REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To __California State University, Long Beach____

Date of Visit
October 21-23, 2020

Team Roster

William Ladusaw, Team Chair, Dean of Humanities, Emeritus
University of California, Santa Cruz

Robin Romans, Assistant Chair, Associate Vice Provost, Arts and Academic Affairs
University of Southern California

Geoffrey Chase, Provost, Emeritus
California State University, Channel Islands

Richard Mahon, Vice President, Instruction
Mount San Antonio College

Mitsue Yokota, Academic Director, Undergraduate Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

WSCUC Liaison: Linda Petersen, Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

California State University, Long Beach was established in 1949 as the Los Angeles-Orange County State College. Known as "The Beach" in many circles, the college expanded rapidly in response to a growing local population, abundant economic opportunities in the post-World War period, an influx of resources with the passage of the GI Bill, and the overall affordability of higher education in California. Beginning in 1959, the college grew quickly from 10,000 students to nearly 30,000 in 1970. It changed its name along the way to the California State College at Long Beach. The college was later elevated to university-status by a vote of the Board of Trustees of the California State University system, joining the system as California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) in 1972 along with 12 other college campuses across the state.

Referred to by some as the "University of the People," the California State University system enrolls almost 500,000 students and confers over 125,000 bachelor's degrees annually. The CSU system has an immense impact on the state of California and the nation. Today, one of every 20 Americans with a college degree is a CSU graduate. Half the residents of California who hold a bachelor's degree earned it from the CSU system, and for every $1.00 the state invests in the CSU, the university generates $5.43 for California's economy.

Today CSULB enrolls over 38,000 students: about 33,000 undergraduates and 5,000 graduate students. CSULB has been continuously accredited by WSCUC (previously WASC) since 1957. It is made up of eight colleges. It offers 85 undergraduate, 72 master's, and four professional doctorate degree programs taught by just over 1,000 full-time and just under 1,300 part-time faculty on its 322-acre campus. It also operates fourteen off-site locations and four online degree programs.

In addition to WSCUC, the university works with 10-15 programmatic accrediting bodies that review programs spread across the university's academic units, mostly at the graduate level. CSULB received

over 71,000 first-time freshmen applications last year, of which just under 40% were admitted and just under 20% of that number enrolled. The university raised its 6-year graduation rate to 74% in 2020. Disaggregated graduation data shows that most ethnic, gender, and race groupings graduate within four percentage points, above and below the overall 74% mark (i.e., 70-77%), with the notable exceptions of Non-Resident Aliens (58%) Native Hawaiians (50%), and American Indians (60%).

CSULB is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and has a highly diverse student body – 4th in the nation according to the respected Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education ranking (2020) – with a Latinx population of 43%, followed by Asian (20%), White/Caucasian (18%), Resident Aliens (7%), African-American (4%), and two or more races (4%).

CSULB serves a high-need student body. The percentage of first-generation students is 55% and the percentage of Pell eligible students is approximately 50%. As is the case with several CSU campuses, Long Beach is highly ranked on many social mobility indexes, often in the top 5-10. These indicators of success should be hailed as marks of distinction for the university, doubly so given their high academic performance, achievements, and service to California residents, the state, and the nation.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

Due to Covid-19 pandemic restrictions, all meetings between team members and with the institution were held remotely. Team preparations began with emails detailing assignments from the Team Chair. The team reviewed all materials provided by CSULB, including its proposal of themes under the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR), its Institutional Report, several required data exhibits, and all appendices. In advance of the virtual visit, team members completed worksheets that thoroughly evaluated the university's institutional report. During its first virtual meeting on September 9, the team discussed their assignments, reviewed the results of all the worksheets, and shared general impressions. They also began a discussion of possible lines of inquiry (areas for further exploration at the time of the visit) and began identifying possible commendations based upon the materials presented. Following

that meeting, the team contacted CSULB's ALO to gather further information and documents, and to request changes to the final visit schedule. The CSULB ALO prepared the final visit schedule and sent it to the team prior to the actual October 21-23, 2020 visit.

Prior to the visit, the Chair and Assistant Chair met with CSULB's President and CEO, Jane Close Conoley, on September 16th and CSU Chancellor, Timothy White, on October 1st to further discuss areas for additional exploration during the Accreditation Visit. Members of the team also reviewed CSULB's four online master's degree programs, and four off-site locations (one in Engineering and three in Education), each via virtual visits/meetings. No concerns were raised during these visits and all required forms were completed and are included in the appendix of this report.

The team also met on October 13, 8-days prior to the visit, to continue its discussions and further prepare for the remote visit. The team had one more pre-visit meeting on October 20, the afternoon before the start of the actual visit, with the ALO and several of her colleagues to finalize plans for the 3-days of meetings and open fora.

The early meetings with the President, Provost, and members of the Accreditation Committee were informative and helped the team further understand the context, challenges, and opportunities that CSULB faces, including the "megatrends" identified in the institutional report: for example, the unpredictability of state budgets; students' decreasing financial resources and increasing need for mental health resources; escalating costs of housing in the Long Beach area; the age and quality of the campus physical plant (average age of buildings is 40-years old); and, political forces around immigration law that affect the large number of undocumented students the institution serves. The meetings with the working groups who wrote each of the three thematic essays – on Intellectual Achievement, Inclusive Excellence, and the Public Good – also helped set the tone for the rest of the visit.

During the next two days, the team met remotely with various constituencies and individuals and learned much more about the institution, including the organizational structure, its values, the faculty,

staff and students, and its processes for ensuring educational effectiveness. The team also reviewed all messages received via the confidential email account. The visit ended on Friday, October 23, 2020 with a private meeting between the Team Chair and President followed by a public exit meeting in which the final commendations and recommendations were read, all of which appear near the end of this report. Every session proved productive and positive and the team was very impressed by the level of commitment of all participants.

The team wishes to thank CSULB's ALO for her receptivity to all of the team's requests and for anticipating several issues on the team's behalf. This includes the many colleagues behind the scenes who clearly worked hard to produce the materials and to make the visit successful. Likewise, the university's leadership and the leadership of the CSU – both leaders were forthcoming, open, and eager to learn from the review process. The team thanks them.

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

CSULB's institutional report is a comprehensive document. It covers all areas of the review in a thoughtful and thorough manner. The report also provided links to various documents and supporting evidence, and addressed how the institution satisfies the WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs).

The team concluded that, given the requirements under Component Two of the review process, compliance with the standards was amply demonstrated and that, for select campuses, the TPR appears to be a far more productive direction than a compulsory compliance-focused review that would carry less value for the institutions going through the process of reaffirmation and to the region more generally. Though there is certainly much to be learned from and amended in these early rounds of the TPR process, the team felt CSULB's institutional report provided an honest assessment of the university's strengths and weaknesses and articulated the paths CSULB wishes to pursue moving forward.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

In its February 28, 2011, letter reaffirming accreditation, the Commission drew attention to the visiting team's recommendations in three areas: (1) assessment of expectations for learning, (2) long-term financial planning, and (3) campus culture. An interim report focused on these issues was requested for November 2015.

With regard to assessment, the team had found substantial improvement in the institution's development of capacity and process for assessment but urged attention to three challenges: implementation of direct methods of learning assessment, the mapping and assessment of institutional outcomes at both the undergraduate and graduate levels to enable documentation of the extent to which CSULB graduates actually meet those expectations, and finally incorporating achievement of learning objectives into the institution's goals for raising graduation rates and other dimensions of student success. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)

In the area of financial planning, the Commission complimented the institution's short-term management of the extraordinary budget situation at the time of the review but urged attention to longer-term financial planning to provide stability as it moves into an uncertain future. (CFR 3.4)

The recommendations around campus culture advised further progress on the institution's improvements in effective communication and consultation within the campus community and the plan to administer a campus climate survey. (CFRs 1.6 and 1.7)

The institution submitted its interim report, which was reviewed by a panel of WSCUC's Interim Report Committee on January 21, 2016. The report described multiple activities and accomplishments in each of the areas called out for attention in the report. The panel acknowledged progress in each of the areas.

The panel expressed hope that during this comprehensive review the institution would take the opportunity to demonstrate through more detailed evidence and reflection its assertion that students are meeting expectations for student learning. (CFR 2.6)

The panel also noted that the review would provide an opportunity to show how campus financial planning has shifted to a more long-range, investment-based model guided by its strategic plan and analysis and interpretation of evidence regarding student success and achievement in learning. Given that this review takes place during another period of extraordinary challenges, the team primarily drew on data regarding fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 to evaluate the institution's financial stability while observing ways in which the campus response to the disruptions triggered by the current COVID-19 pandemic illustrate the resilience of its approach. (CFR 3.4)

The team finds that during the period since reaffirmation, the institution has been responsive to the Commission's recommendations. (CFR 1.8)

Component 2: Compliance: Review Under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Because CSULB has chosen to pursue the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of accreditation (TPR), the Institutional Report itself does not address the standards or CFRs in detail. Instead the institution's self-review under the standards was conducted by the steering committee approved by the Academic Senate in 2018. The committee formed "subcommittees" (i.e., the working groups) for each of the three themes used to organize the review, which drew content from various campus constituencies.

The committee developed the compliance worksheet (Institutional Report Appendix 2.02) through spring 2020. The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI, Institutional Report Appendix 2.01) was completed by the Director for Program Review and Assessment with feedback from departments and programs. Both worksheets were made available to the campus community for feedback, after which the steering committee revised the documents for submission in summer 2020.

Both appendices contain links to relevant evidence or reports, from which additional links lead to more detailed evidence for satisfaction of the CFRs.

The team's evaluation of CSULB's compliance with each Standard follows.

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1, 1.2)

The institution publishes statements of its mission and values, and these are reflected in the various statements published by component colleges and organizations. The institution has a robust framework for program assessment and conducts many activities to support faculty in assessing learning outcomes at the program level. The institution has an initiative to connect program and institutional learning outcomes assessment to WSCUC core competencies. The institution publicizes data about student achievements, notably retention and graduation rates. (CFRs 1.1 and 1.2)

Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.3-1.8)

Campus statements in support of academic freedom take as background resources from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The campus website discusses academic freedom for student audiences in the context of a forum related to issues of freedom of expression. Aside from that, the team found that published statements on academic freedom primarily concern faculty roles and do not explicitly include staff and students. (CFR 1.3)

The institution has an on-going commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, supported by policies, statements, and organized inquiry. The institution has chosen "Inclusive Excellence" as one of the three themes organizing this review. (CFR 1.4)

The campus operates as an educational institution within the governance framework of the California State University under the authority of the Board of Trustees and within the legal framework established by the legislature of the State of California. As such, its policies and procedures governing the full range of expectations of and rights to due process for students, faculty, and staff are publicly

available. The campus regularly reports on data concerning program completion for various groups of students. The team commends in particular the publicly available dynamic portal through which institutional research provides data on admissions and enrollment, characteristics of the student population, and student success, including data regarding program completion for various groups of students. (CFRs 1.5, 1.6, 1.7)

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

Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7)

The institution offers a wide range of programs at the undergraduate (85) and graduate levels (76 including 4 professional doctorates) that are appropriate in content and rigor. No undergraduate program meets the 50% threshold for online delivery and the team reviewed and was confident the few (4) graduate programs that meet this threshold are sound. A sufficient number of faculty members support programs, though concern about decline of tenure-track faculty density was expressed to the team. The team observed frequent and collegial interaction between faculty in different lines (tenure-track, full-time, part-time, lecturer) with quality of service to students serving as the primary common goal. Programs are designed thoughtfully and with primary attention focused on the knowledge and skills students should attain; the Academic Senate sets clear and high standards for academic programs. The institution pays significant attention to issues both in terms of access to programs as well as providing the support necessary for students to meet expected levels of achievement. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2)

The institution provided an Excel document list of 162 programs (Appendix 2.01) with links to learning outcomes, although a small number of programs (primarily graduate programs) include no link, suggesting they have not established or not made intended outcomes public. The collective responsibility of faculty to establish student learning outcomes is recognized at the institutional level;

the team met with faculty who have more thoroughly integrated student learning outcomes assessment throughout their programs as well as faculty who have found this more challenging; faculty in the latter category tend to be in small programs with multiple responsibilities, and the team learned that these faculty generally recognize the value in developing ongoing assessment processes and wish to improve in this area. (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

The institutional response to providing services to support student learning and achievement is clear. The institution provided links to several institutional policies, webpages, and examples of assessment activity, many of which are robust and mature. The institution has made many changes resulting from its shift away from previous approaches to remediation. The institution is challenging students to meet high standards and providing the support services to allow them to do so. The team learned, for example, of the institution's approach to students' need to meet its graduation writing requirement by assessing and placing students into one of three pathways that will provide the support they need to succeed. Students have many opportunities for involvement in academic programs and the institution has expanded its array of high-impact practices across the institution and the team observed that many students take advantage of these opportunities; these include internships, service learning, an honors program, a range of writing-intensive courses, and more. (CFRs 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)

The institution provided links to its policies regarding program review; timely completion of regular assessment reports declined a few years ago, but the institution identified causes for the decline, made changes, and is now seeing an increase in the timeliness and quality of annual submissions. Program review is required for both instructional and student service programs, and the team learned that faculty appreciate the flexibility that is being extended to allow different kinds of programs to evaluate themselves in terms that are relevant to their circumstances; the team was also impressed with the level of collaboration between instructional and student support services. (CFR 2.7)

With regard to learning assessment in particular, the team understands that within the last two years changes have been made to better coordinate the cycle of program review with annual reporting on departmental assessment projects. The team finds that these changes are likely to strengthen and reinforce quality assurance. With this coordination, future follow-up to program reviews can be better informed by the results of faculty inquiry. The team heard many examples of productive assessment projects as well as positive comments about the ability of staff who support assessment to work with faculty to find ways to pursue meaningful inquiry in the context of their programs. The team recommends that the campus continue to pursue this strategy to strengthen the campus culture of assessment to support its clear commitment to student success. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

Although some faculty lamented inadequate institutional support for the expectation of scholarship and creative activity (due to teaching and service expectations), the institution provided evidence of support for faculty scholarship and creative activity. The faculty and institution have been successful in garnering significant external grant support, which allows faculty to pursue scholarship, which ultimately benefits students as they study with faculty who can model scholarly activity. The institution's expansion of high-impact practices has made more opportunities for research and creative activity available to students and the team learned that it is increasingly common for some students to accumulate multiple such experiences before graduation. The team believes that the expansion of high-impact practices and the effective integration of academic and student support services has contributed to a laudable improvement in six-year graduation rates, which increased from 60% to 74% since 2013. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10-2.14)

The team believes the institution's significant improvement in graduation rates is the result of intentional planning, not good fortune. The quality of CSULB's student service programs – an area of focus in its thematic essays – have been effective in improving a range of key indicators. The institution

offers a wide range of co-curricular opportunities; even with fewer opportunities due to COVID-19,

many program websites continue to invite students to be involved on campus beyond their classes.

(CFRs 2.10, 2.11)

Expanding the breadth, variety, and quality of advising programs is another area of focus in the

institution's thematic essays and the team heard from students who were appreciative of the range of

support services they received. Academic support services are especially abundant at CSULB, with large

programs and, in some cases, entire buildings committed to serving students; the institution

appropriately highlights services to EOP students, veterans, students with disabilities, Dreamers, student

athletes, and several more. Yet another area of focus in CSULB's theme essays is expanded services for

transfer and graduate students, which have been enhanced since the previous review. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13,

2.14)

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient

evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

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

CSULB supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human,

physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of

organizational and decision-making structures. Combined, these elements help promote the

achievement of institutional purpose and create a high-quality environment for learning.

Faculty and Staff (CFRs 3.1-3.3)

It was evident in all of the meetings during the site visit that CSULB employs faculty and staff with

substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. Their collective commitment to student

success is impressive. Like many institutions, the tenure density at CSULB has decreased over the last

decade, but the institution employs sufficient faculty with appropriate professional qualifications to

achieve the intuition's objectives. The institution also employs sufficient staff that are more diverse than

the faculty. CSULB's report reiterated, and conversations with administrators during the visit confirmed, their commitment to diversifying their faculty to represent better CSULB's student population. (CFR 3.1)

The Office of Staff Human Resources provides comprehensive support services to the staff population and has clearly articulated performance review guides. Similarly, all faculty participate in an evaluation process that is overseen by the office of the associate vice president for faculty affairs and includes Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) evaluations. The process is clearly outlined and policies are readily available on the faculty affairs website. In addition to the robust processes in place for evaluating staff and faculty, the institution has also implemented practices during the hiring process to mitigate the influences of implicit biases. (CFR 3.2)

Resources are available to support both staff and faculty professional development. Programs such as the President and Provost's Leadership Fellows Program, Data Fellows, Road to Success Academy, and Tri-Campus Leadership Academy provide excellent staff enrichment opportunities. At the university-level, faculty also have an opportunity to participate in learning communities through the Faculty Center. Funding is also available through each College to support professional development activities. (CFR 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources *(CFRs 3.4, 3.5)*

CSULB participates in a budget planning process known as the Resource Planning Process (RPP) that focuses on the university mission, strategic priorities, and institutional goals while making budget decisions to ensure long-term viability. The process has been lauded by the CSU system as a model of planning and consultation. CSULB is financially stable and their Financial Reporting unit coordinates and develops data for the annual CSU Financial Statement Audit and annual CSU Single Audit. Their care to build reserves and the recent growth in their endowments have positioned the campus to have financial stability over the next several years. (CFR 3.4)

The institution provides access to information and technology resources through two main units.

The Academic Technology Services supports instruction, creates learning environments, and supports campus staff to foster student success. They oversee the campus learning management system (BeachBoard), collaborate with faculty to adapt content and teaching methodologies for online course delivery, build and maintain active learning classrooms, and manage the Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT) evaluation process. The Division of Information Technology is the institution's enterprise technology organization and oversees the delivery of technology services (e.g., VPN, Zoom, Office 365, One Drive, SharePoint, etc.) for students, staff, and faculty. During the site visit, the team learned of the commendable efforts of these offices to provide support to students, staff, and faculty as the campus quickly shifted to remote instruction in response to the stay-at-home orders from the State. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.6-3.10)

CSULB has well-defined policies and procedures in place to select, appoint, and review all university-wide administrators. The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority. CSULB has an executive team that supports the work of the president and a full-time CFO who is the Vice President for Administration and Finance. A Board of Trustees governs the 23-campus system and exercises appropriate oversight over the campuses. The Academic Senate is the official representative body of the faculty. It clearly defines the governance roles, rights and responsibilities of both full-time and part-time faculty. CSULB's Senate is an inclusive body with representation from not only faculty but students and staff. They communicate effectively with their constituents and have a collegial and collaborative working relationship. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, 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

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

CSULB has demonstrated and provided evidence that it has employed quality assurance processes to make improvements related to student success. All data related to student success and achievement is provided on web sites maintained by the university. Specifically, the Highly Valued Degree Initiative (HVDI) made use of qualitative data to better understand the factors related to degree completion. Based on the data gathered through focus groups, the HVDI developed a "Beach Road Map" for all students. Additionally, bottleneck courses were identified in science, mathematics, business, and chemistry, and those courses were redesigned. These changes led to increased average unit loads for freshmen (FTF) from 13.7 in fall 2015 to 14.4 in fall 2019. Recently, this enabled CSULB to project an increase in six-year graduation rates from 68.4% to 73.3%. The team commends CSULB for their attention to student success and the graduation rates that have increased significantly in recent years. (CFR 4.1 and 4.2)

Since its last accreditation visit, CSULB has made important changes to the program review policy. All degree granting programs now provide annual assessment reports to the Division of Academic Affairs and to the College Dean. Related to these changes, the Provost has provided a research analyst to work with departments and programs to better understand the data they must review and supply as part of the program external review process. Additionally, the Division of Student Affairs conducts program reviews. These reviews have been adjusted to utilize recommendations previously made by the steering committee of the Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC), which have led to completed self-studies and two-page action plans. CSULB has also administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2017 and in 2019 as well as the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) and has used the results of each to make recommendations regarding the 2030 University Strategic Plan (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3).

CSULB also demonstrates that it has worked to increase its institutional research capacity. As part of these efforts, the Office of Institutional Research and Analytics (IRA) was established and that office now provides public-facing Tableau dashboards, which allow internal and external stakeholders to review data related to enrollment, faculty workloads, student success and admissions. The Director of the IRA also worked with the Vice Provost for Academic Planning to establish the Data Fellows for Student Success Program. The Data Fellows are provided with time and resources to identify challenges to and to develop solutions to increase student success (CFR 4.2 and 4.3).

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3-4.7)

As noted above, CSULB has demonstrated through the establishment and extensive work of the HVDI task forces – comprised of faculty, staff, and students – that all levels of the university are committed to inquiry and assessment, and that these are incorporated into institutional planning processes. The Data Fellows initiative is further evidence that faculty are engaged in important ways to improve educational effectiveness. These efforts provide a series of sustained and focused efforts to articulate priorities related to student achievement and institutional effectiveness (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6).

The team also commends CSULB for the broad involvement from multiple campus constituents as the university moved from the WSCUC visit and recommendations received following 2011 to the preparation for the current accreditation review in 2020. The WSCUC Steering Committee includes faculty, staff, students, and administration. The work completed by the Steering Committee and the work completed by each of the working groups overseeing the themes chosen for the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Review were widely shared across campus and with the University Senate. The required Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) was also shared with the CSULB community for feedback and/or corrections (CFR 4.6).

The commitment to High Impact Practices and the Dream Success Center provides evidence that CSULB has responded positively to changes that are taking place within higher education more broadly and they have adopted a proactive approach to map out directions they will seek to follow to increase student success (CFR 4.7).

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4. The team also verified that the institution meets federal requirements for credit hour, marketing and recruitment, student complaints, and transfer policy.

Component 8: Institution Specific Themes

Theme A: Intellectual Achievement

The selection of "Intellectual Achievement" as one of the institution-specific themes aligns with the strategic planning process, BEACH 2030, which prioritizes the promotion of intellectual achievement and focuses on the rigor, relevance, and data-informed decision making of their campus community. It also aligns with the campus' core values: teaching and learning; compassion, creativity, and innovation; diversity; and public good. It was evident during the visit that faculty and staff embrace these values, as many spoke of their active involvement in the BEACH 2030 process. The team appreciates that the institution offered examples in the TPR report that showcase the intellectual achievements of not only students but faculty and staff as well. (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

Student Success. The report highlighted the meaningful and coherent definition of student success that aligns to the institution's mission and values. The definition, developed jointly by the WSCUC Steering Committee, senior staff, and Academic Senate, demonstrates compliance with the WSCUC Interim Report Committee's request that the institution define student success, "accounting for both completion and achievement of student learning outcomes, given the mission, values, and programs offered, and the characteristics of the students being served." Although the definition includes both

students and alumni, what followed in the report offered little data or measures of success of their alumni. The institution did, however, provide ample evidence of student success for students prior to graduation – specifically in the areas of academic preparation, graduation rates, and participation in research. The staff and faculty's commitment to the success of their students was evident throughout the site visit. (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 3.1)

Academic Preparation: The CSU Chancellor's Executive Order (EO 1110) articulated the need for each CSU campus to implement a college-level skills assessment that informs the placement of first-year students into appropriate courses to ensure successful completion of general education written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses in the first year of CSU enrollment. In response, CSULB redesigned their mathematics and – quantitative reasoning curriculum by utilizing the web-based assessment system, Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces, Placement, Preparation, and Learning (ALEKS PPL). The adoption of this program has helped to increase Intermediate Algebra course completion rates from 53% to 72%. Similarly, to bolster the written communication skills of their students and to support students who did not pass the Graduate Placement Exam (formerly the Writing Proficiency Examination), a Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) of portfolio courses was introduced to help students develop their writing skills before placing them in a writing intensive capstone course. The multiple pathways created for the students to fulfill the GWAR has helped to alleviate roadblocks to graduation for some of their students. (CFR 2.10)

Graduation Rates: Through the work of the Highly Valued Degree Initiative Taskforce, the CSU Course Redesign Program, graduation incentives, and advising strategies, CSULB has been able to improve 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation rates to surpass the expectations for the system-wide Graduation Initiative 2025. In addition, transfer student two-year graduation rates also improved. Their efforts to increase average unit loads for first-time freshmen, new transfer students, as well as

continuing students look strong and promising. Retention and graduation rates for students in CSULB graduate programs have also increased. (CFR 2.10)

The team was impressed by the depth and breadth of the academic support services that have been implemented to meet the needs of their diverse student body, which have helped to improve the institution's graduation rates. This is particularly true for graduate programs where an active Graduate Studies Resource Center has been able to offer advising, workshops and events, and writing support, in addition to mentorship, internship, and scholarship opportunities. The collaborative work between the Office of Graduate Studies and Institutional Research and Analytics to develop a Graduate Student Success Database to facilitate data-driven decision-making is also commendable. The team encourages CSULB to continue to develop these partnerships to use data in meaningful ways and to increase graduation rates of specific populations of students identified as falling below the average. (CFR 2.11, 2.13, 4.2)

Participation in Research: Through the Office of Undergraduate Research Services as well as the University Research Advisory Committee, students have multiple opportunities to participate in research, scholarship, and other creative activities. A 2018-19 report showed that nearly 13,000 undergraduate and graduate students in various colleges engaged in curricular or co-curricular research activities. The team was particularly impressed by the accomplishments of BUILD and the role it is having to enhance the diversity of the biomedical research workforce. The creative ways this program has been able to provide intensive research training experiences for large groups of students is commendable. The recent addition of the Graduate Research Conference as an opportunity to showcase the scholarly work of its graduate students as well as the efforts of the individual colleges to sponsor symposia and conferences to encourage graduate student research are also commendable. The funding opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students to pursue research are also noteworthy. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

Faculty. Faculty from across all colleges also participate in various forms of scholarly work –

publishing in high profile publications, obtaining grants and fellowships for their research, and receiving

national and international recognition for their accomplishments. In 2019, nearly 100 principal

investigators were awarded over $31 million from various federal, state, and local agencies as well as 63

private corporations and foundations. In addition to these external awards, the Office of Research and

Sponsored Programs also supports funding opportunities by allocating over $2 million for research,

scholarship, and creative activity grants, mini-grants/summer stipend, internal grants, and summer

student research assistant funding. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

Staff. In addition to the achievements of students and faculty, the report highlights staff

achievements, noting that they also have the opportunity to participate in programs (alongside faculty),

such as the President's and Provost's Leadership Fellows Program as well as the Data Fellows Program.

These programs help to enhance leadership skills, increase institutional knowledge, and empower staff

to propose solutions to those problems. The Data Fellow program, in particular, encourages the use of

institutional data to promote student success. Since its inception in 2015, the Data Fellow has allowed

the campus community to come together and explore student success metrics in ways they have not

been examined before. The team was also heartened to learn, during the visit, about the activities of the

Staff Council and staff involvement in other important committees in the institution that help to

contribute to the overall academic excellence. (CFR 3.3)

Theme B: Inclusive Excellence

"Inclusive Excellence" is the second of CSULB's themes. The university quotes the Association of

American Colleges & Universities to assert that "Making excellence inclusive is…an active process

through which colleges and universities achieve excellence in learning, teaching, student development,

institutional functioning, and engagement in local and global communities," and links this commitment

to three means of achieving this excellence: diversity, student engagement, and campus culture. In its

many conversations with campus constituencies, the team learned that CSULB's work on the goals of this theme has been intentional and clearly articulated since its last accreditation visit. The centrality of the theme to the college's mission is widely recognized and passionately embraced.

Diversity. Like many public colleges in California, CSULB is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and additionally serves an Asian American, Native American, and Pacific Island (AANAPISI) student population of approximately 24%. The university's principal *identified* means of meeting the needs of these students has been diversity retreats, faculty professional development regarding unconscious bias, and an effort to increase the diversity of faculty through modifications of the recruiting process – e.g., applicants must now include a "student success" statement as part of their application to better demonstrate how they will meet the educational needs of CSULB's diverse student population. The team learned that the theme of diversity is of broader and deeper value to the institution than is described in the Institutional Report. The institution's ongoing assessment and expansion of its student service programs has been guided by a commitment to serve its diverse student population, which includes many first-generation students, Pell-eligible students, and many students from underserved communities. The team also heard that the institution has more work to do in both expanding and supporting faculty from diverse backgrounds, who are still far from reflecting the diversity of the institution's student population. The institution is aware of this issue and continues to take important steps to address the issue.

Expanding Access and Increasing Engagement. In this section of the theme essay, the university addresses advising, tutoring and other support services, and support services for both undergraduate and graduate students. The team met in open fora with both undergraduate and graduate students (it should be noted that Associated Student representatives participated in other meetings during the team's visit) and students report feeling broadly valued and supported. CSULB provides advising services via a mix of structures. Undeclared students are served by the University Center for Undergraduate

Advising (UCUA). As students choose a major, they are redirected to program-specific services that include both faculty and professional staff as advisors. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13)

Student athletes receive dedicated advising services, as do students who would previously have been placed into remedial courses, and transfer students. The institution's expansion of its longstanding Promise Program has begun to provide advising and other services to prospective students enrolling at Long Beach City College. In addition, the institution is working with Long Beach City College to clarify Associate Degrees for Transfer sequences so students arrive after transfer fully prepared for upper division coursework. The university has a vibrant Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), which has expanded to include a Summer Bridge transition program and is associated with increased retention and graduation rates. CSULB is attentive to communication with its student populations as each of these programs has its own website and the team learned that programs are conscious of the need to communicate with students via a range of modalities (email and text but also phone calls and other more direct approaches). Most of the websites indicate that services continue virtually in light of the college's response to COVID-19, with students invited to schedule appointments for any form of support they might need. (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

Tutoring and Support Services. In its report, the university discusses support services for graduate students before those available for undergraduate students – an area in which efforts have recently expanded. In addition to academic advising, graduate students also received expanded guidance in writing, mental health workshops, preparing for internships, and conference support, and there are plans for an expanded physical space for graduate student support services projected to begin in 2021. The team met with a group of graduate students and found them to have high praise for the quality of the programs in which they are enrolled. Despite their praise, the graduate students were not uncritical, expressing concern that departments had not done more to diversify faculty. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 3.1)

Undergraduate students are served by the Learning Center, a University Writing Center, and specialized programs such as the Men's Success Initiative, programs for Dreamers, and students who are or have been migrant workers (or the children of migrant workers). The College's services for students with disabilities are housed in the Bob Murphy Access Center. (CFRs 2.11, 2.13)

Campus Culture. This portion of the essay focuses on a variety of groups and efforts at CSULB to address campus culture over the past few years. The team's current review provided an opportunity to observe the impact of several years of activities aimed at strengthening campus culture – an area of need identified following CSULB's last comprehensive accreditation visit. Following that visit, the College followed up on an earlier work-life survey from 2011 but, instead of using the same survey, decided to administer the Faculty Survey on Student Engagement (FSSE). The FSSE was deemed a more appropriated survey (though it does not pose comparable questions).

Following the results of the survey, the President charged three Commissions to help improve campus climate – one for Inclusive Excellence (its name has changed to the Commission for Equity and Change), a second on the Status of Women, and a third on Accessible Technology. The Academic Senate has its own Campus Climate Committee. This area of the theme essay understated the depth and breadth of attention paid to this issue, which is not new to the institution but which gained urgency in the aftermath of the killing of George Floyd in spring 2020 (an event that was explicitly referenced in multiple team meetings). The Academic Senate leadership is discussing a range of ways to improve campus culture. Leaders in the Academic Senate noted the high value the Senate places on maintaining collegiality across the campus even where there are disagreements. As collegiality is a necessary foundation to any lasting institutional change, this portends well for the ability of the campus to engage and institute change in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The most substantive elements discussed under the "Inclusive Excellence" theme relate primarily to *Student Learning and Success* and in these areas the institution appears both to have sustained ongoing

efforts and to have been alert to new ways to meet student needs, especially for graduate, at-risk, and transfer students. These efforts are emblematic of the seriousness with which the institution addresses these issues and the need to frame challenges properly. (CFRs 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

"Inclusive Excellence" means increased attention to both the cultural sensitivity of existing faculty and diversifying future hires. This need was conveyed to the team in multiple meetings by faculty, staff, and students alike. Both the Academic Senate and the President have made this issue a priority. While faculty with whom the team met welcomed this commitment and affirmed support for their institution and its leaders, they expressed frustration with the lack of appreciable movement in terms of increasing faculty diversity and diversity among senior leaders to reflect CSULB's student body diversity. Faculty also expressed a desire for greater inclusion in discussions about equity as it relates to the future of the institution. Recognizing these issues and concerns are not uncommon at most colleges and universities, CSULB's senior leaders and faculty may be better positioned than most for progress in these areas that might make it a national model.

Much is written in the theme essay about the institution's assessment and expansion of student support services. The team observed that these are also well-integrated with instructional services, that they are widely known and utilized by students, and that they are improving the quality of learning and achievement for CSULB students.

Theme 3: The Public Good

Adopted in 2016 as a central theme to guide CSULB, "the Public Good" provides direction as the university seeks to realize its strategic plan, BEACH 2030. CSULB recognizes that as a public institution, it has a fundamental role to play in its region as it prepares students for successful careers, to support and contribute in multiple ways to the communities and businesses with whom they interact, and to ensure the long-term financial stability of the institution itself. (CFR 4.6)

The team notes that the Public Good is the broadest of the three themes chosen for the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR), and in key ways it overlaps and intersects with both Intellectual Achievement and Inclusive Excellence. A significant and compelling example of the way these three themes intersect is the Long Beach College Promise established in 2008. As a partnership with the city of Long Beach, the Long Beach Unified School District, Long Beach City College, and CSULB, the Promise program provides guaranteed admission to local students who meet minimum acceptance qualifications and then provides support to those students once they matriculate. Through the Promise program, the number of local area students who entered the university as First Time Freshmen made up 44.2% of the those enrolled in 2018. Since its establishment in 2008, the Promise program has evolved and the team commends CSULB for continuing its commitment to local students through the establishment of Promise 2.0. This will provide a closer partnership between CSULB and Long Beach City College and will provide enhanced advising and support for transfer students. (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 2.13, 4.3, 4.7)

Through its many partnerships, CSULB also demonstrates a deep commitment to fostering, developing, and extending community relations that benefit students, faculty, and organizations throughout their region. The CSULB Speech and Language Clinic, for example, provides the opportunity for all their student clinicians, under the supervision of licensed speech pathologists, to conduct (pro bono) speech and language assessment and therapy with individuals in the community who have communication disorders. Another key example of CSULB's use of partnerships is that they offer a variety of summer camps to children in the region. Many of these camps, including Camp Nugget, provide assistance and learning opportunities for children while also providing opportunities for students from CSULB to further their skills and knowledge. (CFRS 4.6, 4.7)

These opportunities are also evidence of the work the university has committed to developing and fostering High-Impact Practices (HIPS) for their students. As noted in the self-study, each college at the university has at least three high-impact programs and the Center for Community Engagement provides

more than 2,000 students each semester with community service opportunities linked to the courses in which they are enrolled. While these are significant and important additions to efforts related to student success, the team recommends that CSULB continue to collect disaggregated data specifically as it relates to first-generation, Pell-eligible and diverse student populations specifically in regards to High High-Impact Practices to ensure that all students benefit from engaging in multiple HIPs early and throughout their academic careers. (CFRs 2.10, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

As part of its commitment to the Public Good, CSULB has also developed processes and practices related to fiscal accountability and to sustainability. Related to the ebb and flow of economic conditions within the state budget, the university has examined ways to expand its revenue beyond tuition and state support. In 2019, the university helped develop the CSULB-Campus Partnership Phase 1, which lays out strategies to increase revenues through marketing-based corporate partnerships. (CFRs 1.1, 3.4, 3.5)

The university has also responded to the growing urgency to ensure fiscal sustainability through its first comprehensive fundraising campaign: I DECLARE. Through that campaign, which was launched in 2014, the university raised $238 million, surpassing the goal that had been set at $225 million. A new phase of the I DECLARE campaign, with an anticipated goal of $275 million, is currently being planned. (CFRs 3.4, 4.7)

CSULB provides significant evidence of their commitment to the Public Good through their interactions with local communities and students, and through their commitment as an institution to work collaboratively across divisions. These efforts are further evidenced in the development of the "Beach Guide" mentoring program for new students, which includes many commendable actions taken to support new students following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. In a few short months, 182 faculty and staff across the university volunteered to mentor incoming students and then in fall 2020 to work with 2,500 students to ensure they received support as they launched their academic careers at CSULB in such challenging circumstances. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13, 4.7)

As noted above, The Public Good is a broad theme that includes intellectual achievement and student success, as well as many other activities to which the university is committed. Moving forward, the team recommends that CSULB identify key commitments within this theme on which they will focus to make specific improvements and advances in upcoming years (CFRS 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

CSULB provided evidence they are in compliance with the WSCUC standards and that they meet all federal requirements. The institution is committed to delivering a quality education and promoting student success, including tracking and disaggregating data on student retention and graduation rates. The university conducts learning assessment across all undergraduate and graduate programs. It has program review processes that cover all academic programs and several programs in other units. Their institutional research capacity is high and the ease of availability of digital data to academic and other units is well advanced. The Data Fellows program builds capacity within the staff and faculty to make productive use of the data collected. Their systems of financial planning and accountability have advanced significantly since its last accreditation review and senior leadership enjoys support from the CSU system as well as the CSULB academic community. CSULB's culture is strong and vital. It is mission-centered. The institution offers a broad array of support programs to help students achieve their goals. Finally, the team observed a high degree of mutual support between faculty, advisors and mentors, student affairs specialists, financial aid and admission counselors, administrative staff, and other student support professionals.

CSULB's institutional report included an in-depth examination of their approved themes bolstered by quantitative and other forms of evidence. The team's review confirmed that the report was the product of a collaborative process with multiple individuals and campus constituents contributing to the final document. That document is of high quality, it is evidence based, and it is thoughtful. Some may find it slightly more descriptive than evaluative but one might expect this to be the case as the new TPR

process is fully implemented across the region. What is beyond question is that the institutional report demonstrates, and the team's visit confirms, that CSULB is an outstanding institution, operationally sound, alive with excitement for learning, and remains an important part of the Western region's higher education ecosystem.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The review team's commendations and recommendations should be seen from the vantage point of an institution whose last two reaccreditation reviews coincided with two of the most disruptive social periods in recent history: the 2008 Great Recession and the COVID-19 pandemic. The senior leadership, faculty, staff, and students have done remarkable work redesigning financial policies and procedures following the Great Recession and demonstrating resilience in facing the current pandemic and meeting the needs of their students. The team's topline observation – reflected throughout the report and confirmed by the campus site visit – is that CSULB's commitment to its academic mission and to serving its students is exemplary.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The team commends the university's ability to pivot quickly in responding to a rapidly changing environment and providing students with much needed support and guidance, for example, through the Beach Guide program established last summer, which mobilized 182 volunteers across all divisions of the university to provide online mentoring to 2,500 new students this fall.

2. The team commends the university for the culture of mutual respect evident across its campus and programs, notably between its student affairs and academic affairs areas, as exemplified by their collaborative spirit, commitment to supporting students, and to helping them progress academically and graduate in timely fashion.

3. The team commends CSULB for the depth and breadth of its academic and other student support services, targeted to the varying needs of its very diverse student body. The team commends the resulting improvements in undergraduate graduation rates.

4. The team commends the university for broadening its academic program review processes to include inquiry into the effectiveness of student support programs and administrative centers.

5. The team commends the university for its approach to supporting the success of graduate students, who receive academic advising, guidance in writing, mental health workshops, preparation for internships, and conference opportunities, and for the College's planned expansion of graduate student space.

6. The team commends the university for its continuing commitment to its local community, exemplified by the Promise program, which has raised the percentage of local area students entering the university and fostered close partnership between CSULB and Long Beach City College that includes enhanced advising and support for transfer students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CSULB has grown and integrated its **digital data collection and analysis capacity** since its last accreditation review. The team recommends the university continue to encourage broader use of that evidence across its academic and administrative units in order to close opportunity gaps for students. (CFR 2.10, 4.3)

2. CSULB has investigated and employed several **high-impact practices** while trying to make sure they are made available to students for whom these engagements can have the greatest impact. The team recommends the university ensure all students – especially first-generation and Pell-eligible students, and students with diverse backgrounds – engage in multiple high impact practices. (CFR 2.2, 2.5)

3. CSULB has built strong **capacity for assessment of student learning**. The team recommends the institution continue its efforts to integrate results of assessment into program review processes and to be flexible in supporting faculty in finding ways of pursuing inquiry meaningful in the academic context of their programs. CSULB should focus on processes for assessment that lead to actionable changes that improve student learning, student achievement, and overall educational effectiveness. (CFR 2.4,2.7, 3.3)

4. CSULB is working to **assess its campus climate** in order to be more inclusive and advance the cause of equity. The team recommends that, as the university continues convening and listening to its many constituent groups, it explore difficult issues around systemic racism and unconscious bias, and devise an action plan to support its aspiration to serve as a model for inclusion and equity. (CFR 1.4, 3.2, 4.3)

APPENDIX 1 – FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? x YES ❒ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? In the General Catalog
	Comments:
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)? x YES ❒ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Credit hours are determined by a course classification system which is determined by the Chancellors Office. The credit hours are included as a part of the curriculum approval process, and are published in the catalog. Each time a course is scheduled, it is scheduled against the credit hour. Schedulers compare times against the course classifications. Thus, the credit hours are reviewed each time the course is scheduled. In addition, each time a course is revised, the faculty member is required to re-check the credit hours, and the revision must go through Departmental and College Curriculum Committees prior to submission to Curriculog and the Curriculum Office.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? x YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Yes, the Schedule of Classes shows when all classes meet and also differentiates the "location" of classes as synchronous online, asynchronous online, mixed online, hybrid, face-to-face on-campus, or face-to-face off campus.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Fully online
	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS x BA/BS x MA ❒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Management, History, Health Science
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? x YES ❒ NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g.,	How many syllabi were reviewed? 10
	What kinds of courses? Directed Reading, Directed Research, Lab, Clinical, Internship,
	What degree level(s)? ❒ AA/AS x BA/BS x MA x Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Speech-Language Pathology, Physical Therapy, Geology, Nursing, Public Policy and Administration, Liberal Arts, Biology,

| internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.* | Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ❑ NO |
| | Comments: |

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 14
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Programs in each of the 7 Colleges
	What degree level(s)? ❑ AA/AS x BA/BS x MA x Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Art, MFA ; Music, BA; Business Administration, Marketing Option, BS; Educational Leadership, Ed.D; Liberal Studies, BA; Education, Curriculum and Instruction, MAE; Biomedical Engineering, BS; Electrical Engineering, MS; History, BA; Psychology, Human Factors, MS; Physical Therapy, DPT; Nursing, BSN; Earth Science, BS; Chemistry, MS;
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? x YES ❑ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Mitsue Yokota
Date: 10/23/20

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? x YES ❑ NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? x YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? x YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Institution provides publicly available data about graduation rates

Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? x YES ☐ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? x YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

*§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: Mitsue Yokota
Date: 10/23/20

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? x YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Academic Senate webpage – Policy Statement 07-01 Student Grievance Procedures General Catalog
	Comments: https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/policy-statement-07-01-student-grievance-procedures%C2%A0superseded-ps-95-21 http://catalog.csulb.edu/content.php?catoid=5&navoid=372&hl=%22Grievance%22&returnto=search#student-grievance-policy
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? x YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Title IX for Sex Discrimination, Harassment, etc.

	General Catalog and Academic Senate for Grade Appeals
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ❒ NO
	Comments: https://www.csulb.edu/equity-diversity/title-ix http://catalog.csulb.edu/content.php?catoid=5&navoid=372#student-complaint-procedure https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/academic-appeals-committee-aac http://web.csulb.edu/divisions/students/judicial_affairs/
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? x YES ❒ NO If so, where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? x YES ❒ NO If so, please describe briefly: Retention of records is guided by CSU Executive Order 1031, Systemwide Records/Information Retention and Disposition Schedules implementation **Student Affairs, Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED), CARES, and Office of Equity and Diversity (OED):** All our of our cases are saved up into an online, secured case management system, called Maxient case management database. It helps with centralized tracking and to catch a serious issue if multiple offices have open cases or issues with one student or there are a lot of prior cases with other offices who all use Maxient. Cases include the original complaint, the decision, and the follow-up.
	Comments:

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

Review Completed By: Mitsue Yokota
Date: 10/23/20

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES ❒ NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? x YES ❒ NO If so, where? Website https://www.csulb.edu/admissions/transfer-credit-for-incoming-students
	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? xYES ❒ NO

	Comments:
	https://www.csulb.edu/student-records/supplemental-credit-for-current-csulb-students

*§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: Mitsue Yokota
Date: 10/23/20

APPENDIX 2a – OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW: TEAM REPORTS, ENGINEERING

Institution: California State University, Long Beach
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: William Ladusaw, Mitsue Yokota
Date/s of review: October 13, 2020

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed. 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

   Lancaster University Center, 45356 Division St, Lancaster, CA 93535

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)

   The Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering (BSEE) and Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME) Extension Programs are located at the College of Engineering's satellite campus in Lancaster, California. The Extension Program is identified as the Antelope Valley Engineering Program (AVEP) and is offered at the Lancaster University Center, 45356 Division Street, Lancaster, CA 93535. The Antelope Valley is referred to colloquially as "the Aerospace Valley" because it is the birthplace of the sonic boom and home to the Air Force Research Laboratory's Rocket Propulsion research facilities which were designated by AIAA as a Historic Aerospace Site in 2002.

   Both programs resulted from a proposal presented to the Dean of the College of Engineering in December 2009. CSULB College of Engineering approved in August 2010. The degree program was reviewed by the WSCUC Substantive Change Committee and issued interim approval in February 2011. Final approval was granted in March 2011.

   Two degrees are offered at this site:
   Bachelors, Electrical Engineering (Degree completion, implemented 2011)
   Bachelors, Mechanical Engineering (Degree completion, implemented 2011)

   The programs are cohort based with a program length of 5 semesters. The three currently enrolled cohorts are:

   Cohort 8 Graduating Seniors   **Cohort 9 Rising Juniors**
   19 ME   ME 16
   16 EE   EE 15

   Cohort 10 Incoming
   16 ME
   10 EE

The ABET report (2017-18) indicated that the Electrical Engineering program had 5 full-time faculty and 5 part-time faculty; Mechanical Engineering program had 1 full-time faculty and 8 part-time faculty.

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

Program and college websites, ABET accreditation documents, interviews with Antonella Sciortino, Interim Associate Dean for Academic Programs of the College of Engineering, Aubrey Priest, Director of the AV Engineering Program, Dr. J. Shelley, lead faculty and adjunct faculty member, Mechanical Engineering Program.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	n/a	none
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	Program curriculum is uniform with other college programs, adopted a cohort model to take advantage of the local industrial connections and engage a regional pool of interested students.	none
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Students have access to all main campus services. All instruction and core support delivered at Lancaster center.	none
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Cohort model supports close peer and faculty interaction. Some faculty local to site, others travel to site to deliver courses.	none
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Through faculty and staff on site advising and technical support provided. Library accessed remotely. Academic advisors travel to site periodically. Main campus based specialized student support services accessible remotely.	none
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Two lead faculty based on site. College faculty from main campus (professor and lecturer mix). Instructors drawn from local industry affiliates appointed as adjuncts. All courses under purview of College of Engineering	none

	departments for development and assessment.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	College of Engineering departmental faculty. Courses comparable to main campus courses and under ABET required LO structure.	none
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Cohort model yields comparable or possibly better retention and graduation rates than main campus. (Small cell size.) No concerns.	none
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	Faculty assess courses, program courses integrated into regular college assessment cycle. Effectiveness comparable to main campus.	none
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	This site's programs fully integrated into College of Engineering QA processes.	none

APPENDIX 2b – OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW: TEAM REPORTS, EDUCATION

Institution: California State University, Long Beach
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: Richard Mahon, Robin Romans
Date/s of review: October 14, 2020

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[1]. 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.

4. Site Name and Address

Huntington Beach High School	Huntington Beach	Additional
Lake Center Middle School	Santa Fe Springs	Additional
Manhattan Beach USD Office	Manhattan Beach	Additional

5. 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)

   Graduate level teaching certificate programs.
   UTEACH
   UDCP – Urban Dual Credential Program

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

Shireen Pavri	CSULB	Dean, College of Education	
Rebecca Bustamante	CSULB	Assoc. Dean, College of Education	
Karina Gerger	Manhatttan Beach Unif.	Principal PenneKamp Elementary & district liaison	EDAD
Dan Bryan	Huntington Beach Union	Director of Educational Svcs. & district liaison	EDAD
Danielle Chung	Long Beach Unified	Elementary Teacher	UTEACH
Nancy Hoyt	Long Beach Unified	Elementary Teacher	UTEACH
Sam Platis	Long Beach Unified	Principal Florence Bixby Elementary	UTEACH
Emily Martinez	Student		UDCP
Tony Valencia	Little Lake School	Director of Special Education	UDCP

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	n/a	none
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	Programs are entirely consistent with the mission of CSULB and the College of Education.	none
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	Education sites align to CSULB's promotion of the Public Good and of Equity.	none
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	Very passionate about the learning environment. They're very careful about hiring of high-quality faculty committed to mentoring and to being equity-minded. The student representative is thrilled to be near young the students they serve. The immersion is valuable. The mentor is great; gives great feedback.	none
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	Access to services is facilitated by faculty, online resources, and mentor teachers. CSULB has been proactive in thinking about what services need to be made available.	none

Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	A mix of tenure/tenure-track and adjunct faculty. Strong community of teachers. To date, there is no CSU process for promoting off-tenure track faculty (their contracts are different).	none
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	Teaching practicums and graduate curriculum happen at K-12 school sites. Faculty are able to integrate and take advantage of the different sites into their pedagogy.	none
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	Very high retention and graduation rates. Employment is more challenging to track though substantive anecdotal evidence suggests high demand for program completers.	none
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	As part of the College of Education, they take this very seriously. They use "signature assignments" to judge effectiveness at the program level. They do regular surveys of continuing students and exit surveys of graduating students. More surveys one year out from graduation and of employers. Very robust!	none

Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	They go through programmatic accreditation and don't participate in CSULB program review.	none

APPENDIX 3 – DISTANCE EDUCAION REVIEW: TEAM REPORT

Institution: California State University – Long Beach
Type of Visit: Reaccreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Geoffrey Chase
Date/s of review: 10/5/20 and 10/7/20

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

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

    > Online MBA - 2019
    > Public Administration MA - 2001
    > Emergency Services Administration MA - 2004
    > Criminology and Criminal Justice MA - 2016

    > Courses for each as noted below.

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

    CSULB offers four online programs, as noted above, and each was established in the years noted above. Enrollments are relatively small. Cohorts consist of 20-30 student per program. The university uses ongoing technological platforms such as Zoom to offer these programs.

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

    Online MBA persons interviewed: Michael Solt (Dean of the College of Business), Rod Smith (Graduate Programs Director, College of Business), and Richard Okumoto (Online MBA Program Director for the College of Business).

    Public Administration, Emergency Services Administration, and Criminology and Criminal Justice persons interviewed: Jennifer Ostergren (Associate Dean, CHHS), David Powell (Director of the Graduate Center for Public Policy), Brenda Vogel (Director of the School of Criminology, Criminal Justice, and Emergency Management), Peter Kreysa (graduate advisor for EMER), Aili Malm (graduate advisor for CCJ), Tim Mozia, (Associate Dean, CPIE), Matt Reimers (CPIE Program Developer) for these three programs.

Material Examined

Syllabi:
1. ACCT 610 Managerial Accounting and Control, Quantitative Methods in Managerial Decision Making
2. MKTG 661-02 Seminar Marketing Policies
3. EMER 540 Section 01Emergency Management Organizations: Constructs for Influencing Complex Systems
4. CRJU 504: Criminological Theory
5. CRJU 520: Advanced Criminal Justice Research Methods
6. PPA 500 Foundations of Public Policy and Administration
7. PPA 535 Intergovernmental Relations
8. PPA 670 -Distance Policy Issue Analysis

Additional Documents Reviewed:
1. Program Review and Assessment Council, University Program Review Committee Program Review Report for the College of Business Administration
2. Enrollment Data
3. AACSB Accreditation Report and Approval for the College of Business CSULB
4. External Review Report for the School of Criminology, Criminal Justice and Emergency Management
5. Master of Science in Emergency Services Administration California State University at Long Beach External Review
6. Program Review and Assessment Council, Program Review Report for the Graduate Center for Public Policy and Administration

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	All four distance learning degrees are consistent with mission of CSULB (CFRs 1.5, 1.2, 2.1)	No follow-up required
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	All the services available to all students are accessible by students in the online MBA. Additionally, students are invited to campus for events and since the cohorts are relatively small (25-30), there is a lot of interaction between instructors, advisors, as students (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13)	No follow-up required

Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Yes.	No follow-up required
Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Students in all the MBA/MA distance education programs have virtual access to all these services (CFRs 2.10, 2.5)	No follow-up required
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Online MBA: primarily full-time faculty. The courses are the same, except for modality, as those offered in the in person MBA. Faculty teaching in the online program work with instructional designers to prepare their classes for online instruction. The courses in Emergency Services Administration and Criminology and Criminal Justice are taught by professionals in the field. Public Administration is taught by the same faculty who teach in the on-campus PA program. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.4, 2.6, 3.1, 3.10)	No follow-up required
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Yes, the student learning outcomes are identical to the courses offered in person. Courses are designed by the faculty teaching, and they are regularly evaluated through the program review process. These faculty also work with and contribute to FEMA on developing appropriate	No follow-up required

	curricula. They also make use of Curriculog so that faculty across the program can review and approve of courses throughout the curriculum. Credit hours are consistent with credit hours required in on-campus courses. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7)	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	The online MBA is new, the first cohort began in 2019, and from that cohort, 4 students dropped out. Interviews were conducted with all of these 4 students to determine the reasons for non-retention. As students enter the Emergency Services Administration program, faculty and advisors work with them to reinforce how to balance life/work demands with a rigorous curriculum. Students are now tracked with Salesforce so that advisors can reach out if students drop a class. The University has noted that there is more attrition in the online Criminology and Criminal Justice program, however, some of that is due to work emergencies that students who are working experience through the nature of their jobs. The University is also working to increase retention by allowing students to take	No follow-up required

	fewer courses at a time, and to re-enter the program if they have been forced to drop out due to work demands. (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13)	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	Student learning is overseen in the online MBA as it is in the in person MBA program by the Associate Dean for Accreditation in the College of Business. In both the Emergency Services Administration and Criminology and Criminal Justice Programs all of the students take an assessment pre-test upon entering the program, and engage in culminating experiences by competed post-tests and theses. All of the syllabi make clear that learning is connected to assessment and agreed upon learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)	No follow-up required
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	No.	No follow-up required
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	See student learning comments above. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)	No follow-up required

Rev 3/2015