REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Charles R. Drew

University of Medicine and Science

March 13-16, 2018

Team Roster

Mark Appelbaum, Chair
Emeritus Professor
University of California, San Diego

Andrew Priest, Asst. Chair
Dean, College of Health and Human Services
Touro University Nevada

Mark Howe
Vice President for Finance and Administration
California Baptist University

Sammy Elzarka
Higher Education Assessment Consultant

Edward Junkins
Associate Dean
Western University of Health Sciences

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

APPENDICES (Separate .pdf documents)
Federal Compliance Forms
      1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
      2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
      3. Student Complaints Review
      4. Transfer Credit Review

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

The Institution: The Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science [CDU] offers a range of medical and health-related academic programs through its College of Medicine, College of Science and Health, and School of Nursing. The College of Medicine includes a medical education [MD] program in partnership with the David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California, Los Angles (UCLA). The College of Science and Health includes the following programs:

> Bachelor of Science, Biomedical Sciences
>
> Master of Science in Biomedical Sciences
>
> Radiologic Technology (AS)
>
> Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Science (BS)
>
> Graduate Certificate in Public Health Concepts
>
> Master of Public Health (MPH) in Urban Health Disparities
>
> Bachelor of Science, Urban Community Health Sciences
>
> Master of Health Science, Physician Assistant
>
> General Studies

The Mervyn M. Dymally School of Nursing includes the following programs:

> MSN-FNP [Family Nurse Practioner]
>
> MSN-PMC [Post Master's Certificate – Nursing]
>
> MSN-ELM [Entry-Level Master of Science in Nursing]
>
> MSN-ANE [Advanced Nursing Education]
>
> RN-BSN   [Registered Nurse – Bachelor of Science Nursing]

In addition, CDU has a fairly large component of administrative offices that provide the usual services required to run an institution of higher education. These services range from student support services to offices which support the physical plant and institutional finance, as well as offices necessary to support faculty and student research. All of these components are present at CDU.

Accreditation History: CDU has a complex history with respect to accreditation – both with WASC directly and with profession specific accreditation bodies. While the history of accreditation issues is fairly complex, the last two special visits are of particular importance and special relevance to the 2017-2018 reaffirmation process. These were the 2011 and the 2015 Special Visits. The reports of the visiting teams, the WASC actions based on those reports, and the CDU comments on those reports and actions are supplied in the historic documents provided to this current team. Of these, the most important comes from the 2015 Special Visit where both the WSCUC Visiting Team Report and the Commission Action Letter of July 10, 2015 both reference 12 recommendations that CDU should address "as part of its next reaffirmation review."

There is direct reference to these 12 recommendations in the CDU Institutional Report as a single page item labelled Appendix A in which the recommendations are itemized, including a column headed "CDU Plans and Progress Since 2015". As a result of the 2018 CDU site visit, the team believes that the institution has made remarkable progress on those 2015 recommendations.

The Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science is a non-profit non-sectarian medical and health sciences university located in Los Angeles, California. It was founded in 1966 motivated largely by a community need for education and healthcare. CDU does not have any off-campus locations. As of Fall 2016 CDU had 571 students in graduate or undergraduate healthcare professional programs, including the those in the MD program joint with UCLA. The university was first accredited by the Senior College Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges [now WSCUC] in 1995. The Commission placed CDU on Probation in 2009. A Special Visit in February 2011 led to a Commission action letter of July 5, 2011 which called upon the institution to make concerted efforts to increase enrollment and fundraising and demonstrate financial sustainability; to address a number of interrelated issues concerning the faculty; to continue to analyze student retention and graduation; to show further development of its assessment capabilities; and to "provide completed program reviews and examples of improvements made as a result of program review and assessment." The Commission removed the university from Probation, issued a Notice of Concern, requested an Interim Report in March 2013, and called for another Special Visit in spring 2014. The institution's Interim Report resulted in a WSCUC staff letter dated June 17, 2013, which noted the "substantial progress achieved by the institution" and recommended that the next Special Visit be moved to spring 2015, with a Progress Report on finances in the interim. For the 2015 visit, the institution was asked to continue to focus on the issues indicated in the Commission's July 5, 2011 letter and to pay special attention to demonstrating the relationship between strategic planning, financial sustainability planning, fundraising, and budgeting. The Progress Report submitted in February 2014 was determined by WSCUC to be precise, direct, and "comprehensive—all items were embraced appropriately." WSCUC

conducted a Special Visit in February of 2015, and at that time, the visiting team found substantial compliance with the Standards and recommendations.

Team Process: The visiting accreditation team was established in the fall of 2017, and given access to the CDU Institutional Report and supporting documents. The team was guided by WSCUC staff and followed the prescribed system for review. The team divided the tasks of the review into subject areas that best fit the experience of each reviewer and assigned writing to each team member. The team met in Oakland in late November 2017 for the offsite review (OSR) and reviewed the CDU documents and discussed areas of commendation and concern. The team created an OSR document with commendations and lines of inquiry for CDU and also requested several more documents which CDU has since supplied. The team held one conference call in late February in preparation for the site visit and made final writing assignments to team members. During the site visit, the team met with a large number of stakeholders with varied institutional interests. The team met periodically during the site visit to compare notes and discuss each other's findings. At the end of the visit, the team met for several hours to discuss findings, and ultimately provided several commendations and recommendations. Overall, the WSCUC Institutional Report from CDU was extensive and informative; however, in some areas the team felt that the institution did not address all of the components adequately, including some of the 12 recommendations made in the July 10, 2015 communication from WASC. Clarifications and additional data were requested. CDU provided responses which assisted the team in understanding the university better. Conversations and interviews during the site visit helped clarify many areas that were missing in the self-study. We found, in summary, that while the institutional report provided much of the needed basic information, it did not fully represent the institutional accomplishments and current state. The team was pleasantly surprised

when it learned what is happening at the institution which is much more vibrant and progressive than might have been inferred from the self-study in isolation.

CDU established a variety of teams to conduct their self-study process. The teams included faculty, staff, community members, administrators, and some students. The teams appear to have been quite inclusive. Faculty from every area in the institution were included in all aspects of the development of the report. CDU appears to have taken the reaccreditation process quite seriously and used it as an opportunity to both reflect on their history and to imagine their future. The institution appeared honest and realistic regarding where it has been and how far it has come considering the significant threats faced in the last decade. The report was open in explaining some of the academic challenges CDU has faced in recent years and the strategies it has implemented to address those challenges. A number of these are ongoing. The team was concerned that some significantly untoward events have occurred (pass-rates below regulator's thresholds) and they seemed to have come as a surprise to CDU. Possibly these could have been anticipated (and avoided) had consistent adherence to adequate processes been in place. It is our hope that the processes that are currently in place, and those being currently developed, will prevent a reoccurrence of that kind of process.

In general, CDU used appropriate methodology and effectively used evidence in the process of conducting its self-study. In those cases where the team requested additional information (as in the letter of February 6, 2018) CDU effectively provided the additional data. A few issues did arise during the site visit and CDU provided, in the main, the additional data that was sought. Generally speaking, CDU's responses did address the team's issues and questions. In general, the data and evidence CDU provided supported their claims.

The team believes that CDU's report has helped the institution to better understand themselves and their situation. In general, the individual academic units do a good job assessing their effectiveness and measuring student learning. However, administrative units, in particular, student services, are lacking in their assessment of effectiveness and continuous quality improvement (discussed later).

CDU is ambitious regarding its future. As we discuss throughout the report the vision for the future of CDU, as expressed mostly in its strategic plan, is based upon a number of strong assumptions and will require considerable good fortune. While the plan is exciting, visionary, and boldly tied to the institution's declared mission, the team is somewhat concerned about the ambitious growth plans of the university with somewhat limited resources.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The 2015 Special Visit team identified twelve "Recommendations" for CDU:

> *RECOMMENDATIONS*
> *1. That the University engage in meaningful and realistic strategic planning under the evolving "One University" concept, as part of its dedication to its mission and commitment to sustainability.*
> *2. That the University develop a programmatic Academic Plan flowing from the Strategic Plan that governs its decisions about appropriate degree offerings at the undergraduate and graduate levels.*
> *3. That the University consider new delivery modes for offering its curricula, perhaps through weekend, blended, online, or distance program offerings.*
> *4. That the University create a more structured approach to enrollment management and develop an Enrollment Growth Plan.*
> *5. That the University expand the scope of support services required to assure student success and enhance services that promote the wellbeing of its students.*

6. That the University continue to recruit and retain a permanent senior leadership team that will bring the "One University" concept to fruition.

7. That the University collaboratively develop a streamlined shared governance process with clearly defined relationships between and among college, Senate, and University committees, the administration, and the Board.

8. That the University continue to develop its contractual relationships with faculty with a view towards the possible implementation of a process for awarding multi-year contracts as appropriate.

9. That the University establish a process to review the relationship of such factors as appointment status, rank, series, and productivity as they relate to the determination of compensation under the Institutional Base Salary framework.

10. That the University clarify the role and responsibilities of the non-compensated faculty within the institution.

11. That the University seek to establish clinical relationships with Martin Luther King Hospital and other facilities in the region.

12. That the University embrace the preceding recommendations so that it can demonstrate significant progress by the time of its next comprehensive visit.

CDU has since 2015 developed and begun the implementation of a thoughtful and detailed Strategic Plan. (A detailed implementation plan was provided in the self-study as appendix D. This document list 108 items in describing the path to full implementation.) The plan was developed with input from a highly inclusive group of stakeholders – including many members of the board. The academic plan (including the development of new majors) appears to be derived from the strategic plan and the "One University" concept appears to have taken hold within the institution. Shared governance is operational All of the issues identified in the 2015 report have been addressed through the strong leadership of the president, the new provost, and the deans as well as through the close attention of the board. There is considerably better structure to the curriculum, administration, student services, shared governance, academic assessment, and there appears to be significant "buy-in" from all constituencies. We believe that the 2015 Recommendations have been adequately addressed or are in the process of being addressed.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements;

Compliance with WSCUC Standards

STANDARD 1: *Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives (CFR's 1.1 - 1.8)*

CDU has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines (CFR 1.1). Appropriate educational objectives are widely recognized and are systematically assessed. It makes its data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning public (CFR 1.2). The institution follows generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Appropriate due process procedures are in place and appear to function properly (CFR 1.3). It has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the Equity and Inclusion Policy (CFR 1.4). The university does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution (CFR 1.5). The university catalog has published policies on complaint, grievances, refunds, etcetera, and does not have a history of violations. It maintains student records for at least 6 years. There is clarity in its credit offerings and in their grading and student evaluation policies (CFR 1.6). The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors (CFR 1.7). CDU has been honest and communicative with WSCUC and has been straight-

forward in its dealings with the Commission (CFR 1.8)   The team's finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

STANDARD 2: *Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions (CFR's 2.1 - 2.14)*

The team found that the institution was generally in compliance with relevant Standard 2 CFRs. Evidence was sought by the team during its onsite visit to demonstrate sufficient infrastructure for General Education programming, as well as future program expansion. The team found through document review, and verified on site, the degrees awarded are clearly defined in their Catalog (CFR 2.2), and graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives different from undergraduate (CFR 2.2b). Institutional Learning Outcomes are widely shared (CFR 2.4), and the institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes (CFR 2.6). Further, CDU subjects all its programs to an internal review process (CFR 2.7). Processes by which internal programmatic review occur were extensively discussed with the team during the onsite visit. There appears to be a robust methodology in place for review of programs without concomitant professional accreditation oversight. Finally, students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees (CFR 2.10).

The visiting team did find some areas where the institution has opportunities for improvement, particularly as it pursues its ambitious plan for enrollment expansion and programmatic growth. Additional resources, such as more teaching faculty and educational support services, for general education will required to accommodate the expansion of the undergraduate programs. Due to expansion of undergraduate programming at the institution, CDU needs to strengthen university-wide co-curricular activities, embedding co-curricular activities in each program. Academic and other student support services such as tutoring,

services for students with disabilities, and related activities will need to be expanded. CDU lists "Better tracking of gainful employment after graduation, advancing their education, etc." as another area to be addressed or improved (CFRs 2.11 and 2.13). Also, an expansion in the breadth and depth of General Education curriculum is needed (CFR 2.2a). As such, additional teaching faculty will likely be required in certain courses, while additional night classes might be offered for working students (CFR 2.1). Additional evaluation of service learning activities, reformation of Institutional Learning Outcomes and refinement of service learning requirements are also needed (CFR 2.3). Finally, at the time of the institutional self-study and accreditation visit, no tenure track available for faculty at the institution (CFR 2.8); CDU operates through a renewable contract system.

The team's finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2 although there are areas which would benefit from additional institutional activities.

STANDARD 3: *Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability (CFR's 3.1 - 3.10)*

The institution responded to prior recommendations by the WSCUC by awarding multi-year contracts to full-time CDU faculty for the first time in 50 years, and by reforming and consolidating policies relating to appointment and compensation in their new faculty handbook (CFR 3.2). Also, the institution has a very strong governing board that has significant understanding of institutional operations with individuals from many of the major health care educator and provider institutions in immediate geographical area (CFR 3.9). Finally, CDU has a strong and stable leadership management team, including: the President, EVP Provost, Chief Business

Officer, Chief Financial Officer, VP Advancement, VP Research, University Attorney, and Chief of Staff (CFR 3.8).

The university has identified improvements that are needed for faculty and staff related to job descriptions, performance management, and documentation (CFR 3.1). Also, while the institution made improvements in faculty contracts and issued multiple year contracts in 2016, its process of faculty rank assignment and step advancement needs better formal documentation (CFR 3.2). Further, the institution notes a concern that promotion in faculty rank is not clearly correlated with performance indicators (CFR 3.3), although interviews on-site showed that faculty were familiar with promotion policies. Faculty development activities exist, but are not systematic and are probably not at an optimal level... Many faculty are experienced clinicians but are relatively novice faculty. They would benefit greatly from a structured and focused faculty development plan. CDU should develop a more robust faculty development program. Finally, while the university has a Memorandum of Agreement of shared government between compensated faculty, administration and the Board of Trustees, the next step for the institution is to review the role of non-compensated faculty (CFR 3.10).

CDU employees confirmed that several improvements have been made to ensure the sufficiency of faculty, staff, and senior leadership. New job descriptions have been completed; improvements to faculty and staff development and training programs that include required sexual harassment and Title IX training have been implemented. There have been significant investments of time creating, developing, reviewing and implementing more efficient and effective faculty governance models creating a more collaborative and supportive environment. These investments are in alignment with the culture of diversity and inclusivity

that guide and sustain the institutional culture... Furthermore, the growth in student enrollment has been included in the process of determining the number and expertise needed for faculty and staff. The budget articulates the increases in those resources and affirms the strategic goal of creating a more comprehensive University. The budget presentation confirms the departmental understanding of the strategic plan and supports those objectives (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.8).

An important element to its strategic plan is the continued growth of enrollment. An important component in the success of the plan, will require faculty that are compensated equitably and treated with respect. Faculty need to have continuity and surety that the investment of their time and energy is rewarded. CDU has accomplished that goal by providing full-time faculty multi-year (three-year) contracts beginning the fiscal year 2017-2018. An all-inclusive faculty handbook detailing faculty rights and responsibilities has been drafted and is currently under review. The document clearly describes the Mission and Values of CDU and supports an environment of diversity, respect, accountability, and responsibility for faculty members (CFR 3.1, 3.3, 3.10).

Information technology infrastructure continues to be a challenge for the university. It will be an important component of CDU's ability to successful execute on a number of their strategic plans and most importantly the increase in enrollment. Increase in enrollment will mandate the implementation of systems that will allow CDU faculty, staff and students to access, analyze and deliver data efficiently and effectively. The infrastructure must support scalable solutions to the rapidly evolving work and learning environments demanded by CDU's technology skilled faculty, staff and students body (CFR 3.5).

Shared governance has historically been a substantial issue for the university. Recently, a shared governance document has been signed by the Board of Trustees Chair, the President and CEO and President, Faculty Senate. The document articulates a shared governance model for the purpose of supporting the academic activities of CDU. The document identifies the role of each governing entity and encourages the support and accountability required to provide "effective management and smooth running of the University operations." (CDU Board of Trustees' Statement of Shared Governance) (CFR 3.9, 3.10).

The team's finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

STANDARD 4: *Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFR's 4.1 - 4.7)*

CDU employs a robust set of quality assurance processes in its academic areas. However, the processes appear to be operational at the program or school level, and are not necessarily consistent across the institution. All new programs and substantive curricular changes are vetted through a program review process. All programs are subject to periodic program review. Students are regularly assessed using a variety of metrics. The process appears to be comprehensive, well established and is sustainable over time. The team found that most of the non-academic areas of CDU also have quality assurance processes, although not nearly so well developed as the academic areas. Student services is one area that should have a much more developed system of continuous quality improvement. There has been significant staff turnover in the student services area in the past few years, and this turnover appears to have been a factor in their relative lack of periodic quality assurance reviews. A recommendation is included at the end of this report for the university to develop a program review process for

Student Services. The other non-academic areas should enhance their systematic quality assurance processes as well (CFR 4.1).

CDU has a rich research environment that is remarkable for the size of the institution. Scholarly activity is regularly conducted and disseminated appropriately. The research program at CDU has a continuous quality improvement review system that works well (CFR 4.2).

The institution has a clear, well-established process for gathering, analyzing and interpreting information that helps create a culture of assessment leading to evidence based improvement. This is particularly true for the teaching and learning processes that enhance student learning (CFR 4.3).

Most of the academic programs have their own professional accreditation bodies that grant approval for programs. All of the professional program accreditation bodies require that periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices. This process appears to occur with programs that do not have professional accreditation as well (CFR 4.4)

 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, potential employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs (CFR 4.5).

CDU has a very active, and large variety of constituencies, particularly within the community it serves. CDU regularly invites these constituencies to be involved at a genuine level in reflection and planning processes to help determine the direction, core functions, and resources for CDU. It is remarkable just how involved the community is involved in CDU's

evolution (CFR 4.6). CDU actively evaluates micro and macro environmental changes that might affect the institution, and attempts to anticipate these factors as it plans for its future development and resource allocation (CFR 4.7).

The team's finding is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate general compliance with Standard 4.

IEEI

CDU completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) in a reflective and analytical way. In the IEEI report, the institution provided a comprehensive and thoughtful overview of its assessment process across all degree programs, some of which are new. Professional accreditation recommendations are embedded in the institutional assessment plan. As noted by the institution, lagging indicators which have been identified and are being tracked by the institution, include passage of the NCLEX-RN licensure exam and the procurement of gainful employment as a graduate of the nursing program. These topics were discussed during the team visit, along with many other topics related to assessment and outcomes. Administrators at the university have closely studied the processes which resulted in low NCLEX-RN licensure examination performance. There is a strong team of leaders throughout the institution actively engaged in programmatic assessment.

Federal requirements

The university abides by revised regulations designed to streamline clock-to-credit hour conversions when evaluating transfer credit hour equivalencies. Regarding federal compliance, as mandated through regional accreditors by the US Department of Education, the university has

explicit policies on credit hour equivalencies, and transfer credits. These policies are documented in its catalog. Information on degree program length and typical time to degree is compiled and published by the Office of IRE at the university. The material reviewed included: Credit Hour Policy; procedure for periodic review of credit hour; schedule of courses; sample syllabi; and sample program information.

Regarding recruiting and admissions practices (Marketing and Recruitment), the institution is in compliance with federal regulations. No CDU employee or affiliated staff has incentive compensation for student recruitment. The "Facts and Figures" information published provides a wide array of data regarding overall cost of and typical length of time to a CDU degree. The Cost of Attendance is also available via the consumer information web page embedded within main website. Similarly, the institution provides information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified in its published material.

The institution has explicit policies on student complaints and grievances which are provided in the catalog. The catalog contains contact information for the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education for review of a complaint. Web address, phone and fax information is clearly published to enable reporting. Further into the catalog, there is additional information which details the policies and procedures regarding student complaints and grievances. The Students Complaints and Grievances Advisory was reviewed. Each college/school and program maintains and disseminates a complete policy and procedure document for their respective students. Also, each college/school has a dedicated student complaints/grievances committee that receives, investigates and resolves issues; the committees collaborate with their respective office of the dean to track and record the number, nature and resolution of complaints and grievances.

A summary of formal staff and student complaints received by Human Resources at CDU from January 2017 to March 2018 was reviewed. Over the same time period there were no faculty complaints received, as reported by the Chair of the Academic Senate subcommittee Academic Rights, Privileges & Grievances Committee.

The university has explicit policies on transfer credits. These transfer policies are publicly disclosed; and include a statement of the criteria established by CDU regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education. These policies are documented in the catalog, including a wide variety of informational and promotional materials which are tailored to students. The transfer credit policy was amended to include internal options for concurrent or accelerated sequential degrees. The transfer policy, in general, appears clear for most programs.

The team finds that the institution is in compliance with federal requirements.

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

The meaning, quality, and integrity of a degree at the CDU is firmly grounded in accreditation standards and is deeply informed by the mission and strategic plan of the institution. Professional degree programs closely follow professional competency requirements set by professional and regulatory agencies. The provost has charged a taskforce to translate the tenets of the academic brand into measurable ILOs for CDU degrees). The institution is quite public in its commitment to the meaning, quality and integrity of its degree programs and summarizes this in its statement of the "CDU Advantage".

In various forms the "CDU Advantage" is promoted on its web-site and other promotional materials where the institution states that the CDU Advantage represents the:

> University's promise to the world a defining set of characteristics of our graduate and undergraduate education. In the next five years, CDU student experience shall be defined by RESEARCH training and engagement; education in and for SOCIAL JUSTICE and DIVERSITY; GLOBAL and INTERNATIONAL education; COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT; and HEALTH POLICY knowledge and advocacy. In essence, the CDU Advantage is a promise of specialized education that cultivates medical and health LEADERS who are able to conduct and translate empirical works in their never-ending quests for social justice and health equity 'globally' and who in partnership with the community serve as agents, activists, and advocates for policy reform and catalysts for societal transformation, especially for the underserved populations.

Moreover, indirect, qualitative evidence of MQID is provided by student and faculty focus groups that are well-described/summarized in self-study. Faculty note that the imprint of the mission is evident across the curriculum and provides a unifying platform for defining the meaning of a degree. Students widely concur that CDU has: (i) a deeply inspiring and integrative mission that permeates all facets of the student experience, and which conveys a unique meaning for a health professions degree; (ii) faculty with rare exceptions are qualified, set high expectations, and demonstrate deep commitment to student success; and (iv) academic and conduct policies are clearly articulated and applied fairly and equitably. Also, there was a strong consensus (among CDU students) across degree levels and disciplines, that the standards, challenges, and rigor of academic programs are perceived as uniformly high. Regarding policy transparency and integrity (i.e., consistency in practice), CDU students, without exception, viewed academic and student conduct policies as clearly articulated, widely accessible, and fairly and equitably applied.

The team, however, notes that quality assurance mechanisms are needed to ensure degree coherence and a rich learning environment are developed and consistently applied. Also, assessment plans and feedback systems are developed but not consistently utilized across all programs, and are not institutionally centralized. Although the CDU provided evidence of faculty perspectives, aggregate results may mask some important differences in the perspectives of faculty educators from different degree programs, particularly in the General Education programming. While teaching faculty report a favorable overall experience, they tended to agree that the institution: (i) communicates better with internal rather than external audiences, including prospective students; (ii) engages better with graduate students than with the undergraduate cohort regarding the MQID; and (iii) is committed to defining MQID, however limits this commitment to continuous improvement efforts. It is particularly worth noting that student focus group report that student support services are uneven.

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

The University describes processes to ensure the quality of academic programs and supporting infrastructure. Under a "one university" model, CDU depicts a comprehensive set of evidence-based planning and improvement processes that have a significant impact on student and institutional outcomes. According to CDU, they have on-going strategic and academic planning processes and a process for academic program review and assessment of student learning outcomes. These processes are informed by evidence furnished by academic and business officers and validated by the office of institutional research and effectiveness. The creation of the strategic plan was highly collaborative and inclusive, and all units continue to be engaged with the implementation of the plan. University officers work in concert to ensure a

high degree of quality assurance, and to generate actionable options for improvement that can inform operational planning and resource allocation. It was clear to the visiting team that leadership, faculty, and staff are committed to the maintenance of educational quality. Examples include deep partnerships between all the academic programs and the Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) unit.

According to the strategic plan, expanding the number and types of CDU academic programs is a goal. The university believes new programs enhance institutional reputation as well as existing program attractiveness by providing a broader range of electives and academic pathways. To achieve this, CDU expects to add 10-15 new degrees over the next several years. Planning for proposed new programs is overseen by a new program directors committee chaired by the provost. Proposed new programs are carefully assessed regarding student demand and job prospects, and they are planned to ensure financial and academic viability within their first few years of operation. The University has shown clear evidence that all academic program development and improvement is guided by the comprehensive strategic plan and considerate of the financial realities of the institution.

The new program feasibility process at CDU is designed to protect the institution and the students it intends to serve. The desire to grow is not being allowed to overextend institutional resources or compromise the quality of existing academic and business operations. For example, the new RN-BSN program was originally scheduled to start in January 2017. However, concerns over first ensuring the recovery of the ELM program and the emergent reorganization of enrollment management services, prompted delays in marketing and recruiting efforts for the new program. A decision was made to delay the start of the program until the following term so

that expenses would only be incurred once the student demand and resulting tuition/fee revenue to cover those costs was assured. The University should ensure that ample student support infrastructure is provided for all program development and expansion efforts.

The original design of the CDU academic program review committee (APRC) was based on the good practices guide of WASC at the time under its 2008 handbook of accreditation. Over the last seven years, all academic programs of the University have undergone comprehensive internal program reviews at least once. The APRC process played a critical role, for example, in early identification of problems in the nursing school's ELM program (although the eventual outcomes would have been better if the early warnings were heeded), and determination of specific significant changes in the post-baccalaureate program to improve its program quality, including its relocation to the college of medicine. Committee feedback also supported the allocation of resources to create a 'hot lab' for the radiologic technology program on campus, which was completed in summer 2017. The APRC also offers to review draft reports to external oversight agencies prior to submission to ensure accuracy and quality and enhance prospects for favorable results. For example, the 2014 APRC review of a nursing self-study for the California BRN led to an extension on their report due date and site visit to first address APRC findings. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.5) The seriousness of CDU responsiveness to sub-change reviews was also reinforced in recent APRC reforms. The University has been inclusive of all stakeholders throughout the planning and implementation process.

In a special summer 2017 session of the APRC, the ALO of the University facilitated a focus group of eight committee members on the overall performance of the committee. They used the WSCUC rubric for assessing the integration of student learning assessment into

program review, and also discussed a set of criteria for evaluating program review design. The results of both self-study exercises were similar, and reflect a constant challenge: as one APRC member put it, "we need to finish the process that was put in place." There was consensus that the purposes and components of the review process are clear and abide by best practices. However, it was emphasized that requiring is not the same as fulfilling a component of the preferred process; having a culminating action plan (MOU) with real incentives and consequences was singled out as a persistent gap in the overall APRC quality assurance process. The APRC self-study exercises resulted in six recommendations for improvement of committee operations and performance. Currently, the provost is elevating the APRC role to ensure that program reviews are systematized, findings are made public, and review exercises result in concrete actions for program improvement. The IRE unit was demonstrated to be supportive of academic program review.

The IRE officer secures, consolidates, and validates evidence used for planning, review, and reporting purposes. In support of mandated compliance reporting, the IRE officer collects and analyzes a wide variety of campus data, ranging from faculty, staff, and student profiles to enrollment and revenue projections and classroom utilization rates. The IRE officer maintains a data warehouse that supports reporting on key student outcomes data, and develops instruments to support planning and evaluation activities (e.g. strategic planning surveys, alumni surveys, residential program planning etc.). He serves as a permanent APRC voting member, and furnishes data packets to inform reflections on program design, quality, and learning outcomes. The packets include data on student diversity, enrollment, retention, graduation, and employment rates, course utilization and grading patterns, and faculty workload and budget trends. The IRE officer has no support staff, which limits the volume of work that can be done, and introduces a

risk of loss of institutional capacity if there is staff turnover. The provost is exploring additional

staff support, and as a precautionary mechanism, an IT department analyst was granted backup

access to the data warehouse to ensure that all manner of program review and regulatory

reporting data remains accurate, secure, and nevertheless readily available to authorized

personnel. (CFR 4.2) Examples of IRE officer work products that facilitate evidence-based

planning and quality improvement include annual alumni surveys conducted since 2014 in

collaboration with the alumni affairs office. The surveys help keep alumni engaged with the

University, and, in return, helps the institution monitor post-graduation outcomes in

employment, further educational endeavors, and sustained service to the CDU mission. (CFR

4.5)

Recognizing the critical role of faculty in assuring academic program quality, and the

need to assess learning outcomes at all levels, CDU recruited a full-time dedicated executive

director of faculty development and assessment (FDA), in spring 2016. The explicit combination

of assessment and faculty development provides a creative solution for faculty training on

assessment. The FDA director provides vision and strategic leadership in establishing programs

for faculty professional development, particularly in the areas of curriculum design, pedagogical

methods, and assessment of student learning outcomes. However, the FDA official was not

available at the time of the visit. Questions were raised about the extent to which faculty

development efforts are regular, systematic, and related to the overall academic program goals.

In 2016, for example, attention was focused on development of nursing faculty knowledge and

skills as clinical educators, since most of the nursing school's faculty are recruited from clinical

practice rather than higher education settings. The FDA officer worked closely with nursing

faculty to identify gaps that contributed to RN licensure pass rate declines, with a training series

on curricular, pedagogical, and assessment matters. Nursing faculty were highly receptive to the programs, and the rapid recovery of RN exam pass rates is in part a reflection of the effectiveness of her timely interventions.

In the interest of building faculty capacity, the academic senate of the University created a new curriculum and assessment committee with consolidated authority. This was one component of structural reforms that aim to standardize and streamline protocols across the campus for academic program design and evaluation. The new committee reviews annual assessment reports from each academic program, evaluates assessment processes, and recommends improvement action plans. The report of the new committee serves as one of the key documents in comprehensive reviews conducted by the APRC. The structural reforms of the academic senate were replicated by the faculty governance councils of each college/school, and the FDA officer was instrumental in leading faculty efforts across the University and all governance levels to ensure calibration of the articulation and alignment of student learning outcomes with the new CDU Advantage. The resulting proposal for revision of institutional learning outcomes was vetted and approved by the curriculum/assessment committees of each college/school and ratified finally by the academic senate. (CFR's 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

The FDA officer has developed a standardized form for documenting faculty workload performance and plans, and a system for monitoring faculty plans on an annual basis. This also serves to assist conversations between faculty and their respective program directors, department chairs, and deans on related aspects of faculty roles and goal attainment. The initiative was prompted by faculty objections to applying staff performance appraisal protocols to faculty. As academic personnel, CDU faculty should be held accountable to a peer-driven rather than staff-based evaluation system, and the new faculty planning and reporting tool functions as a form of

annual formative assessment. In contrast, periodic peer review serves as a form of summative assessment; comprehensive data collection and analysis is especially critical for career reviews, whether for initial appointment, a change in academic series or departmental home, or a promotion in rank. Since the implementation of this new evaluation system is now in progress, its success will be of great interest in future reviews.

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

Information presented as part of the student dashboard on the institutional website provides aggregate outcomes data on student retention, graduation, and licensure rates. The dashboard also provides data on student and faculty demographics, average class size, cost of attendance, and financial aid allocations. (CFR 1.2, 1.6, 2.6) As detailed in appendix R, table 1 of the self-study report on fall 2016 demographic data, CDU enrolls high percentages of underrepresented students, reflective of its mission, location, and the shifting demographics of a diversifying California population; almost 90% of students self-identify as Black, Hispanic, or Asian.

Table 1 provides retention, graduation, and licensure pass rates (as applicable). Graduate programs are more successful regarding retention and graduation rates, while the BS program in biomedical sciences has lower retention and graduation rates, both in absolute terms and relative to other programs.

As indicated in appendix R, table 2, combining data on graduation rates with those still enrolled in the BS biomedical sciences program speaks to a positive trend due to recent changes in program design and delivery. The upper-division courses of the degree program are now tailored to individual career goals, with six pre-professional tracks. In contrast, the post-

baccalaureate certificate program now focuses only on admission prospects of students into medical school. The certificate program was moved in fall 2016 from the College of Science and Health COSH to the College of Medicine (COM), and is now accepting a lower number of students to concentrate on quality and boost medical school program placement rates (initial outcomes of the re-cast certificate program will be available by spring 2018).

Another lagging indicator of student success accrues from clinical licensure rates. Historical data on the pass rates of radiographic technology students taking the ARRT licensure exam is shown in Table 2. The lowest rate, which occurred in 2013, appears as an anomaly; rates have improved since 2013 with average rates of 70% or higher since then. The resulting rolling three-year averages are in compliance with standards of the program's national accreditor (JRCERT), and in April 2017, the agency reviewed an interim report of the program and confirmed its accreditation status through 2020. However, the California state agency that oversees radiography programs has a different formula for evaluating pass rate compliance. In June 2017, the director of the radiographic technology program received "a notice of deficiency in examination pass rates" from the California Department of Public Health (CDPH); per relevant state code regulations, a radiologic technology program must maintain a five-year credentialing exam average pass rate of at least 75%. The 2013 rate, with only 52.2% of the first-time takers passing the national certification exam hosted by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT), still factors into the CDPH formula. CDU is not waiting upon these results to cycle out of the formula as an assurance of compliance, with the provost leading a team to design and implement a systematic intervention analogous to the nursing pass rate remediation plan. The citation given by the state agency requires submission of a corrective action plan within 2017 Institutional Report.

The institution recently completed construction of a "hot lab" and purchased an Anatomage® table to support radiography simulation programs for student instruction and faculty professional development. Furthermore, there were recent changes in the academic and administrative personnel of the program. There was no additional information of these issues during the visit.

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

As mentioned in Component 2, specifically under Standards 3 and 4, the visiting team found that the institution has a robust continuous quality assurance and improvement process, particularly with regard to academic programs. Data have been and are used to inform decision making and improve instruction and student learning.

For example, CDU used the results of the program review process in the School of Nursing to enhance student outcomes. Below threshold 1st-time pass rates on the entry-level licensing examination led directly to the school implementing more rigorous and detailed formative, predictive, and summative assessments of their entry-level students, which has resulted in demonstrably higher (above threshold) 1st-time pass rates. Another example of the use of results of program review to improve outcomes include the Radiation Technology program that identified areas of deficiency in their student outcomes, took appropriate action to strengthen those areas and have measured improved student outcomes as a result.

At an institutional level, CDU has used data to inform the development of new programs. For example, information gathered through market surveys, content experts, and

needs analysis led CDU to develop a Master of Health Science, Physician Assistant program and an Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN - Family Nurse Practitioner) program. These programs are in high demand. It is anticipated that many graduates from these programs will choose to live and/or work in the south Los Angeles community after graduation, mostly practicing primary care medicine and providing significant additional value to the community. Additionally, CDU plans to expand the APRN program to include Psychiatric/ Mental Health and Gerontology

Acute Care tracks based on data that supports the development of these programs.

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

CDU has developed a culture of collaboration with respect to the budgeting process (CFR 3.4). There are budget hearings and presentations that provide specific requests for funding and reasons for the investment. Furthermore, the presentation material does align with the strategic plan and demonstrates the idea that the budget is developed to support the strategic plan. The presentations describe the projected allocation of faculty/staff to students that will insure the continued quality and integrity of the institution. Increases in faculty and staff personnel to accommodate the additional enrollment expectations by program was included and articulated in the budget presentations. The response document from CDU (dated September 2017) supports this: "To build capacity, the provost is recruiting subject matter experts and is leading expansion and consolidation of academic program and student services infrastructure." This includes establishing new divisions with dedicated deans/directors in the areas of: (i) student services and student life; (ii) enrollment management services; (iii) pipeline and school partnership programs; (iv) international student programs and services; and (v) clinical simulation education" (CFR 3.1).

30

The strategic plan articulates the need for revenue diversification and, a greater emphasis on increasing enrollment (see "G. Degree Program and Enrollment Growth" – CDU's WSCUC response document September 2017). In this document, CDU identifies "the lead objectives for the first theme of the strategic plan: (i) increase the number of undergraduate majors and graduate degrees leading to most of the health professions critically lacking in underserved communities; and (ii) increase enrollments to at least 2,000 students in the next 5 years." The document further describes the method and means in which CDU will accomplish those goals. These include:

- Start four new degree programs for fall 2017.

- Develop new articulation agreements with local high schools, school districts and community colleges.

- Promote the four new pathway programs for high school students.

CDU is also working to establish a new partnership with Collegiate Housing Services to provide communal and independent living arrangements for incoming and continuing students (CFR 3.5).

The approved budgets for fiscal year 2017-2018 reflects a somewhat modest increase in tuition and fee revenue and continues to rely heavily on Grants & Contracts (Federal, State, and Local). This does not seem to support the goal identified in the 2016-2020 strategic plan of 2,000 students within five (5) years. Furthermore, it does not seem to support the statement made in the above referenced document "All four new degree programs will open fall 2017". These new degree programs include a BS degree in nursing, an MS degree in biomedical sciences, BS degree in urban community health sciences and BS degree in radiologic sciences.

Currently the infrastructure, based on the same document referenced above, "can reasonably support up to 1,000 students." CDU, according to their website, for the fall 2017 academic year, has a total of 605 full-time (491 graduate and 114 undergraduate) and 49 part-time students.

The strategic plan suggests that there will need to be a focus on infrastructure preparedness. CDU will focus on resource expansion: recruiting and hiring well-qualified faculty and staff, expand IT systems and increase the campus "footprint" as necessary, with the goal to provide infrastructure "befitting a comprehensive, midsize university".

The challenge for CDU will be to generate sufficient revenue to meet its current and future operating expenses, in support of strategic plan. Based on the financial statements presented, it appears CDU will struggle meeting those objectives within the time frame is has set as its goal. Its current operating margin (revenue over expenses) has either been negative and/or minimally positive during the last five (5) years. The minimal margin created may allow CDU to meet its current and short-term obligations, but it does not provide any excess required for reinvestment in new programs and/or provide resources for increased capacity. Student enrollment and revenue growth are critical to the success of CDU. While the institution does have a modest endowment (approximately $ 90 million) and considerable amount in cash at this time, the team is concerned that the institution will have difficulty achieving its ambitious goals within the time frame it has established.

Generating margin to reinvest in human capital and physical capacity needs will be critical. Communicating, collaborating and coordinating the efforts to accomplish the objectives outlined in the strategic plan will be substantial. CDU will need to carefully evaluate programs that can leverage current offerings and existing infrastructure to accommodate as much growth as possible with the least amount of initial investment.

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

Since CDU's development of its Strategic Plan as well as its self-study and institutional report were developed almost simultaneously in a relatively short period of time, and involved essentially the same individuals, it is difficult (and probably not necessary) to know which processes lead to which conclusions. It is safe to say that the institutional thinking did come together in this activity and indicates a very high level of reflection and planning for institutional improvement. The process had input from administration, faculty, staff and students, and community.

CDU may be unique among American universities in terms of its mission and the degree to which almost all aspects of the university tie to that mission. They describe themselves as a community university and they behave as a community university. Their community for the most part consists of area in and around south Los Angeles, and to a lesser degree the greater Los Angeles area. They have established community programs that begin when members of the community are in elementary school (Saturday Science programs), they recruit students from the community, they involve community members in all aspects of their operation (including what they call community faculty – who are far more than just occasional commenters on programs but are actively involved in them), they strive to encourage their graduates to return to the community as health care professionals. Their mission, which includes among other goals, commitment to social justice and reduction of health disparities, is reflected in all aspects the institution including both its instructional and research programs. This outstanding commitment to community and mission is not inconsistent with the Standards articulated by WSCUC but

sometimes makes the demonstration of compliance with the standards a bit difficult to articulate and the match to the CFRs may not be as self- evident as might be in a more traditional liberal arts university with a less community oriented approach.

It is no secret that in the last 10 years, CDU has been in a very difficult and precarious position and thus virtually all of its activities have been centered on improvement (improvement in the areas of fiscal condition, shared governance, instructional quality, physical plant, etc.) while continuing regular operations. The fact that they have addressed all of the issues/recommendations that arouse from their last accreditation Special Visit stands as evidence of its commitment to improvement. The newly formulated Strategic Plan is both strategic and a plan. It is a very aggressive plan and a plan that if realized would certainly lead to substantial growth and improvement in all aspects of the institution. It is a plan that is almost breathtaking in its scope and it will require very great effort on the part of many individuals. It will also require the confluence of many events some of which are not necessarily high probability events. The institution will need to carefully and realistically monitor the progress of the elements of the strategic plan in order to assure that the entire system is growing and changing in a way that the elements of the program can offer mutual support. If successful the resulting institution will certainly be in compliance with all of the standards articulated by WSCUC.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

CDU has engaged in fairly rapid expansion of their academic offerings in the past three years.

Substantive changes since 2015:

March 13, 2015:	New Degree - Master of Physician Assistant
June 10, 2016:	New Degree - BS in Nursing
June 27, 2016:	New Degree - BS in Rad. Sci. (No Action, resubmission invited)
July 25, 2016:	New Degree - MS in Biomedical Sciences
March 24, 2017:	New Degree - BS in Urban Community Health Sciences
June 1, 2017:	New Degree - BS in Rad. Sci.

Special Visit Letter:

July 10, 2015:	Removed Formal Notice of Concern

SECTION IV – COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. Strong commitment to their mission which includes involvement with the community, social justice, community service, address health inequalities, producing health professionals who would return to the community and serve. This commitment strengthens the Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the CDU degree. (CFR 1.1, 2.2)

2. The CDU has a Strong Governing Board that has demonstrated open and transparent collaboration with the President and management team, as well as with the students and faculty. The Board has been highly involved in the Strategic Planning, and demonstrates continuing engagement across the institution. (CFR 3.6, 3.9, 4.6)

3. The senior administrative leadership is strong, and has fostered a culture of trust, transparency and shared governance. (CFR 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10)

4. Growth has been deliberate while managing resources, resulting in financial stability. (CFR 3.4)

5. The team commends the institution for its strategic plan. Its development was collaborative, inclusive and is well-understood across the institution. The implementation plan is credible and deliberate. (CFR 4.6, 4.7)

6. Significant progress has been made in terms of responding to the series of past WASC recommendations. (CFR 1.8)

7. The institution has a centralized academic program review process, assessing learning outcomes embedded throughout the curricula. These assessments serve to improve program quality. (CFR 2.4, 2.7)

8. The team commends the institution for maintaining the high-quality of its research enterprise while moving towards a student-centered focus. (CFR 2.8)

The team **recommends** the institution:

1. strengthen student services infrastructure to manage current programs and planned expansion. (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.12).

2. make better utilization of information technology/automated services, and assure sufficient staff training. (CFR 3.5)

3. assure there are sufficient instructional faculty (including adjuncts) and staff to support development and implementation of future programs (CFR 3.1)

4. develop a review process for administrative units to assure continuous quality improvement. (CFR 4.3)

5. implement an institutionalized faculty development program to support continuous program improvement. (CFR 4.3)

6. demonstrate the success of their strategic plan for growth which adheres to its mission and financial realities. (CFR 4.7)

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.

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Where is the policy located? On CONSUMER INFORMATION webpage at: https://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/ConsumerInfo
	Comments: Also embedded in CDU Catalog and referenced in program manuals and handbooks.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Curriculum, assessment, and program review committees review credit hour assignment compliance.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Used course schedules from official Registrar system for validation.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 12
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? AS, BS, MS
	What discipline(s)? Radiography, Biomedical Science, Public Health, Physician Assistant, Nursing (2 tracks)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Reviewed 2 syllabi from each current degree program.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 6
	What kinds of courses? Lab and Clinical
	What degree level(s)? AS, BS. MS
	What discipline(s)? Radiography, Biomedical Science (Lab), Public Health, Physician Assistant, Nursing
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: CDU programs maintain rigorous logs for attendance and elapsed time in laboratory and clinical courses of instruction.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 9
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? All degree granting programs (inc., two MSN tracks)
	What degree level(s)? AS, BS, MS
	What discipline(s)?)? Radiography, Biomedical Science, Public Health, Physician Assistant, Nursing (2 tracks)
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ■ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Program information is posted in a wide variety of printed and electronic materials.

Review Completed By:

Date:

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 ❐ NO
	Comments: No CDU employee or affiliated staff have incentive compensation for student recruitment.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ■ YES ❐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ■ YES ❐ NO
	Comments: The Facts and Figures webpages provide a wide array of such data, at: https://www.cdrewu.edu/admin/Reports/ Cost of attendance data is also available via the CONSUMER INFORMATION webpage: https://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/ConsumerInfo
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ■ YES ❐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ■ YES ❐ NO
	Comments: The Facts and Figures webpages provide a wide array of such data, at: https://www.cdrewu.edu/admin/Reports/

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By:
Date:

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 ☐ NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Advisory On CONSUMER INFORMATION webpage at: https://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/ConsumerInfo
	Comments: Each college/school and program within maintains and disseminates a complete policy and procedure document for their respective students.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ■ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Each college/school and program within maintains and disseminates a complete policy and procedure document for their respective students.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ■ YES ☐ NO If so, where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ■ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Each college/school has a dedicated student complaints/grievances committee that receives, investigates, and resolves issues; the committees collaborate with their respective office of the dean to track and record the number, nature, and resolution of complaints and grievances.
	Comments: Samples of summary statements of student complaints are available for inspection.

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

Review Completed By:
Date:

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ■ YES ☐ NO
	Is the policy publically available? ■ YES ☐ NO If so, where? https://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/ConsumerInfo
	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 ☐ NO
	Comments: Policy recently modified to accommodate transfer credits from clock-hour programs.

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

    (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

    (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By:

Date: