

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

October 21-23, 2019

Team Roster

Dr. Cynthia Matson, Review Team Chair,
President, Texas A&M San Antonio

Dr. Stephen Schellenberg, Review Team Assistant Chair,
Assistant Vice President for Educational Effectiveness, San Diego State University

Dr. Manuel Cortes-Fontcuberta
Director of Quality Assurance, Peruvian University of Applied Sciences

Dr. Amy Liu,
Director of Academic Program Assessment, Sacramento State University

Dr. Phillip Doolittle,
Executive Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer,
Brandman University

Dr. Maureen Maloney, WSCUC Staff Liaison and Vice President

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT..... 3

 A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History..... 3

 B. Description of Team’s Review Process 4

 C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence..... 7

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS..... 9

 Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions..... 9

 Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators..... 11

 Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives: 12

 Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions:..... 13

 Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability 13

 Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement 15

 Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees 15

 Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation..... 18

 Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation 21

 Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence..... 24

 Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment 28

 Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes 36

 Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement 36

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change) 40

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 41

APPENDICES 44

 Appendix A. Federal Compliance Forms 45

 Appendix A.1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form 47

 Appendix A.2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form 48

 Appendix A.3. Student Complaints Review Form 49

 Appendix A.4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form 50

 Appendix B. Off Campus Location Reviews 51

 Appendix B.1. UCLA Extension Complex, Westwood, CA (Master of Interior Architecture)..... 51

 Appendix B.2. Pioneer High School, Whittier, CA (Administrative Services Credential) 53

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

The mission of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona—known as Cal Poly Pomona (CPP)—is to “cultivate success through a diverse culture of experiential learning, discovery, and innovation.” The campus was established in the fall of 1938 as a branch campus of California Polytechnic State University, Can Luis Obispo (Cal Poly San Luis Obispo), separated from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo in 1966, earned WSCUC accreditation in 1970, and was granted university status in 1972 by the California State University (CSU). As a regional comprehensive state university, CPP now comprises over 2,600 faculty and staff, serves ~25,000 undergraduate and ~1,500 graduate students, and has a vast network of more than 160,000 alumni.

As one of two polytechnic universities in the CSU and eleven in the nation, CPP prides itself cultivating student practitioners, integrative thinkers, and model leaders through a “learn-by-doing” approach that prepares students for civic engagement and fulfilling professional and personal lives. Recent strategic planning has focused on strengthening an inclusive approach to polytechnic education by coupling innovation and academic excellence with a holistic model for student success through student belonging, well-being, access, and equity. This strategic planning, and current commitment to strategic doing, are focused on six core values: student learning and success, academic excellence, experiential learning, inclusivity, community engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

The institution includes eight academic colleges (Agriculture, Business Administration, Education and Integrative Studies, Engineering, Environmental Design, Science, Hospitality Management, and Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences) that together offer 54 bachelors degrees and 32 master degrees. Beyond the campus, CPP provides a strategic selection of academic programs across eight southern California locations, including an agricultural training program in Escondido, an evening-hours K-12

administrative service credential at various high schools across greater Los Angeles, a Master of Interior Architecture within UCLA Extension space, and master degrees in electrical engineering and engineering at the Lancaster Educational Center. As part of this reaffirmation of accreditation, the administrative service credential and interior architecture programs were reviewed prior to the Accreditation Visit (AV). CPP provides a variety of online major and general education courses, but, does not currently offer any degrees in a distance education modality.

CPP's last reaffirmation of accreditation by the WSCUC was on March 7th, 2011, and, included a request for an Interim Report on improving retention and graduation, strengthening program assessment and program review, implementing general education assessment, and presenting plans to address declining state funding. This Interim Report was submitted by CPP on March 1st, 2013, and the WSCUC Action Summary on July 13th, 2013 acknowledged substantive progress in these areas and requested an additional Interim Report by November 1st, 2015 with progress updates on retention and graduation, program assessment and program review, and general education assessment. CPP submitted this Interim Report on November 1st, 2015, and the subsequent WSCUC Action Summary on March 23rd, 2016, commended CPP for their reported progress and requested that these topics be areas of continued effort and focus for the present visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The CPP Offsite Review (OSR) was conducted on February 11-12, 2019, at the WSCUC office by the review team with support from CPP's WSCUC staff liaison and vice president. The OSR process included thorough review of the Institutional Report (IR) and all supporting materials along with the development of a team worksheet that identified the institution's strengths, weaknesses, and other notable aspects in light of the WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review. Based on discussion of these materials, the team developed 14 Lines of Inquiry for the Accreditation Visit, and, presented these to

the CPP leadership team via a video conference on February 12, 2019. These Lines of Inquiry, along with commendations, requests for additional documents and information, and requests for individual and group meetings during the Accreditation Visit, were finalized in the formal OSR Summary of Lines of Inquiry Report and presented to CPP on February 14, 2019, and CPP subsequently provided the requested additional documents and information by the established deadline.

Prior to the Accreditation Visit (AV), the review team conducted two video conferences to review their OSR-related work, examine the requested and received additional documents and information, and plan out the AV. These efforts led to the development of a formal AV schedule, focused on the Lines of Inquiry, which was subsequently finalized through collaborations with the CPP Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). The AV began informally with an evening team session and dinner on Sunday, October 20th, 2019, that reviewed the AV process, deliverables, and policies on public disclosure, revisited the Lines of Inquiry and their relationship to the finalized AV schedule, and refined specific questions and issues to be explored by team members during various sessions.

The formal AV began on Monday, October 21st, 2019 with separate whole-team morning meetings with the president, the CPP WSCUC Steering Committee, and a student guided campus tour. These meetings and tour set the stage for the rest of the day and the subsequent day, which generally consisted of two to three concurrent sessions led by one to three team members. These sessions involved specific organizational levels and units (e.g., college deans, institutional research staff, academic senate executive committee), thematic areas with representatives from across campus (e.g., academic program review, general education, co-curricular experience, implementing and connecting plans), or dedicated open forums for students, staff, and faculty. The final meeting of the second day was with the president's cabinet and attended by all team members. Throughout the AV, a confidential WSCUC-based email address was available to the campus community, and received communications

were considered by the review team. The AV ended on Wednesday, October 23rd, with a private meeting between the team chair and CPP president followed by a public exit meeting where the team chair presented finalized commendations and recommendations.

The various AV sessions were productive and largely positive, and the review team was impressed by the level of commitment of faculty, staff, and administrators to their campus mission and community. The team was particularly appreciative of the responsiveness of the ALO to various questions and request during the visit. During and following the visit, designated review team members developed specific sections of this report based on the initial review of the Institutional Report, the additional documentation and information provided after the OSR, and the findings from the various sessions during the visit.

In addition to the above Accreditation Visit on the CPP campus, two reviews of off-campus location were conducted by the assistant chair between the OSR and the AV. The first review was on May 1, 2019, at the UCLA Extension complex in Los Angeles, CA, and focused on the sole location program, a CPP self-support Master of Interior Architecture established in 2010. The second was on May 2nd, 2019, at Pioneer High School in Whittier CA, one of five regional high schools or district offices that host the CPP self-support administrative services credential, which was established in 2007 and is designed for K-12 educators and administrators seeking professional development opportunities. The staff for both programs, along with the CPP ALO, provided abundant context and information, informative tours of facilities, and informative meetings with staff and students. Additional details for both off-campus location reviews are provided in Appendix C.

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

The CPP Institutional Report was a clearly written and comprehensive document that provided a candid assessment of the campus and its ongoing continuous improvement efforts. Following the suggested order presented in the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation, the report addressed the eight required components with supporting documentation and evidence; the institution elected to forego the optional essay on an institution-specific theme. A common theme throughout, however, was how the recent conversion from a quarters to semesters structure (as mandated by the CSU Chancellor's Office; hereafter referred to as Q2S) and the development of multiple campus wide plans (Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, and Campus Master Plan) are serving as strategic frameworks and operational catalysts for recent accomplishments, ongoing efforts, and future endeavors across the university.

The Institutional Report was accompanied by the two required exhibits, the Review under the WSCUC Standards and the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators, each of which appear to have been completed through broad engagement of appropriate campus stakeholders. The Institutional Report was developed under the guidance of the WSCUC Steering Committee, a 20-person committee comprising faculty, staff, and administrators from across the campus. As evident during the AV, care was taken to involve relevant campus constituents in the document's development, leading to both a breadth and depth of engagement. The quality of the Institutional Report suggests that preparation was thorough, insightful, and evidenced-based. In sum, the team found the Institutional Report to accurately portray the conditions of CPP as understood by its constituents, and this finding was confirmed through subsequent meetings, discussions, and deliberations during the AV. The IR and AV together demonstrate

that CPP undertook the reaffirmation of accreditation process with seriousness and candor, and, is committed to honest and open communication with the Commission. (CFR 1.8).

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

Previous Commission Actions were centered on recommendations to focus improvement efforts on three areas: Retention and graduation, program assessment and review, and general education.

In response to the retention and graduation recommendation: CPP convened a Graduation Initiative Committee in 2012 that created a campus-wide underrepresented minorities (URM)-focused student success initiative, developed an Early Academic Indicators Report for advisors, created a Student Success Dashboard to monitor disaggregated graduation and persistence rates, launched an effort to improve student access to bottleneck courses, expanded faculty development programs to improve student learning in courses characterized by high failure and high equity gaps, and developed the First Year Experience program. Through these and other efforts, CPP has substantially improved its retention and graduation rates as discussed in detail in Component 5 below (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 3.3).

In response to the program assessment and review recommendation: CPP hired a faculty director for assessment and program review in academic affairs and an educational learning and assessment specialist in student affairs to lead, coordinate, and integrate cross-divisional efforts. All academic programs now have a mission statement, learning outcomes, and assessment plans, and are expected to annually collect, reflect, and report on direct (and indirect) evidence of student learning as well as evidence-based program improvement efforts. Assessment committees exist within each college and at the university level in the form of the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) and the Academic Programs Assessment Committee (APAC). These committees worked with faculty across the university to produce and utilize institutional rubrics to assess general education program and institutional learning outcomes, many of which parallel the WSCUC Core Competencies (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 4.1, 4.4). To support a culture of evidence-based improvement, CPP has expanded professional

development opportunities for faculty through the Summer Assessment Institute, various workshops, and targeted assessment events. In 2017-2018, over 150 faculty participated in assessment-related workshops and events, and over 300 faculty engaged in rubric development, data collection, analysis and dissemination of assessment evidence for GE Student Learning Outcomes. In addition, new faculty are now introduced to the intent and value of assessment through a new faculty orientation session led by the faculty coordinator for assessment and program review. During the quarter-to-semester (Q2S) transition, some academic units elected to delay their program reviews while they focused on curricular needs and reforms related to this major institutional change. Now that this Q2S transition has been largely completed, the schedule of academic reviews appears to be ramping back up under the guidance of the faculty coordinator for assessment and program review (CFRs 2.1, 2.7). Efforts to advance CPP's culture of program assessment and review are discussed in Components 3, 4, and 6 below.

In response to the general education recommendation: CPP conducted a comprehensive review of the GE program in 2011-2012 through a self-study, led by the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC), followed by an external review. During the Q2S, the GE program revised its structure through extensive campus dialogue and recertified every GE course to ensure alignment between assessment methods, course learning outcomes, and GE learning outcomes. The GEAC developed learning outcomes, rubrics, and a timeline for assessment, with subsequent implementation and progress now facilitated by a faculty director of assessment and program review. In 2018, a faculty director for undergraduate studies and general education was hired to provide leadership, coordination, and guidance for GE (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4). The GE program is discussed in more detail in Components 3, 4, and 6 below.

In addition to the above efforts since the last WSCUC visit in 2016, CPP undertook a major campus-wide transition from a quarters to semesters—a major undertaking that impacted nearly every

aspect of campus operation and organization. As demonstrated through the institution report and accreditation visit, clear evidence exists that the campus embraced this quarter to semester (Q2S) transition as a means to identify and drive institutional improvements with respect to academic programs and many other aspects of the student experience.

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

As required by the 2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation, CPP submitted to the review team, along with their Institutional Report, completed versions of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI), the Review under the WSCUC Standards (RUWS), and the federal requirement reporting forms. All documents were thoroughly and appropriately completed, with additional information often provided in the form by hyperlinks to relevant evidence.

At the institutional and general education levels, as well as for each listed academic degree (i.e., 5 non-degrees, 54 Bachelors, 1 Bachelors/Credential, and 32 Masters), the IEEI presented individualized learning outcomes along with their respective direct and indirect forms of evidence, who and how the collected evidence is analyzed and interpreted, and how the emerging findings are used to improve the institution, curriculum, and student experience. In sum, the IEEI demonstrates that learning outcomes and program review, and associated activities grounded in continuous improvement, are well-established and operational at all three institutional levels.

The submitted Review under the WSCUC Standards (RUWS) was developed through the collective input of CPP's twenty-member WSCUC Steering Committee (which included representatives from all divisions) and the provost's administrative leadership team. The CPP responses to each Criteria for Review as well as to the synthesis and reflection questions for each WSCUC Standard appear well-

developed and to have served their purpose in providing a “roadmap” for the development of CPP’s Institutional Report.

In the remainder of this Component, CPP’s compliance with the Standards is briefly summarized based on broader evidence gleaned from the Institutional Report, IEEI, and RUWS as well as the findings and deliberations of the review team before, during, and after the Accreditation Visit.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives:

Educational objectives are widely recognized and consistent with CPP’s applied or “learning by doing” interpretation of a polytechnic degree. A current point of emphasis that is consistent with CPP’s purposes and character is on diversity, equity and inclusion (see Component 5) (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4). CPP appreciates the current demographic disparity between the students it serves and its faculty, and, is taking concrete steps to narrow this gap (see Section 7). During the campus visit, sufficient student feedback emerged to form an additional Line of Inquiry regarding campus climate, particularly for underrepresented minorities; the team chair requested an additional short-notice meeting with student leadership and others to explore this issue (see Component 9).

CPP is a member of the California State University and one of two polytechnic universities within the system. While the system dictates particular expectations and parameters (e.g., general education and budgetary requirements), CPP operates with appropriate autonomy, is demonstrably transparent and benefits from the backing of the state of California (CFRs 1.5, 1.6, 1.7). Furthermore, faculty within CPP benefit from a well-articulated policy statement regarding academic freedom (CRF 1.3). CPP is committed to honest and open communication with WSCUC and approaches accreditation with seriousness and candor (see Section I.C.) (CFR 1.8).

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions:

The institution's education programs are appropriate for a polytechnic university. CPP clearly identifies student learning outcomes at the institutional and programmatic levels and for general education. The university has in place a robust and comprehensive albeit relatively new system for assessment of these outcomes (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.5). CPP is making progress to demonstrate that its graduates meet these expected outcomes at appropriate levels (CFR 2.6). The university used the process to transition from quarters to semesters, in part, as a proxy for program review during that period of time. Since completion of that process, CPP has re-designed program review and has recently begun operationalizing that plan (CFR 2.7).

Faculty have clear expectations for research, scholarship and creative activity. The university has appropriate linkages across scholarship, teaching, assessment, and service (see Component 7) (CFRs 2.8, 2.9). CPP has developed an array of equity-driven student support structures and interventions that strive to provide a holistic approach to student success. The university has made progress with closing equity/achievement gaps among various student constituents, but, has generated a number of additional actions towards greater equity (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 2.

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

CPP is striving to increase tenure density among faculty to 67.7%, the level in place at the start of the 2008 recession. As a part of the CSU system, faculty recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives and evaluation practices are routinized and aligned with the system's and university's

objectives. CPP regularly provides professional development opportunities, e.g. on diversity, equity and inclusion and assessment of student learning (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)

Although the university has strengthened its overall financial health, it is still recovering from some of the financial setbacks of the 2008 recession, as evidenced through such current challenges as deferred maintenance and the need to replenish a large number of tenure-track faculty positions (CFR 3.4). The university's developing Information Technology Plan with help CPP advance their efforts to provide quality information and technology resources (CFR 3.5)

The Institutional Report, appended materials and conversations with personnel during the Accreditation Visit evidenced high functioning leadership including a full-time chief executive officer (CEO) and chief financial officer (CFO) (CFRs 3.6, 3.8). All 23 CSU campuses, including CPP, share a governing board that complies with the WSCUC Governing Board Policy; CPP supports faculty to exercise effective academic leadership (CFRs 3.9, 3.10). While the relatively new executive leadership are clearly fulfilling their roles, during preparation for its visit, the team noticed a relatively large number of interim positions for "middle management" (e.g., assistant and associate vice presidents and directors) on the schedule and additional interim positions emerged during the campus visit. This pattern likely reflects the combination of recent organizational restructuring that has created new positions along with organizational fatigue from myriad initiatives in recent years (e.g., quarter to semesters conversion, preparation for WSCUC reaffirmation of accreditation, and concurrent development of a Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, and Campus Master Plan). Campus leadership is aware of this issue, and, striving to reduce interim positions in service to improving campus effectiveness (CFRs 3.1, 3.3).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 3.

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

CPP has a deliberate set of quality assurance processes in place producing evidence that the university's leadership uses to inform decision making (see Components 6 and 7) (CFR 4.1). From conversations with the university's leadership it is clear they support the assessment of teaching and learning to inform their work; more and more faculty are involved in the inquiry of these processes to ensure their efficacy. As CPP operationalizes their updated assessment and program review systems broader and consistent faculty engagement will be important (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

A signature element of CPP is institutional reflection and planning processes that inform decision making and resource allocation. The university is also keenly aware of and responsive to the changing landscape of society, in general, and higher education, in particular (see Component 7) (CFRs 4.6, 4.7).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 4.

Based on the above and the broader report, the team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with all four Standards. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

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

The meaning, quality, and integrity of a CPP degree is grounded in the institution's "learn by doing" approach and a commitment to an inclusive polytechnic experience characterized by eight core elements (i.e., *application of knowledge; critical thinking and problem solving; creativity, discovery, and innovation; diverse and multidisciplinary perspectives; integration of technology; collaborative learning; community and global engagement; and professional and career readiness*; note that these elements are

explicitly student-centered and complementary to the broader “elements” in the strategic plan discussed in Section I.A.). These core elements are reflected within various outcomes at the institutional, general education, and program levels, which are publicly available through various websites across the university, particularly the *Assessment and Program Review* website (for all three levels) and typically individual departmental websites (for program learning outcomes) (CFRs 1.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4).

At the institutional level, three complementary and aspirational competencies have been established that together comprise twelve institutional learning outcomes (ILOs; noted parenthetically in the form of basic skills, abilities, etc.): (1) *Practitioners: Equipped with a foundation for growth and professional success* (i.e., *communication skills, interpersonal skills, disciplinary learning*); (2) *Integrative Thinkers: Able to apply their knowledge and skills to future challenges and opportunities* (i.e., *critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy, integrating and transferring learning*); and (3) *Model Leaders: Taking an active role as a citizen in a diverse multicultural environment* (i.e., *ethical understanding, liberal learning, global citizenship, intentional learning, lifelong learning*). CPP recently developed a complementary set of graduate ILOs (GILOs) that focus on communication, information literacy, evaluation of theories, and scholarship and creative activities (CFR 2.2b); the plan to implement and assess these GILOs was under development at the time of the visit.

At the general education (GE) level, CPP has developed a distribution-based curriculum in accordance with California State University requirements that accounts for ~40% (45-48 of 120 units) of each undergraduate degree. In this GE curriculum, fourteen explicit outcomes exist among four broader categories (i.e., *Foundational Skills and Capacities, Disciplinary Knowledge, Social and Global Awareness, and Capacity for Lifelong Learning*), and these outcomes are intended to be developed and realized through student completion of courses among five CSU-defined areas (i.e., *Communication and Critical Thinking, Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning, Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Lifelong*

Learning and Self Development). Notably, these GE learning outcomes have been mapped to the above institutional learning outcomes as well as the WSCUC Core Competencies, and findings from the assessment of these outcomes is discussed in Component 4.

At the program level, the faculty of each CPP undergraduate and graduate program have established a core set of program learning outcomes, and these have been also been aligned, as deemed appropriate, with the above institutional learning outcomes, the WSCUC Core Competencies, and (where applicable) professional accreditation standards. In addition, each program has developed curricular maps that (1) illuminate how their courses support capacity building within students to achieve these outcomes and (2) serve as a framework for their program assessment work within the curriculum.

Based on a broad review of these outcomes at the institutional, general education, and program levels, expectations for students appear appropriate in both content and standards for the various degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels (CFR 2.1). Furthermore, the majority of undergraduate programs require some form of meaning-making beyond the successful completion of a sequence of courses, such as capstone experiences, portfolios, senior projects, and internships. In many programs, these high impact practices are leveraged as assessment data for insight into student achievement and for curriculum improvements (CFR 2.2a). As appropriate, the vast majority of graduate degrees require some summative signature work (e.g., thesis, composition, or performance) that reflects substantive student accomplishment with respect to some form of scholarship, research, or creative endeavors as appropriate for each disciplinary field (CFR 2.2b).

Since the 2016 report to the WSCUC, the institution used the major institutional conversion from quarters to semesters as an opportunity to develop a more sustainable, meaningful, holistic, and actionable approach to assessing these outcomes (see Components 1 and 6), and the scaled

implementation of this approach is clearly underway with respect to institutional and general education (see Component 4). Implementation of this revitalized appeared less evident at the program level, and the campus and its faculty should prioritize the norming and performing such work to promote evidence-based reflection and improvements, including through program review.

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

CPP accurately describes their assessment of student learning in their Institutional Report as “emergent.” Starting in spring 2017 with leadership by an inaugural faculty director for assessment and program review, the institution essentially rebooted its efforts, with a focus on designing and implementing a broad assessment campaign of all five WSCUC Core Competencies along with aligned and selected institutional and general education learning outcomes. This campus-wide process involved more than 100 faculty who developed eleven rubrics, many of which drew aspects from broader established rubrics (e.g., Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics, National Communication Association Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation form, Trinity University’s Rubric Assessment of Information Literacy Skills). This report highlights some key efforts and findings related to the WSCUC Core Competencies below, and notes that CPP has admirably posted much of their emerging work, including rubrics, findings, and actions on their assessment and program review website.

Written Communication: The Graduation Writing Test (GWT), a long-standing, locally-designed, and multiple-reviewer-normed graduation requirement that measures writing skills for students who have completed 75 semester units, was leveraged as a summative assessment, and showed moderate improvements in pass rates from 82% in 2011-2012 to 90% in 2016-2017. In summer 2019, in an effort to move beyond such general pass/fail data and unpack more granular performance data, 15 faculty

from across the campus normed and scored 188 randomly selected senior-level papers from 19 courses spanning their eight colleges. For written communication rubric categories of context and purpose, organization, and grammar and mechanics, 82-85% of students showed mastery or proficient, while 71% of students showed mastery or proficient for the rubric category of idea development. These findings have informed conversations around potential development of a “writing across the curriculum” program to strengthen written communication for all students.

Oral Communication: This Core Competency was explored in 2017 by applying the oral communication rubric to three different populations of student presentations: 181 from 12 courses across seven colleges, 71 at the 2017 CPP Student Research, Scholar, and Creative Endeavors (RSCA) Conference, and 48 at the 2018 Honors Convocation. Findings among the populations included generally increasing skills from lower to upper division, greater general mastery by RSCA-presenting students compared to peers in upper-division courses, and greater mastery in language, delivery/platform presence, and presentation aids by honors students compared to their upper-division peers. These findings have supported campus conversation around opportunities to reinforce oral communication as well as the need for refined assessment approaches and data.

Information Literacy: Using the same design and materials as the written communication assessment above, scoring with an information literacy rubric revealed that 68% of students showed mastery or were proficient in presenting evidence and sources, and 54% of students showed mastery or were proficient in appropriate citation of sources. Disaggregation of these data by gender, URM, and generational status revealed that female students were significantly better at citing evidence and sources than men. Additional approaches to assessing information literacy, including piloting of the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS), and the strengthening of connection

between the library and academic colleges are summarized in the Institutional Report (p. 32) and publicly posted assessment reports.

Critical Thinking: Perhaps the most difficult to define and therefore assess in a generalized way, CPP approached this Core Competency using a four-criteria rubric (problem/issue, perspectives, evidence, and conclusions) in a manner similar to the above oral communication and information literacy assessments. Based on the analysis of 220 student works drawn from 13 courses spanning their eight colleges, results generally showed positive progression from lower to upper division courses, and subsequent exploration and discussion led to some specific improvement efforts within majors and future steps to move the effort forward. Results from a piloting of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA+) showed largely similar results, with 48% of first-year scores being proficient or greater compared to 60% of seniors.

Quantitative Reasoning: Also taking a rubric-based approach for this Core Competency, CPP faculty examined 165 students works (typically capstone projects, theses, and exams) from upper-division general education and major courses from across seven colleges. Little to no difference emerged between these course types, and further refinement of efforts were placed on hold while the campus complied with CSU Executive Order 1100 centered around mathematics remediation.

The above efforts demonstrate an institutional commitment to the “doing” of assessment and that many students are meeting, or progressively developing towards meeting, CPP’s expectations for learning. Furthermore, the experience and results has generated robust faculty-driven campus discussion on how to improve and sustain these efforts (CFR 2.4), which is discussed in detail in Component 6.

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

Complementing the academic and curricular endeavors discussed in previous Components, CPP has developed an array of equity-driven student support structures and interventions that strive to provide a holistic approach to student success. On the “front end” of the student experience, support programs have been established for first-time freshman and transfer students, including equity-focused programs for historically underserved populations (e.g., Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics or STEM Success Coordinated Program, Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Summer Bridge, PolyTransfer) (CFRs 1.4, 2.11). A Resource Learning Center supports the success of all students through various programming around tutoring, advising, mentoring, and financial literacy, in part through Department of Education TRIO funding dedicated to supporting first-generation, low-income, and/or disabled students (CFRs 1.4, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13). More tactical interventions, often focused on specific high-challenge courses (i.e. courses that result in a high proportion of D or F grades or withdrawal commonly referred to as DFW courses), have also been implemented, including supplemental instruction, workshops, and course redesign. Some of these pilots have proven viable, so the campus will likely need to develop a means to compare their relative impact to inform sustaining and scaling presuming limited resources.

Student engagement in campus life beyond formal courses is facilitated through over 320 registered student organizations, and student wellbeing is supported through various centralized services and programs focused on health, advocacy, disability, counseling, wellness, and food and housing security (CFR 2.13). For the ~35% of first-year students who live in residence halls, CPP has developed thematic communities that connect their academic experiences and residential life, and program participants show higher persistence and greater number of passed units compared to non-residential first-year students. Similarly, the Center for Community Engagement connects the campus to

the community through the cultivation of service learning, internship, and volunteer opportunities (CFR 2.5). Finally, CPP's holistic approach to student success includes a variety of career resources (e.g., job fairs, resume workshops, and a "Clothes Closet" program providing free gently worn professional clothing) (CFR 2.13). In addition to these traditional career services, campus leadership appears engaged in a substantive conversation about the "future of work," specifically how CPP can best prepare students for a future that, given the rapidity of technological, social, and environmental change, we can arguably no longer clearly see.

CPP's commitment to providing an inclusive polytechnic experience by coupling the above student support, engagement, and development resources with high quality academic programs promote improvement in institutional metrics such as retention and graduation rates, which are the focus of the remainder of this component. Basic trends in graduation rates provided by the CSU Student Success Dashboard include (CFRs 1.2, 1.6):

- From the Fall 2005 to Fall 2011 cohorts of first-time full-time students, six-year graduation rates have risen from 50.3% to 65.9% with a maxima of 68.6% for the 2010 cohort
- From the Fall 2005 to Fall 2013 cohorts of first-time full-time students, four-year graduate rates have risen from 12.3% to 22.8% with a minima of 10.0% for the 2007 cohort
- From the Fall 2005 to Fall 2013 cohorts of upper-division transfer students, four-year graduation rates have improved from 66.1% to 77.4% with a minima of 63.0% for the 2007 cohort
- From the Fall 2005 to Fall 2015 cohorts of upper-division transfer students, two-year graduation rates have improved slightly from 19.0% to 23.9% with a minima of 9.7% for the 2008 cohort

With respect to retention rates for first-time full-time CPP students as derived from the CSU Student Success Dashboard, first-year retention rates are 84.8% to 89.8% for 2008 to 2018 and second-year retention rates are 77.2% to 80.8% for 2008 to 2017, with no notable trends through time.

With respect to the WSCUC Graduate Rate Dashboard data, for 2017 CPP has an Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR) of 90.0% (compared to a CSU average of 88.8%) and an average Unit Redemption Rate (URR) of 95.0% (compared to the CSU average of 89.3%). These data reveal, as intended, how institutional and student success may be obscured and distorted through traditional Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) metrics. Thus, while the complex lives of CPP students may involve transfers, leave-of-absences, and part-time enrollments that decrease six-year graduation rates, students are eventually earning high-quality degrees that, in turn, contribute to the regional workforce and broader society.

A key focus of the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI25) is the elimination of equity/achievement gaps for URM students (e.g., Black, Hispanic, Native American). Based on six-year graduation rates for the 2008 cohort first-time first-year students, CPP's six-year graduation rates are broadly similar with the national average, but, show smaller to nearly equal equity/achievement gaps compared to the national average (i.e., Native American: 7.4% versus 23%, Black: 20.7% versus 24.0%, Hispanic: 10.8% versus 11%). The CSU Chancellor's Office has noted that the campus has made "good progress" with these and other GI25 equity/achievement gaps. Discussion within CPP, including town halls, have generated a number of actions towards greater equity, such as increasing resource awareness earlier, revising university policies, and improving advising. Such conversations appeared welcomed by all parties during the visit, and, speaks to a desire to develop a student-ready campus committed to inclusive excellence (CFR 2.10).

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

CPP appears to have embraced an “improvement science” approach to defining, demonstrating, and improving the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degrees through program assessment and program review. For example, the Q2S conversion was often mentioned as an opportunity to “assess the assessment” of the past and drive intentional improvements in both process and content, and as part of this restructuring nearly 50% of all CPP programs engaged in a structured process to examine, revise, and explicate their program learning outcomes, curricular matrix, assessment methods, and timeline.

Ensuring shared governance and faculty responsibility: The development and assessment of CPP’s outcomes at institutional, general education, and program levels, and more recently the development of a new approach to program review, has been grounded in shared governance through formal proposals and actions by the academic senate and its committees followed by final approval by the university president (CFR 3.7, 3.10). Evidence for assessment has largely been drawn from formal coursework as taught by CPP faculty, and CPP faculty are responsible for assessing their program outcomes and participating in program reviews (CFR 2.4, 2.7, 4.3). The institution provides support for faculty to engage in broader assessment efforts, such as through summer assessment institutes and college assessment liaison positions, and has progressively clarified their processes and practices through webpage content, workshops, consultations, etc. (CFR 4.5). During the visit, however, some faculty still expressed confusion as to the importance of, interrelationships between, and approaches to assessing the various levels of outcomes.

Building institutional capacity through personnel investments: Progress in quality assurance and improvement has been aided by recent organization changes and personnel investments. For

example, an office of assessment and program review (OAPR), led by a faculty coordinator, was established in 2017, and this office now includes a research technician, a faculty fellow for program review, a faculty fellow for university assessment, and nine college-specific assessment liaisons, each supported by three units of release time per academic year. In 2017, a faculty director of graduate studies was appointed to support graduate education, including the diversification and expansion of offerings, the assessment of CPP's nascent graduate institutional learning outcomes, and the strengthening of graduate student support services (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b). Consistent with a holistic approach to evidence-based continuous improvement, in 2018 an educational learning and assessment specialist was hired to lead assessment efforts within student affairs (CFRs 3.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). Finally, also in 2018, CPP hired an associate vice president for academic programs charged with supporting and championing the efforts of OAPR and working collaboratively with the two senate assessment committees. Importantly, this position has a committed budget to support and sustain faculty engagement in program assessment and review. Together, these strategic personnel investments are helping to transform program assessment and review from historically compliance reporting into evidence-based, improvement-driven, and action-oriented conversations. While evidence for such conversations around general education outcomes (and Core Competencies) was well-represented within the Institutional Report and during the visit, discipline-oriented evidence from program assessment was relatively scarce but likely starting to emerge following recent operational changes and recovery from the Q2S conversion.

Building institutional capacity through process improvements: The visit revealed diverse evidence, in the form of session conversations and detailed documentation, that recent and ongoing institutional shifts in the approach to, and organization of, program assessment and review have not been random changes in lieu of doing the work, but reflect a combination of broader institutional

imperatives (i.e., Q2S conversion) and genuine and intentional improvements informed by faculty feedback and needs (CFRs 2.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). Program review is a case in point: During the visit, a session focused on program review presented various findings consistent with numerous CFRs (e.g., 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 4.1-4.7) for three selected programs (i.e., plant science, education leadership, and science, technology, and society) and included a discussion of actions around these findings.

At an institutional scale, after conferring with WSCUC and based on the Q2S conversion, CPP largely placed program reviews on hold starting in 2014 (although some programs elected to conduct their reviews by choice or due to professional accreditation requirements) and then began to ramp back up in 2018. The team noted, however, that analysis of the IEEI-based “last program review date” for programs that had previously undergone review (n=75 with dates extending back to 2006) showed that reviews rapidly declining since an all-time high of 17 in 2010 (coinciding with the last WSCUC educational effectiveness visit), with 11 in 2011, 6 in 2012, 2 in 2013, and 0 in 2014. Furthermore, analysis of the same IEEI data for programs with a “last program review date” and a “next program review date” (n=75) in terms of years between these reviews showed that 33% had between-review intervals of 6 years or less, 69% had between-review intervals of 10 years or less, and 100% had between-review intervals of 15 years or less (note that five programs with likely erroneous last review dates of 1999 were excluded; if these dates are correct, then these programs have not been reviewed for 20 years). While these IEEI-based data have limitations (e.g., all dates show a month/day value of 1 June, so their exact academic year is unclear), CPP may want to pay particular attention to meeting their stated goal of a five to seven year periodicity for future program reviews. Setting these historical analyses aside, the director of assessment and program review recently led a complete redesign of the ten-year-old program review process with broad input from CPP faculty. The new process, under review for approval by the academic senate at the time of the visit, would establish formal senate committee

involvement and produce a shared action memo between the program and college and academic affairs leadership. Notably, many of the proposed self-study components align with many of the WSCUC CFRs and programs are required to report on past assessment findings and action as well as ongoing and future assessment plans.

Infusing institutional data into decision-making: Over the last decade, institutional research (IR) at CPP has undergone a series of organization changes, while also being stretched thin by major resource limitations and extensive reporting responsibilities. In 2017, based on growing demand for timely data across campus and the need to inform and track strategic planning, CPP expanded the capacity for IR and formalized two major and complementary IR offices: An office for institutional research, planning, and analytics (IRPA), which focuses on business intelligence, strategic planning support, data visualization, and analytics, and an office for academic research and resources (ARAR), which focuses on data collection/aggregation/analysis/reporting for short- to long-term planning, program assessment and review (including campus-wide internal assessment activities and external assessment instruments and surveys), and the management of budget, space, and enrollment. Both offices work collaboratively to “free the data” via the extensive development of Tableau-based dashboards that provide on-demand, both historical and current, aggregated data and visualizations to serve local and global needs across campus (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). An example of disaggregating assessment data by student demographic data for information literacy was discussed in Component 4, and such data integration will likely become more crucial as the campus strives to identify and remove equity/achievement gaps at multiple scales (CFR 4.3).

In closing, as the various efforts and improvements outlined above formalize and normalize, CPP will benefit from ensuring a shared campus understanding of (1) the structure and relationships among institutional, general education, and program outcomes and their contextualization within the eight

core elements of CPP's polytechnic educational approach, (2) how the integration of assessment efforts and findings from the local program and broader general education levels, as well as from student affairs, can provide insights into the campus's institutional learning outcomes, and also be used as evidence for improvement actions, and (3) the central role of program review as an opportunity for reflecting upon recent efforts, clarifying program intentions, and developing shared actions. Such efforts, especially when informed by institutional data and analytics, may reveal important opportunities at multiple institutional levels to develop more inclusive and engaging learning environments, strengthen the campus community, and narrow and close student equity/achievement gaps.

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

Overall Financial Stability: The university's financial position has progressively improved since the 2008 recession, with available funds having grown from a low point of \$208.6 million in FY 2011-2012 to \$306.9 million in FY 2017-2018, an increase of \$98.3 million (47%) over six years. This improvement was the result of a number of factors, including the implementation of the CSU Sustainable Financial Model, implementation of a new student success fee in 2013, which now produces more than \$9 million per year, and increased revenues from student enrollment growth. In addition, the College of the Extended University (CEU), Associated Students, Inc., and CCP Foundation, Inc. contributed positively to the overall financial well-being of the institution. The university has also established a new Philanthropic Foundation to enhance the overall philanthropic capacity of the institution. Starting in July of 2019, the Philanthropic Foundation is the primary entity responsible for accepting gifts to the university and oversees the management and investment of \$25.0 million in operating funds and \$95.0 million in endowment funds. Although the university has strengthened its overall financial health, it is still recovering from some of the financial setbacks of the 2008 recession, as

evidenced through such current challenges as deferred maintenance and the need to replenish a large number of tenure-track faculty positions. (CFRs 3.4)

Strategic Planning 2017-2025: CPP has been engaged over the past few years in the development of a Strategic Plan that charts the university's course through 2025 with respect to areas of growth and opportunities for improvement. The Strategic Plan also provides a blueprint for aligning budgets with strategic priorities in order to advance the university's mission and vision, with the primary focus on student learning and academic excellence. Guided by the institution's mission, vision and values, the Strategic Plan identifies five strategic initiatives: (1) Deliver quality programs that promote integrative learning, discovery and creativity; (2) Enhance student learning, development and success; (3) Prepare students for the future of work, human and civic engagement; (4) Strengthen economic vitality and input; and (5) Advance organizational development and employee excellence. In addition to these five major initiatives, the Strategic Plan includes 22 goals and 61 objectives. The final version of the plan was shared with the university community in Fall 2019. Moving forward, all divisions of the institution will prepare strategic planning progress reports on a semester basis utilizing the Nuventive platform. The university plans to issue its first annual Strategic Plan progress report at the end of the 2019-2020 academic year (CFR 4.6).

In association with the Strategic Plan, the university has developed an Academic Master Plan and is developing a Campus Master Plan. The Academic Master Plan reflects the institution's vision for academic identity, values, philosophy, and future direction. The Campus Master Plan is being developed to be integrated with the objectives of Strategic and Academic Master Plans. Elements of the Campus Master Plan include campus-wide improvements, space analysis and utilization, planning for the renovation and transformation of academic spaces, and student life improvements, including student housing, student dining, a health and wellness center, a student center, athletics, and recreation. The

university expects to complete the Campus Master Plan over the next eighteen months and present it to the CSU Board of Trustees for approval and adoption in 2021. In addition to these three plans, the university is also developing an Information Technology Plan. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 4.6, 4.7)

Multi-Year Budget Processing: The university has established a multi-year strategic budget planning process with the objective of apportioning financial resources to campus priorities in alignment with the Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, Campus Master Plan, and Information Technology Plan. Through the annual budget process, each institutional division is responsible for identifying and prioritizing operational and strategic needs, and, presenting budget requests aligned with specific aspects of these strategic plans. The president's cabinet is then responsible for ranking submitted budget requests and making recommendations to the president. A multi-year budgeting model, based on a three-year timeframe, was adopted in 2016-2017, and is now in its fourth budgeting cycle. It is still early to fully determine the effectiveness of this multi-year approach relative to aligning resources with strategic initiatives, but university leadership is optimistic about this budget planning process and is currently in the process of selecting a budget planning software tool that will provide comprehensive support (i.e., budget and planning, financial modeling, strategic goal setting, monitoring, analysis, and reporting). This technological investment should promote greater engagement and transparency for all involved in the institution's budget process, and also permit the university to more effectively monitor and measure the alignment between local resource allocation and achievement of broader strategic goals (CFRs 3.4, 3.5).

Facility and Infrastructure Deferred Maintenance: The university has identified facility and infrastructure deferred maintenance as a significant institutional challenge. Campus infrastructure and facilities updates were delayed in response to the 2008 financial crisis, which contributed to the current deferred maintenance situation. The university estimates its current deferred maintenance backlog at

\$184.0 million and has calculated the current Age of Plant to be approximately 18.2 years, including the Lanterman property (see below). While difficult to realistically compare Age of Plant between institutions, it is likely that 18.2 years would be considered relatively high, signaling that attention and resources need to be directed at this issue given that average institutions are generally in the 13 to 14 year range. In the period of 2015-2019, the institution completed nineteen projects in the deferred maintenance category totaling \$21.3 million, and, has nine deferred maintenance projects actively funded in 2019 totaling \$51.1 million. The university is in the process of identifying resources to address this deferred maintenance challenge going forward, including working with its partners in the CSU system to address the requirements and identify funding. For example, the 2020-2021 Action Year Request includes eight deferred maintenance projects with an estimated value of \$29.2 million. The university has estimated that if these investments in deferred maintenance are funded, then the Age of Plant would likely decrease to the 15.59 year range in 2022. Finally, the university has built, or has started construction on, eight facility additions to the campus, and four of its most recently completed buildings are Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified (CFR 3.4).

Lanterman Property: In 2015, CPP received authority on a 300-acre property as the result of a transfer from the State of California. The site, formerly known as the Lanterman Development Center, borders the cities of Pomona, Diamond Bar, and Walnut, and is located a few miles from the main campus. The Lanterman Development Center was operated for 87 years by the State of California, most recently through the Department of Development Services, for providing services to California citizens with developmental disabilities. The center's closure in 2015 provided the opportunity for the university to secure control of the property, which consists of mainly vacant buildings, including residences, an acute hospital facility, a training center, administrative buildings, and recreation facilities. The university has embarked on a long-term plan to develop on this site as a university-oriented, mixed-use community

with the principle purpose of generating revenue to support the university's academic mission. In addition to revenue generation, CPP leadership envisions the development to be a "live, work, learn, play" environment that promotes and supports campus initiatives aligned with colleges and programs (e.g., research facilities and student internships) as well as affordable housing for faculty, staff, students, and the general community, a variety of retail stores and restaurants, and green space for outdoor activities. In 2018, the university formulated a campus committee to provide input on the project and completed a self-study report on the property. The university recently selected FivePoint Holding, LLC as its development partner, and is in the process of finalizing an exclusive negotiating agreement with the firm. FivePoint is a development firm that specializes in the design and development of mixed-use planned communities in coastal California, with developments in San Francisco, Valencia, and Irvine. Once the agreement with FivePoint is finalized, the university plans to engage in a three-year due diligence process to further refine vision, develop project plan elements, and assess environmental and mitigation planning requirements. The university sees the Lanterman development as contributing to the institution's long-term financial health and sustainability. The Lanterman property represents a very unique opportunity that will take 10 to 20 years to fully realize. When the property was transferred to the university by the State of California, the intention was that no state funds be appropriated for the transfer, operation, maintenance or development of the property, so the university is responsible for securing all of the resources necessary for the long-term development of the property. Although the Lanterman development has the possibility of generating substantial revenue for the institution, it will be many years before the university experiences these benefits, and like all development projects, challenges and risks the institution could arise along the way. In the meantime, the university is spending approximately \$1.9 million per year to maintain and secure the property; approximately \$1.0

million of this cost is mitigated by income generated from film companies using the property as well as revenue from other activities (CFRs 1.5, 3.4, 4.7).

Tenure-Track Faculty/Tenure Density: As a result of the 2008 recession, CPP experienced a reduction in tenured faculty, with tenure density (i.e., percent of all instruction faculty who are tenured or tenure-track as compared to contingent lecturers) dropping from 67.7% in 2008 to 56.1% in 2017. The university has identified the need to develop a multi-year tenure-track hiring plan as a major component of its Academic Master Plan. The established objective is to increase tenure-density by approximately 2% over the next five years, which would progressively increase tenure-density to the institution's targeted goal of approximately 67.7% and restore tenure-density to around pre-recession level. Towards this goal, CPP hired 52 new tenure-track faculty in 2016-2017, 43 in 2017-2018, and 51 in 2018-2019. For the 2019-2020 academic year, a total of 50 tenure-track faculty searches have been approved : In conversations with leadership it was evident that the campus was evaluating whether it should increase tenure density beyond its initial target of 67.7%. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2).

Faculty and Student Gender and Ethnicity Diversity: As CPP addresses the challenge of tenure-density, it is also examining the faculty's gender and ethnicity diversity, particularly for tenure-track faculty. The table on the next page summarizes the current diversity profile (%) of the instructional faculty at the time of the AV:

Diversity Profile - Instructional Faculty	All Faculty	Tenure-Track Faculty
Gender		
Female	42.2%	41.6%
Male	57.7%	58.4%
Non-Binary	0.1%	0.0%
Ethnic Group		
White	54.7%	53.2%
Asian	20.4%	24.4%
Hispanic/Latino	11.4%	8.5%
Black/African American	3.7%	2.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.3%	0.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.2%
Non-Resident	3.8%	5.2%
Non-Specified	5.0%	5.3%
All Other	0.6%	0.4%

The table below summarizes the current diversity profile of the tenure-track faculty by professor category at the time of the AV:

Diversity Profile - Tenure-Track Faculty	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Gender			
Female	43.5%	45.6%	38.9%
Male	56.5%	54.4%	61.1%
Ethnic Group			
White	52.0%	41.8%	53.7%
Asian	17.0%	27.9%	30.3%
Hispanic/Latino	9.0%	8.9%	9.0%
Black/African American	1.7%	5.1%	2.5%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Non-Resident	14.1%	3.8%	0.4%
Non-Specified	4.5%	12.7%	3.3%
All Other	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%

As the gender data indicates, the percentage of female employees in tenure-track assistant and associate professor positions is increasing in comparison to the percentage of female employees in tenure-track full professor positions, suggesting that the balance between female and male tenure-track faculty may be moving towards parity over time. In regard to ethnicity data, however, it is less clear if the tenure-track faculty population is becoming more diverse. If non-specified and non-resident categories are excluded from the analysis, faculty of color represent 36.1% of total tenured-track assistant professors and 54.2% of total tenure-track associate professors, as compared to 44.3% of tenure-track full professors. Non-resident tenure-track faculty represent 14.1% of assistant professors, 3.8% of associate professors, and 0.4% of full professors (CFR 1.4).

It is important that senior leadership permanently identify roles and responsibilities to systematically recruit and retain a diverse faculty within its plans to increase faculty tenure density. As next steps, efforts have been identified that begin to address campus climate which include creating a University Inclusive Excellence Council, a Campus Climate Response Team, a speaker series, and targeted training as well as outreach to historically underrepresented minority student communities. The campus may benefit from sustained support of fiscal and human resources and outwardly visible signs of inclusive messaging and commitment throughout the campus community (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 3.2).

CPP has implemented a Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) for tenure-track faculty. Of the tenure-track faculty currently participating in the program, excluding the non-specified category, 74.1% are white and 25.9% are faculty of color. Of the total faculty participating, excluding the non-specified category, 19.0% are Asian. Retirements may provide the opportunity for the institution to further diversify the tenured faculty ranks.

CPP's student body is one of the most diverse in the county. Approximately 75.1% of its undergraduate enrollments and 63.1% of its graduate enrollments are students of color, excluding the

non-resident alien category. The university is a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI); approximately 39.0% and 34.0% of its undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, are Hispanic. Asian students represent approximately 25.0% of undergraduate and 18.0% of graduate enrollments, respectively. Like many institutions of higher education, CPP is challenged to make its faculty and staff more ethnically representative in relationship to the student population it serves. University leadership recognizes this challenge and has been in the process of implementing a more disciplined structure for attracting qualified faculty of color to its candidate pools, including diversity and inclusion training for faculty search committees and a monitoring and approval process for the final composition of the candidate pool for each faculty search. In support of this structure is the hiring of a new permanent position of faculty diversity outreach recruiter that is charged with working with academic affairs and the colleges and departments on extending the institution's outreach efforts to expand and diversify candidate pools. In addition, CPP has also created the position of presidential associate for equity diversity and campus climate that will report to the president and serve as a member of the president's cabinet. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes

CPP elected to not submit an optional essay on institutional specific themes.

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

The CPP self-study and Institutional Report characterize and capture the institutional dynamics experienced throughout the last decade as a period of institutional transformation from the great recession through its post-recovery and review period. The evidence supports an effort to communicate throughout the various campus stakeholders the nature and purpose of the WSCUC visit. CPP is intently focused on its identity as an inclusive polytechnic that transforms lives within a diverse student body context. It has leveraged this opportune time to examine and reshape its identify to ensure it remains

relevant in the 21st century educational context. The report articulates an understanding that alignment across its initiatives and support for student success are imperative, and it also recognizes areas that warrant further attention, particularly around the strength of the faculty and the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degrees. Overall the report provides a tempered balance of what can be achieved in the highest priority areas and documents intentionality in alignment with WSCUC Standards as it examines its strengths and resource allocation pertaining to student success. CPP has prioritized academic infrastructure that warrant further attention, particularly the need to enhance its tenure-track faculty ranks.

A recognition of university strengths is consistently demonstrated in its strategic vision and actionable through integration of the three plan elements along with reorganizations and the creation of new departments to support areas of focus. CPP leadership has reinvigorated a shared vision in student success in alignment with the Graduation Initiative 2025, and the campus is already making progress in course redesign to reduce remediation rates and implementation of supplemental instruction for high challenge courses, both of which will likely improve time to degree. The CPP graduation rates continue to be greater than the CSU system average. New resources focused on degree attainment are being deployed to improve academic preparedness and achievement and to provide the holistic support needed to enhance the student experience and shorten the time to degree. These concentrated efforts, along with the creation of new departments such as the Office of Equity, Inclusion and Compliance and other exemplars featured throughout the report, are intended to highlight and ensure equity throughout the university community, such that the campus culture is shaped by its diversity. CPP is making clear progress in its efforts to recognize, embrace, and celebrate its diverse student population. However, the issue of campus climate warrants attention particularly with the African American students and the Black Faculty Staff Association.

As the institution has grown and reshaped itself, particularly during the Q2S conversion, it is evident that one of its challenges is to continue building a culture of assessment and evidence-informed decision making. The process of building quality assurance throughout the organization is often confronted with competing priorities and the continual day-to-day demands that tax the institutional capacity of its faculty and staff. The review team received feedback about “campus fatigue” and many interims in various roles which may impede stability and progress. However, it is evident that continual attention should be directed to methods and analyses that enhance learning at the university level.

To ensure the campus deliverables in student success, CPP must also remain focused on bolstering its tenure density back to 68% and reevaluating the ideal faculty composition. Additional partnerships between the Office of Faculty Affairs and the Office of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance have the potential to strengthen the diversity of the professoriate and help mitigate campus climate issues. The campus has identified techniques that can build diverse pools, furthermore fiscal resources have been provided to enhance outreach and connections to historically underrepresented communities to promote CPP as an employer of choice. These additional resources and attention are critical first-steps to attract diverse candidates, but continual attention and likely additional efforts beyond what is presented in the report and gleaned from the visit will be needed to attract diverse candidates in this competitive environment, particularly in the STEM fields. Talent management will require constant attention as the strength of tenure-track and full-time faculty are an integral component of CPP’s strategy to deliver an inclusive polytechnic education.

The CPP campus is an overwhelmingly undergraduate student body with less than 6% of students enrolled in its 29 graduate and 6 credential programs. An emerging focus on reimagining graduate education is underway with new leadership, including developing new program goals to create guided pathways for graduate degree attainment (i.e. 4+1 programs) and offering support networks that

are crucial to attaining a graduate degree. Again, the critical role that tenure track faculty provide is imperative in ensuring graduate education is enhanced and grows. Increasing tenure density and alignment with the Academic Master Plan will have a significant impact on ensuring future success of graduate degree success particularly in a polytechnic environment. The support from a recently obtained grant may help guide the work identified in the Academic Master Plan for the future of graduate programs.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

Based on the Institutional Report and the Accreditation Visit, no additional topics, such as Substantive Change, emerged to address within this section.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As manifested within the Institutional Report and demonstrated through the Accreditation Visit, the WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation process provided CPP with an opportunity to reflect on its mission and strengthen its approach to its vision as a polytechnic university serving a diverse student population in a major metropolitan region.

Based on its evaluation of submitted materials and interactions with the campus community, the review team identified the following CPP accomplishments and practices as particularly worthy of commendation:

1. Using the campus wide conversion from quarters to semesters (Q2S) as a catalyst for developing a student-centered strategic plan focused on enhancing learning, integrating curricular and co-curricular programming, and elevating academic preparation.
2. Promoting broad and comprehensive participation in the development of the Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, and Campus Master Plan.
3. Developing a holistic and coordinated advising structure across academic affairs and student affairs.
4. Using the Q2S conversion as a catalyst for a campus-wide inclusive and collaborative planning process for reaffirmation of accreditation.
5. Ensuring sustainability of resources through the creation of a multi-year all-funds budget model and the Implementation of a student success fee to support teaching and learning.
6. Strengthening service and support units (e.g., the Office of Assessment and Program Review, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Analytics, and the Academic Research and Resources Office) to support evidence-based (e.g. Tableau), student-centered decision making across the university from academic departments to the Office of the President.

Based also on its evaluation of submitted materials and interactions with the campus community, the review team identified the following recommendations to CPP:

1. Address issues of diversity and inclusion as a core value identified in the Strategic Plan with a sense of urgency.
2. Develop and implement a sustainable approach to fill interim leadership positions with permanent staff and faculty. The campus community, including students, may benefit from a comprehensive communication strategy that establishes clarity of purpose and invites engagement with these new roles or departments (CFRs 3.1, 3.6).
3. Develop a structure to establish relationships between program learning outcomes, general education learning outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 4.1, 4.3).
4. Articulate how assessment from programs, general education, and student affairs provide evidence of meeting institutional learning outcomes. These assessment efforts and results should be combined with institutional data to explicitly understand the relationship between student learning and student success (CFRs 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.13).
5. Adopt the improvements proposed to the University Senate by the Office of Assessment and Program Review (OAPR) to make program review more meaningful and manageable. OAPR should integrate overall assessment results as part of a program's evaluation (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3).
6. Create a sustainable institutional plan and process for the development, assessment, support, and resourcing of graduate programs, building upon current graduate institutional learning outcomes and ensuring that graduate students have ready access to student services (CFRs 2.2b, 2.4, 2.13).
7. Complete the Campus Master Plan and Information Technology Plan, and integrate these with the Academic Master Plan and Strategic Plan, including mechanisms for monitoring progress

and achievement. The university should further enhance its budget and financial planning processes to ensure that these prioritized institutional goals are appropriately funded (CFRs 3.4, 4.7).

APPENDICES

The 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 Reviews

1. UCLA Extension Complex, Westwood, CA (Interior Architecture Masters)
2. Pioneer High School, Whittier, CA (Administrative Services Credential)

Note: CPP does not offer any Distance Education Programs,
so no Distance Education Review is included in these appendices

Appendix A. Federal Compliance Forms

OVERVIEW

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

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

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

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

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

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

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

- (1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
 - (i) It reviews the institution's-
 - (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework;and
 - (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
- (2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

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

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

- (1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
- (2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

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

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

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

Appendix A.1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? CPP Academic Catalog
	Comments: Specific catalog location: https://catalog.cpp.edu/content.php?catoid=36&navoid=2926&hl=%22credit+hour%22&returnto=search#Credit_Hour
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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? Four
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters, and Ed.D.
	What discipline(s)? Education Leadership, Computer Information Systems, Nutrition, Urban and Regional Planning
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? Four
	What kinds of courses? Dissertation, Internship, Service Learning
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters, and Ed.D.
	What discipline(s)? Education Leadership, Animal Science, Management and Human Resources , and Gender, Ethnic, and Multicultural Studies
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Three
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? Bachelor, Master, and Ed.D.
	What discipline(s)? Business Administration, Biological Sciences, and Education Leadership
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Specific program examples may be viewed at the following catalog locations: https://catalog.cpp.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=36&poid=9420&returnto=2904 https://catalog.cpp.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=36&poid=9420&returnto=2904 https://catalog.cpp.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=36&poid=9447&returnto=2905

Review Completed By: Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Chair

Date: 31 October 2019

Appendix A.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 <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The Outreach, Recruitment and Educational Partnerships office follows federal requirements, and uses the NACAC's Statement of Principles of Good Practice as a guide.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Information available at: https://www.cpp.edu/~data/index.shtml (typical time to degree) https://www.cpp.edu/~student-accounting/tuition-fees/ (overall cost of degree)
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Information available at: https://www.cpp.edu/~career/ (kinds of jobs available to undergraduates; see also individual degree program descriptions in catalog and on academic unit websites) https://www.cpp.edu/~career/senior-exit-survey.shtml (employment of graduates; see pdf link to annual survey results)

*§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: Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Chair

Date: 31 October 2019

Appendix A.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 <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Academic Catalog; see https://catalog.cpp.edu/content.php?catoid=36&navoid=2923#Student Complaint Procedure
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly: Complaints are directed to the most appropriate office for responding (e.g., Dean of Students, Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance); as appropriate, complaints are investigated and resolved; records are kept so that patterns may be discerned and addressed
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where? Each office that receives complaints maintains a record of complaints and outcomes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly: Orderly records are kept. When new complaints are received, records are examined for patterns or trends
Comments:	

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Chair

Date: 31 October 2019

Appendix A.4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s transfer credit policy and practices.

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 <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? See links below https://www.cpp.edu/admissions/transfer/requirements.shtml https://www.cpp.edu/registrar//transfer-credit-info/index.shtml
	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 <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	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: Stephen Schellenberg, Assistant Chair

Date: 31 October 2019

Appendix B. Off Campus Location Reviews

Appendix B.1. UCLA Extension Complex, Westwood, CA (Master of Interior Architecture)

Institution: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Type of Visit: Off Campus Location Review

Name of reviewer/s: Stephen Schellenberg

Date/s of review: May 1st, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address: *UCLA Extension Complex, 1010 Westwood Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90024*
2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC): *One degree, a Master of Interior Architecture, is offered at this "additional" WSCUC location type, and this degree was established by CPP in 2010. This self-support program graduates roughly 30 student per year with high retention and graduation; faculty counts for this highly applied industry-serving degree vary and are drawn from CPP, other campuses, and the professional community as per professional accreditation requirements and expectations.*
3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed): *Reviewer examined documents for the initial establishment of the program (which was conducted with input from UCLA campus and extension) and their most recent professional accreditation by the Council of Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA). Reviewer also met with the program director, manager, advisor, and coordinator for expansive discussion of all lines of inquiry that follow as well as an extensive tour of the physical space and student work.*

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

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?		N/A
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	This self-support program complements the polytechnic spirit of CPP and is well organized and operated.	None
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Many student services are locally provided through dedicated staff. Students have access to all digital affordances of other CPP students.	None
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Physical environment is largely characterization as a living studio and portfolio, with ready access to diverse physical sample materials to inform interior design and a stand-alone extensive dedicated library. Site is well-managed by a dedicated staff.	None
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Capacity and delivery of service is timely and adequate, largely through a one-stop approach via dedicated staff.	None
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Course are taught by dedicated full time staff augment as appropriate by professional drawn from the industry. Faculty are engaged in ensuring curricular continuity across courses given the strong portfolio- and project-based nature of this applied degree.	None
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	No comparable program exists on the main campus, and the programs and courses are highly informed by industry standards and professional accreditation.	None
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	The program has extremely high retention rates for a relatively small population of students; variations are largely driven by one or two students and their personal situations.	None
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Assessment of student learning is grounded in product and design in two and three dimensions. Evidence of student learning were strong in both summative efforts, many of which are displayed and contextualized throughout the space.	None
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Program is professional accredited and in good standing.	None

Appendix B.2. Pioneer High School, Whittier, CA (Administrative Services Credential)

Institution: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Type of Visit: Off Campus Location Review

Name of reviewer/s: Stephen Schellenberg

Date/s of review: May 2nd, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed². One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address: *Whittier Union HS District: Pioneer High School, 10800 Benavon St., Whittier, CA 90606*
2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC): *This site is one of five regional high schools or district offices that host the CPP self-support Administrative Services Credential, which was established in 2007 and is designed for K-12 educators and administrators seeking professional development opportunities. The credential is cohort-based with roughly 25 students within each cohort. Formal faculty consist of three highly experienced high school administrators, who also recruit exemplary administrators for supplemental presentation, discussions, etc.*
3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed): *Extensive document was provided to the reviewers, and the reviewer interviewed the three lead instructors as well as a cohort of students, and also sat in on an entire evening session.*

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

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A	N/A
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	This self-support program complements the polytechnic spirit of CPP and is well organized and operated.	None
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Staff meet most student service needs, and student have access to other service via the campus as needed. Students have access to all digital affordances of other CPP students.	None
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Physical environment for cohort meetings is typically a high school classroom. Faculty leads provide reports and seek feedback for curricular modifications.	None
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Capacity and delivery of service is timely and adequate, largely through a one-stop approach via highly dedicated faculty. Student satisfaction was uniformly high.	None
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Faculty are experienced high school and district administrators who have literally seen it all and focus on meeting students where they are and moving them towards evidence-based best practices.	None
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	No comparable program exists on the main campus, and the program structure is highly informed by its intent to facilitate the professional development and advancement of student who are already in a K-12 system and looking to advance professionally.	None
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Cohorts of typically 25 students have extremely high completion rates for the credential. Students who must step out of the cohort may join the next cohort without repeating accomplished content.	None
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Student learning is evidence through faculty evaluation of projects, individual and group, and through student surveys during the credential and following its completion.	None
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	Faculty maintain program quality and effectiveness through an awareness of student needs around K-12 issues, making modifications to instruction, projects, and content in response to regional workforce needs as well as the broader literature on organizational effectiveness in service to effective K-12 environments	None