time from the IRPA staff; regularized proactive reporting, in-depth data analysis, as well as predictive analysis to support planning, has therefore been a challenge.

There are several institutional structures in place designed to support the use of data in continuous improvement and quality assurance, including the Faculty Assessment Coordinators (FAC) team, the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), the Graduation Taskforce, and the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (USP-BAC). IRPA is directly engaged with all of these; however, it was unclear to the team what kind of leadership role IRPA has in supporting these various committees in data analysis (versus data reporting at the committees' requests).

Constituents interviewed by the team throughout the visit shared several concerns about institutional data quality and reliability (such as inconsistency in a department's enrollment numbers), as well as their difficulty analyzing large collections of data in report tables that were disseminated without summary findings or analysis. Examples of incorrect or inconsistent data sets, or a lack of analysis of data, were shared across academic departments, administrative units, and student affairs. Furthermore, the team itself was challenged by inconsistency of data reported around graduation and retention. For example, the team viewed one data report that had a mislabeling of URM equity gaps as Pell and then incorrectly reported numbers relative to the Chancellor's Office website. CSUB showed a 4.3% gap for 2012-2018, when it was actually 8.2%. Then CSUB predicted 2.8% for their next year (2013-2019). If the 2.8% was based on the incorrect 4.3% (though the team did not know how the estimations were made), the 2.8% is likely optimistic. It appears CSUB downloaded the CSU Dashboard data and then inserted a 2019 data point which was simply noted at the bottom as "*predicted." While offering a predicted data

point is not unusual and can be quite useful for planning purposes, there was no source identified for the predictive analysis, so it was difficult for the team to be assured that the report will be helpful.

As described above and in other places within this report, a consistent challenge identified by the team in reviewing the Institutional Report before and during the OSR as well as during the visit was the quality, regularized reporting, and systematic analysis of institutional data that demonstrably supports and informs decision-making, planning, and improvement. In order to monitor its progress on its new strategic plan, ensure its goals and intended outcomes, and assure overall institutional quality, it will be critical for CSUB to develop the capacity of institutional research to provide high quality, accurate data and analysis for use in program review, assessment, planning, student success initiatives, resource allocation, and overall institutional effectiveness (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

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

CSUB is dependent on continuing state funding allocations to provide funding for expected increases in faculty and staff compensation, medical and pension cost increases, and to continue to provide funding to support enrollment growth and student success initiatives. The California state economy remains strong, and the state has set aside money to provide a rainy-day fund to maintain funding to state programs in the event of an economic downturn. In addition, CSUB sets aside 24% of new funding allocations into its campus reserves. Currently these reserves total approximately $16M excluding funds set aside to contribute to large capital projects. State funding is expected to continue to grow in the immediate future, and the reserves held by both the state and CSUB provide the campus with strong financial foundation to continue to serve students and meet the public educational needs of the region it serves. CSUB is also diversifying and expanding its financial resource pool aside from state appropriations; the team commends the institution on soon launching its first large scale capital campaign that is expected to provide the university with a significant influx of donations to help fund new scholarships, programs, and capital projects. Several million-dollar commitments have already been secured by the university. (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.6)

Under new leadership, CSUB is reexamining its internal business processes; in doing so, it will need to fully implement its academic program reviews and assessments; and will need to align the campus decision-making process around the recently approved strategic plan. CSUB has a budget allocation process that is based on shared governance with representation from faculty, staff, and students. During the FY2019/20 budget allocation process, 51% of available new funding was designated for new tenure-track faculty, and 24% was set aside for campus reserves. The remaining 25% of the new funding was provided in 5% allocations to the university's five primary divisions. It is unclear how the recommendations from the campus budget advisory group influenced the budget allocation process. In practice, the CSUB strategic plan informs the budget allocation process. The campus will need to build a process that aligns future budget allocations to its new strategic plan. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 4.1, 4.3)

As described in several places in this team report, significant work is necessary to properly evaluate the effectiveness of campus programs and make sure that the educational outcomes built within the curriculum are being achieved. In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of the academic programs, the campus information technology infrastructure will play an important role in supporting the educational mission of the university. The campus Information Technology Committee is positioned to help identify and prioritize the key technology changes necessary to help the campus transition to provide a larger portion of its instructional resources to support online and hybrid programs and classes. CSUB has been moving more of its software applications and systems into the cloud, which provides for a more

streamline management of its IT infrastructure. The campus is also evaluating implementing Canvas as a new learning management system that could provide the faculty with new online educational tools and easier access to course materials. From an academic technology perspective, CSUB is positioning itself to better meet the student needs in the future. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3, 3.5,3.10, 4.4)

CSUB has a highly qualified president and CFO, with direct oversight from the CSU Chancellor and an independent Board of Trustees. CSUB is the only four-year public university in the southern portion of California's Central Valley. The region lags behind the educational attainment of the rest of California, and the demand for educational services is expected to grow in the foreseeable future. Increasing faculty diversity to better match the demographic diversity of the student population will remain an important goal for the university (CFRs 1.4, 3.1). CSUB is building strong relationships with the K-12 school districts in the region and with the local community colleges. In addition, the university is actively engaged in the local business community. This network of support will help to ensure that CSUB will continue to be viewed as a critically important institution in the region. In the event of an economic downturn, the state and the university have set aside reserves to soften any financial shocks should they occur. CSUB has a sustainable financial model, adequate reserves, effective leadership, and a new strategic plan to help guide the university forward. It is positioned to meet the educational needs of the region it serves well into the future. (CFRs 3.1, 3.8, 3.9, 4.6, 4.7)

Component 8: Reflection and plans for improvement

Component 8 summarized the Institutional Report at a high level. The CSUB Lines of Inquiry document (not to be confused with the team's Lines of Inquiry resulting from the OSR) submitted with the report revealed eight key concrete areas for improvement and specific plans as a result of its self-study and Institutional Report; these were not addressed in this component per se, but it was clear to the team that the institution found value in the self-study and had identified specific concerns and plans for improvement. Additionally, many areas for improvement and plans were identified and shared during the visit, and several are explicitly built into the institution's new strategic plan. Given the importance of the strategic plan in addressing these plans for improvement and moving CSUB into its future, the team recommends that CSUB continue the implementation of the new strategic plan by identifying key metrics of success, and aligning the plan to budget, resource allocation, and organizational structure. (CFR 4.6)

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

There are no other topics to address in this report as a result of this review.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As demonstrated throughout its self-reflective and well-prepared Institutional Report, its numerous items of documentation and evidence, and the interviews and meetings during the team's visit, CSUB fulfilled the intended outcomes of the comprehensive accreditation review. The team found that the entire campus community was substantially engaged in the process for almost two years leading up to the report and visit, and at this time, with the ratification of its new strategic plan in September 2019, the university is positioned to continue to engage in continuous self-improvement.

Commendations:

The team would like to commend the institution for:

1) Taking steps to improve graduation rates through several student success initiatives, including advising roadmaps, 15 to Finish, block scheduling, and promise programs.

2) Ensuring a coherent, holistic approach to a comprehensive university life experience, including mental health counseling, the establishment of the Dream Resource Center, the food pantry, civic engagement, and wellness programs. This approach includes the commitment to a culture of assessment and continuous improvement.

3) Establishing a coherent approach to graduate education, including redesigning graduate learning outcomes, developing and sustaining a Graduate Student Center, and promoting a graduate-going culture in its undergraduate students.

4) Increasing the university's involvement and presence in the region through academic programs, student engagement, and community and workforce development partnerships.

5) Developing the first comprehensive capital campaign, designed to strengthen and support student success.

6) Exhibiting its collaborative culture, as demonstrated by its preparation for the institutional accreditation report and visit.

7) Creating an inclusive, transparent process for strategic planning.

Recommendations:
The team recommends that the institution:

1) Further develop the capacity of institutional research to provide high quality, accurate data and analysis for use in program review, assessment, planning, student success initiatives, resource allocation, and overall institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

2) To foster a culture of continuous improvement, re-establish a system for completing rigorous and consistent program reviews. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1)

3) Ensure consistency, effectiveness, and quality of academic support services, including advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and course scheduling, to enhance student success for all students. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13)

4) Demonstrate considerable progress toward achieving the institution's goals for GI 2025 first time freshman 4-year and 6-year graduation rates. (CFR 2.10)

5) Through a comprehensive institutional strategy, demonstrate substantial progress toward increasing faculty and staff diversity. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1)

6) Continue the implementation of the new strategic plan by identifying key metrics of success, and aligning the plan to budget, resource allocation, and organizational structure. (CFR 4.6)

7) Establish the process of regular assessment of administrative units, including external reviews where appropriate, to engage in continuous improvement and ensure effectiveness. (CFR 4.1)

APPENDICES

This report includes the following appendices:

A. Federal Compliance Forms
    1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
    2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
    3. Student Complaints Review
    4. Transfer Credit Review
B. Off-Campus Locations Review: Antelope Valley
C. Distance Education Review

A. FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	**Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)**
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? **YES - verified**
	If so, where is the policy located? Campus Catalog
	Comments: The credit hour policy is outlined on page 59 of the catalog at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/_files/2018-2020_updated/013.pdf
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? **YES – verified** 4 key processes: 1. Academic Planning: http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Academic%20Planning%20Manual/index.html 2. Program Review: http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Program%20Review/index.html 3. Distributed Learning Policy: http://www.csub.edu/tlc/online_instruction/distributed_learning_policy/index.html 4. Curriculum Committee – when courses are approved. Also, the Retention, Tenure, Promotion process includes syllabi, which are reviewed by department members.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? **YES – verified**
	Comments:
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 – verified**
	Comments: The schedule of courses is posted at https://cmsweb.cms.csub.edu/psc/CBAKPRD/EMPLOYEE/SA/c/COMMUNITY_ACCESS.CLASS_SEARCH.GBL?&
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 4
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Hybrid/Online syllabi: • SOC 2018 (undergraduate, online) • PSYC 3260 (undergraduate, online) • ADMIN 5160 (graduate, online) • EDSP 5530 (graduate, hybrid)
	What degree level(s)? BA/BS, MA
	What discipline(s)? See above.
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? **YES - verified**
	Comments:

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="5">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)
Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td><td>How many syllabi were reviewed? 5</td></tr>
<tr><td>What kinds of courses?
Internship/Lab syllabi:
CHEM 1001 (undergraduate, lab)
PHIL 4620 (undergraduate, applied experience)
BIOL 5710 (graduate, lab)
SW 6500 (graduate, internship)
Online plus Service Learning syllabus:
SOC 3600 (undergraduate, online, service learning)</td></tr>
<tr><td>What degree level(s)? BA/BS, MA</td></tr>
<tr><td>What discipline(s)? See above.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? YES - verified</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</td><td>Comments:</td></tr>
<tr><td>How many programs were reviewed? 5</td></tr>
<tr><td>What kinds of programs were reviewed? Variety across university</td></tr>
<tr><td>What degree level(s)? BA/BS, MA</td></tr>
<tr><td>What discipline(s)? Variety across university</td></tr>
<tr><td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? YES – verified</td></tr>
<tr><td>Comments:
For undergraduate programs, information on the number of credits required is available in the catalog by major at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/2018-2020_regularlyUpdated/toc/index.html.

Academic program roadmaps for each undergraduate major are also posted at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/roadmaps/default.html.

For graduate programs, information on the number of credits required is available in the catalog by graduate program at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/2018-2020_regularlyUpdated/toc/index.html.

Minimum requirements for master’s degrees are described in the Division of Graduate Programs section of the catalog at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/_files/2018-2020_updated/061.pdf.</td></tr>
</table>

Review Completed By: Melanie Booth
Date: 10/8/19

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? **YES - verified**
	Comments: Each campus in the CSU has a designated Local Admission Area as well as a Service Area for outreach and recruitment efforts. For the Local Admission Area, campuses may be impacted or not, and, if impacted, may have specific areas designated for admission priority. For CSU Bakersfield, the campus is not impacted at the admission level and therefore open to all CSU eligible applicants. All undergraduate applications for admission are accommodated and evaluated using minimum CSU eligibility standards. CSU Bakersfield receives and accommodates all applicants in the state of California and provides outreach and recruitment services as described in this document: https://www2.calstate.edu/apply/freshman/Documents/CSULocalAdmission-ServiceAreas.pdf. While the campus is not impacted at the admission level, at the program level, one major is impacted, Nursing. Program impaction can be found here: https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/degrees-certificates-credentials/Pages/impacted-degrees.aspx. Relations with schools in providing services places CSU Bakersfield as a Central campus in line with other campuses such as Fresno and Monterey Bay, while also recognizing the diversity and sensitivity of the prospective student population within the Central area. Practices for recruitment of students not only extend externally from the campus, but also within the campus. This is done by showcasing the campus and holding event targeted to individuals, families, and particular grade levels within the service area and beyond to promote access and promote college-going awareness. Admission Requirements: https://www2.calstate.edu/apply/freshman/getting_into_the_csu/Pages/admission-requirements.aspx CSU Admission Handbook: https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/student-services/Documents/admission-handbook-2019-20.pdf Application Fee Waiver: https://www2.calstate.edu/apply/paying-for-college/Pages/fee-waiver.aspx Campus Directory (CSU): http://www.calstate.edu/sas/documents/campusinfodirectory.pdf College Planning "How-to": http://blogs.calstate.edu/college/teachers-counselors/download-a-free-handout/ Cost of Attendance Tool (CSUB): http://www.csub.edu/finaid/cost/index.html Overall CSU Cost Comparison Resource: https://www2.calstate.edu/attend/paying-for-college/Pages/CSU-Costs.aspx CSU Conflict of Interest Code: https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/systemwide-human-resources/conflict-of-interest CSUB Compliance: http://www.csub.edu/compliance/ CSUB Procurement Policies and Contracting Authority: http://www.csub.edu/bas/fiscal/procurement/policies/index.html CSUB Mission, Vision, and Values: http://www.csub.edu/about_csub/mission/index.html Federal Higher Education Act. http://www2.ed.gov/policy/highered/leg/edpicks.jhtml

	NACAC (National Association of College Admissions Counseling) Statements of Good Practice: https://www.nacacnet.org/globalassets/documents/advocacy-and-ethics/statement-of-principles-of-good-practice/spgpfinal_approvedsept2017.pdf
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? **YES - verified** There is a time to degree data set provided from IRPA available on this page: https://www.csub.edu/irpa/Student%20and%20Campus%20Data/index.html
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? **YES – verified** CSUB's Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships provides information on the cost of attendance at http://www.csub.edu/finaid/cost/budgets/index.html.
	Comments: Academic program roadmaps (representing 4-year completion pathways) for each undergraduate major are posted at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/roadmaps/default.html.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? **YES – verified**
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? **YES – verified**
	Comments: What information and where it is presented varies by program. Venues include program descriptions in the Campus Catalog, academic program websites, and program outreach materials. CSU Bakersfield's Center for Career Education and Community Engagement also maintains a "What Can I Do With This Major?" website at http://www.csub.edu/cece/Student%20and%20Alumni/Explore%20Major%20Career/Major%20Options/index.html. For some examples of information regarding employment of graduates collected by programs and schools, please see the following: • https://www.csub.edu/philosophyrs/alumni/index.html • https://www.csub.edu/english/Alumni/index.html • https://www.csub.edu/theatre/about/alumni/index.html • https://www.csub.edu/comm/Internship%20and%20Career%20Information/Alumni%20Success/index.html • https://www.csubaha.com/alumni-buzz • https://www.csub.edu/nsme/alumni%20page%20-%20NEW/index.html IRPA and Center for Career Education and Community Engagement First Destination survey will be posted on IRPA website when completed.

*§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: Melanie Booth

Date: 10/8/19

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	**Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)**
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? **YES – verified**
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? **YES – verified** The student complaint policies and procedures related to nondiscrimination are outlined in the campus catalog starting on page 74 at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/_files/2018-2020_updated/014.pdf. The policies and procedures related to student complaints and grievances for both academic and non-academic situations are posted online at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Complaints%20and%20Grievances/index.html. The policies regarding complaints concerning student conduct are posted online at https://www.csub.edu/studentconduct/students/policies.shtml. A complaint reference list is posted online at https://www.csub.edu/compliance/_files/ComplaintReferenceList.pdf.
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? **YES – verified** If so, please describe briefly: Detailed in links above and below.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? **YES – verified**
	Key Links: Procedures for student complaints and grievances are posted online at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/_files/correspondence/GRIEVANCEPROCEDURES021717.pdf. Office of Student's Rights and Responsibilities https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Complaints%20and%20Grievances/ Following Executive Order 1074, the student discrimination/harassment/retaliation complaint procedure timeline is posted online at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/_files/CSU%20Student%20Discrimination,Harassment,%20and%20Retaliation%20Complaint%20Procedure%20Timeline.pdf. Processes for filing complaints regarding University Police are posted online at http://www.csub.edu/bas/police/Complaint/index.html.

Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? **YES – verified** If so, where? Office of Academic Programs tracks and maintains records of complaints.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time **YES – verified** If so, please describe briefly: Administrative Support Coordinator in Office of Academic Programs oversees this process; logs in complaints; maintains process and records.
	Comments: Records of student complaints and grievances related to academics are maintained by the office of academic programs. Records of student complaints regarding discrimination/harassment/retaliation are maintained by the office of equity, inclusion, and compliance. Records of student complaints regarding student conduct are maintained by the office of student rights and responsibilities.

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Melanie Booth
Date: 10/8/19

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? **YES – verified** The policy for the evaluation of transfer credit is outlined in the catalog beginning on page 65 at http://www.csub.edu/catalog/_files/2018-2020_updated/013.pdf. Information about the evaluation of transfer credits is also posted online at http://www.csub.edu/admissions/apply/transfer/evaluation_transfer_credits/index.html. Criteria for transfer are outlined in the CSU Admissions Handbook posted online at http://www.calstate.edu/sas/documents/admissionhandbook.pdf.
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ❒ YES ❒ NO **YES – verified**
	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? **YES – verified**
	Comments:

*§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: Melanie Booth
Date: 10/8/19

B. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW

Institution: California State University, Bakersfield
Type of Visit: Off-Campus Location Review – Antelope Valley
Name of reviewer/s: S. Terri Gomez
Date/s of review: May 2, 2019

Site Name and Address

California State University, Bakersfield
Antelope Valley
42209 30th Street W
Lancaster, CA 93536

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

CSU Bakersfield first began offering classes in the Antelope Valley in 1991 through Extended University. The current site received its first building in 2001 and the majority of the campus was finished in 2002. In 2011 the newest building and renovation occurred, creating a student lounge, new Library/computer center, faculty offices, mental health counseling center and technology office. Currently, the branch campus location offers 8 undergraduate degrees for transfer students, 1 educational doctorate, 6 master's degrees and 4 teaching credentials. The degrees and credentials are:

Undergraduate Degrees

o B.A. Child, Adolescent and Family Studies
o B.A. Criminal Justice
o B.A. Interdisciplinary Studies
o B.A. Liberal Studies
o B.A. Sociology
o B.S. Business Administration
o B.S. Natural Science
o B.S. Nursing (RN-BSN)

Teaching Certificates

o Multiple Subject
o Single Subject
o Special Education: Mild Moderate
o Special Education: Moderate severe

Graduate Degrees

o Master of Business Administration (MBA)
o M.A. Educational Administration
o M.A. Special Education
o Online M.S. in Administration
o Online M.S.in Education-Curriculum and Instruction
- Hybrid Master of Social Work (MSW)
- Educational Leadership (EdD)

Enrollment

The Fall 2018 FTE student count was 461.9 students with a head count of 602, which reflects a one-year growth of 11%. In addition to adjuncts, fifteen full-time faculty teach at this location which is also supported by 9 staff members.

Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
The Off-Campus Review was conducted on May 2, 2019. I received an introduction and campus tour from Dr. Randy Schultz, Dean of the Antelope Valley Campus. I then had a number of separate meetings with key stakeholder groups: faculty, staff and the student affairs team. A lunch meeting was arranged which included a combination of faculty, staff and students. After lunch, I met separately with students from a number of undergraduate and credential programs. My visit concluded with a wrap up meeting with the Dean, Dr. Randy Schultz.

A packet of material was shared with me which included degree distribution (70% undergraduate, 25% credential, 4% graduate, and 1% doctoral), disaggregated student counts by major for 2018, 2013-2017 student enrollment by degree type, AV student ethnicity demographics (35% Hispanic, 35% White, 12% Black, 4% Asian, 1% American Indian), gender breakdown (77% female, 23% male), student age distribution, graduation rates by cohort from fall 2008 to fall 2015, 2019 coordinated campus events, and a history of degrees/programs at the AV campus.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	n/a	
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)	CSU Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university committed to offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. An emphasis on student learning is enhanced by a commitment to scholarship, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The University collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region's overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development. CSU Bakersfield's service area includes part of Los Angeles County (the Antelope Valley region, including the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale) as well as the counties of Inyo, Kern, Mono, and Tulare. In terms of square miles, CSU Bakersfield has one of the largest service areas in the CSU System. Kern County is home to over 900,000 people, and the population of the Antelope	

	Valley region is over 500,000. The establishment of the Antelope Valley campus allows CSU Bakersfield to better serve its region. Though a smaller number of programs are offered in Antelope Valley (AV), the degrees at both campuses are identical. All curriculum is decided at the departmental and school level, and there are no stand-alone departments at the AV campus. All faculty who teach in AV are hired and evaluated as members of main campus department, report to the chair on the main campus, and participate in all departmental and school meetings. Typically, the same faculty member delivers a course on both campuses, choosing to teach at AV in person, through instructional television (ITV), or via an online course. Students from both campuses attend ITV courses and online courses. The Dean of the AV campus reports to the Provost, attends Provost Council, and meets regularly with leadership at the Bakersfield campus. All academic decisions are made by the four school deans, the chairs of the departments, and the faculty. Any department that has a program on the AV campus is completely in control of the satellite program. It operates as if it was on the Bakersfield campus. All academic decisions are made by the faculty of the department. The AV campus administration supports the effort of the department's program, offers insight to the AV community, and works directly with the chairs and school dean on opportunities and issues as they may arise. Ultimately the final decisions are made by the department, department chair, and the dean of the school that houses the department.	

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)	All AV departments function are under the purview of the Bakersfield campus departments. The AV campus has a full time Student Life Coordinator. There are specific student clubs (e.g. Sociology, Criminal Justice, Multicultural, Gamers, LGBTQ, Business) which have active student participation. In addition, there is a Student Life Advancement Committee (SLAC) comprised of current students who plan multiple activities during the school year.	
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)	CSU Bakersfield AV leases the land from Antelope Valley College (AVC). The AVC campus is responsible for yard maintenance and grounds keeping. The rest of the campus (buildings and lights) is owned by CSUB. The AV campus submits work orders in the same way that they are done on the Bakersfield campus. Emergencies are handled by either local vendors or from the main campus after a quick assessment. The AV campus has a full time Fiscal Services Coordinator who is also responsible for facilities' needs.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	At the AV campus, staff collaborate with AVC to support transfer student transition. AV staff visit AVC multiple times each month to provide one-on-one advising, information sessions, and workshops for prospective students. There is one full time advisor for all undergraduate programs. Information sessions, application workshops, and advisor meetings are held on the AV campus. Teacher credentialing and Special Education do their own advising. All graduate program students are advised by their program. Each semester the AV campus holds an orientation program for all incoming new transfer students. AV students are provided mental health counseling services on the AV campus. There is one full time position filled by two part time counselors on the	

	campus. Counseling is available to students five days each week. In the past three years the counselors have seen an average of 120 students per academic year. Walter Stiern Library supports student learning at the AV campus. In July 2016, the CSU premiered a new Unified Library Management System (ULMS) for each library at its 23 campuses. Stiern Library also provides library services to satellite and distance students by prioritizing electronic resources and providing students at AV with an onsite librarian. The AV campus offers a 25-station computer lab available to students during campus hours. There is a 25-computer classroom available to students when classes are not in session. Students are also able to utilize IT support services in the open lab. The Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships supports AV students by partnering with iGrad, an online financial literacy resource, and financial aid staff visit the AV campus at new student orientations and on a monthly basis for one-on-one meetings. The Services for Students with Disabilities office has a permanent office on the AV campus and a 2/3-time Disability Management Counselor. The remaining third of her time is as the campus's intern coordinator. Students are provided with accommodations and resources that comply with Federal and State laws and regulations mandating equal opportunity and access for persons with disabilities, provided with appropriate accommodations and resources that meet the needs of verified permanent or temporary disabilities. The food security needs of AV students are addressed through a partnership between CSU Bakersfield and AVC. The Community College campus serve about	

	250 - 300 students per semester through an onsite food pantry.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	There is a total of 15 full time faculty on the AV campus (7 are Tenure/TT). Over the past three semesters a total of 45 adjuncts have been used to teach courses for programs at AV, and 81 faculty from the Bakersfield campus have taught courses. In fall 2018, 45% of AV classes were face-to-face, 12% through ITV, 22% online, 3% hybrid and 19% internships/Field Work/ Independent study. All full-time faculty on the AV campus work with their department on oversight of the programs offer to AV students. Curriculum development is a function of the departments and the faculty at AV are fully engaged with the process. Faculty attend departmental meetings either in person or via web conferencing. Students are assessed the same as they are on the Bakersfield campus and all student data is reviewed both as a separate institution and combined.	
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)	All program design, course design, and assessment are completed through the department. All course work at AV is identical and, many times, taught by the same instructor as the Bakersfield campus. Both Bakersfield campus faculty and AV campus faculty teach online courses to both populations in mixed classes. Therefore, the content is similar.	
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,	Graduation and retention rates at the AV campus are similar to those at the Bakersfield campus. Over the past six years the 2-year graduation rate has improved 38% (66% grad rate for fall 2016 cohort) and the 4-year graduation rate has improved 18% (71.4% grade rate for fall 2014 cohort). They attribute this growth to the enhanced advising	

how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	services offered at AV, growth in tenure track faculty at AV, and the two-way communication with the Bakersfield campus.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Assessment is the same on both campuses and monitored by each department. At this time, they do not disaggregate CSUB AV student achievement data from whole department data.	A recommendation would be to disaggregate AV achievement data.
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Educational effectiveness of AV programs is tracked in a similar manner as the main campus. The AV faculty are members of the main campus departments. Educational effectiveness is also tracked through a variety of indicators, including graduation rates. Another is the percentage of students in good standing. Currently 88% of AV students are in good standing academically at the AV campus. They also track the number of students qualifying for the dean's list for their major's school. For the Fall 2018 semester, there were a total of 151 students on the dean's list. This is 28% of the student population. Each year the AV campus awards an outstanding student award to a graduating undergraduate, graduate and a credential student.	

C. DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW

Institution: California State University, Bakersfield
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation for Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Carol Ann Gittens, PhD; Melanie Booth, Ed.D.
Date/s of review: October 8, 2019

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

    - For this WSCUC reaffirmation review, one course was reviewed: EDCI 6100: Research Methods for Educational Leaders (Fall 2019). This course is one of the core courses required in the online MA in Education – Curriculum and Instruction Program.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

    - As noted in the institutional response for the Distance Education Review, the CSU Bakersfield stateside campus offers hybrid and online courses, and these are not restricted to particular programs or majors. All undergraduate and graduate programs offer hybrid and online course formats but according to the documents provided for this review there are no stateside programs that are offered in their entirety in an online format.

    - Through the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO), CSU Bakersfield offers five (5) distance education degree programs. The EEGO website shows that there are two bachelor of science degree programs one in Communications and the other in Sociology; there is also a hybrid format master's in Social Work (MSW) program. The EEGO offers two 100% online masters programs, a Master of Arts in Education – Curriculum and Instruction and a Master of Science in Administration.

    - The Communication and Sociology bachelor's programs and the MSW program are identified as hybrid programs. The two BA programs are designed for transfer students who have done their General Education in a face-to-face format at a local community college before matriculating to CSUB to complete the remaining bachelor's program credits online. The MSW program is similarly identified as a hybrid program – both face-to-face and online courses - offered through the CSUB Antelope Valley campus. The MA in Education and the MS in Administration are fully online programs offered through the EEGO.

    - Per the institutional provided response regarding distance education, there are "152 FTE participating in fully online distance education programs through EEGO." Though the FTE for the hybrid programs was not directly reported, a review of the 2016-17 Program Profiles for the Communication department showed that enrollment data are

disaggregated for the Bakersfield, Antelope Valley and Extended University campuses suggesting that an enrolled student headcount could be tabulated.

- A data report on Distance Education Enrollments was provided showing fluctuations in enrollment in hybrid programs between 2011-12 and 2018-19; increase in enrollment in online programs during same time period (4621 unduplicated headcount to 6107); overall increase in enrollment in both hybrid and/or online during same period (5615 to 7054).

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

    - A review of printed and electronic documents provided to the team and available via the campus website were reviewed prior to the campus visit. During the campus visit, the Director of Instructional Development at the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center and the Director of Academic Programs through Extended Education and Global Outreach were interviewed about the programs offered through distance education.

    - The following materials were reviewed:

        - Distance Education LOI response document provided by institution
        - Institutional Response (IR) document provided by institution
        - Appendix 2.1.10 - 060413 Distributed Learning Policy.pdf
        - Appendix 2.1.11: Initial Requirements to Teach Online or Hybrid Classes for CSUB
        - Appendix 2.7.20 ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES Spring 2010
        - Appendix 2.7.21 - Program Review Template.pdf
        - Appendix 2.7.26 - Program Profiles_Communications_2016_2017.pdf
        - EEGO website
        - Online Course environment for EDCI6100 which was live in Fall 2019
        - Distance Education Enrollment report showing data from 2011-12 through 2018-19
        - Curriculum and Instruction Exit Survey
        - MA in Curriculum and Instruction 2016 Program Review

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance	The online and hybrid programs offered through the EEGO are well aligned with the campus mission in that these programs allow CSUB to offer high quality degree programs to a wide service area than could be achieved in campus-bound programs only; it also allows for broader instructional delivery methods for an ever	

education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	diversifying and increasing student body. The Distance Ed LOI document states that the EEGO administers programs that are developed and overseen by campus departments and Schools. Programs and curricula are developed, delivered and funded by academic departments and schools but are supported through the centralized administration in collaboration with the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO) and in collaboration with a local community college for undergrad degrees.	
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Students in hybrid or online courses offered through stateside programs are considered part of the overall student body and therefore have access to all of the same campus services and resources; EEGO program students are also provided with campus email and CSUB ID and NET IDs. These enable the EEGO students to access similar resources (e.g., library), events, and services as the stateside students but not all because EEGO students do not pay campus fee. Additionally, the EEGO students have academic advisors and are invited to participate in commencement activities. Because the EEGO students are relatively few, they are not currently tracking participation and engagement separately.	An evaluation plan and regularized process to assess can help ensure EEGO student integration into life and culture of the institution.
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	The campus is in the process of considering a transition from Blackboard Learn LMS to Instructure Canvas; the decision will be made at the end of Fall semester. Two key reasons for the new LWM: Canvas offers better mobile access and is used by the majority of their students transferring from community colleges. The course reviewed for this reaffirmation process was offered through Canvas. Zoom conferencing is also used for online collaboration and conferences. EEGO Students have access to the IT Help Desk.	

Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	The EEGO provides students with a designated professional advisor for academic questions, and to refer to financial aid, billing, registration, grad checks, commencement registration, etc. They also have a designated financial aid counselor. Details about program requirements are accessible through the EEGO website; Distance education courses are included in the SOCI (Student Opinionaire on Course and Instructor) process; EEGO students have access to accommodations through the Services for Students with Disabilities Office. Course evaluations are done at the end of every course (same as main campus) but these don't tell much about support services. GR students: There is an exit survey in the Curric and Instruction program. EEGO wants to create exit survey for the Admin program. UG students: have direct access to staff and very small. Not a formal review process.	An evaluation plan and regularized process to assess will be helpful to ensure the effectiveness of the services provided to DE students.
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	EEGO faculty come from the main campus faculty and community experts; EEGO faculty are selected and approved by department chairs, School Deans and Academic Coordinator. DE instructors must go through 3 mandatory phases before they teach: 1) LMS training; 2) Quality Matters course or Chancellor's office course in teaching online; 3) internal peer review of course prior to it being taught. The latter includes a checklist of required components. Support services for faculty using the LMS are provided by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC): Faculty design their online courses and FTCT provides support with instructional design. Also student assistants who run the Help Desk who are trained using the LMS are available to help faculty.	

	Faculty are trained to offer courses that adhere to the Quality Matters campus requirements (QM subscription available since 2012). Support and training is offered through the FTLC during a Summer Institute for Online Teaching.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	The campus Academic Senate adopted a Distributed Learning Policy that requires faculty training in order to offer online or hybrid courses; a set of requirements was developed by the Distributed Learning Committee that cover competency with using the LMS, attending course design training and submitting one's course for internal or external review. Quality Matters certification is also an option; Impressive number of faculty have completed QM training; many courses positively reviewed with a smaller number receiving QM certification; some CSUB faculty are QM peer reviewers, course facilitators and QM master reviewers. The curriculum is developed within the campus academic programs and is approved by the respective departments and Schools. No information was provided in terms of the comparability of online versus on-ground courses as this data is not systematically collected and analyzed. There is a new Chancellor's research program to look at faculty who receive QM training vs. those who don't and SLOs. They have a faculty member who is helping w/ research. One faculty in English has done comparison study.	An evaluation plan and regularized process to assess outcomes comparability will be helpful to ensure academic quality in DE programs.
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	No disaggregated analysis is available for retention and graduation rates in distance education programs. Grad and retention rates are reported as overall rates; IRPA Office will begin tracking this in Fall 2019.	An evaluation plan and regularized process to assess retention and completion disaggregated by DE will be essential going forward to ensure outcomes and analyze comparability.

Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Assessment of student learning and program review are integrated campus processes and are not performed independently or separately for EEGO. Assessment of student learning is conducted at the overall program level. EEGO is working with IRPA to disaggregate student success metrics for "DE cohort" tracking but this hasn't been established yet (plan to begin Fall 2019). No disaggregated analysis is available for online / distance education assessment results. Distance education programs offered through the EEGO are to be included in the academic program review process. In the Program Review Template programs are asked to disaggregate and compare SLO data by mode of delivery and specific reference is made to online, remote ITV courses.	An evaluation plan and regularized process to assess student learning disaggregated by DE will be essential going forward to ensure outcomes.
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	N/A	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	Distance education programs offered through the EEGO are to be included in the academic program review process. In the Program Review Template programs are asked to disaggregate and compare SLO data by mode of delivery and specific reference is made to online, remote ITV courses.	This is an area for development and attention; see above.