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INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

This Capacity and Preparatory Review Report (CPR) is designed for institutional reflection and educational improvement. Its immediate purpose is to evaluate the extent to which Fresno Pacific University (FPU) has fulfilled the “Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity,” defined by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) as demonstrating that the university “functions with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures and processes to fulfill its purposes.” The CPR, designed around the four WASC standards and FPU’s selected themes, as introduced in the Institutional Proposal, provides a holistic perspective on the University’s capacity to achieve its educational aspirations.

In the last self-study (2003), FPU identified directions and actions for continued development as a learning-centered institution. The WASC Commission applauded FPU for a deep commitment to “teaching excellence and student support” and made recommendations in three areas for continued attention: 1) sustaining institutional capacity; 2) developing diversity initiatives and promoting multiculturalism; and 3) embedding and extending learning-centeredness. Based on the Interim Progress Report in 2007, WASC commended FPU for the “engagement and candor in the report and was encouraged by the University’s efforts to implement change in the areas of concern.” Recommendations for continued attention included: 1) a more structured cycle for program reviews with external reference points; 2) need to develop expectations of scholarship, community service, and the culture of research and explicitly state these; 3) clearly demarcated faculty governance structures; 4) data and analysis of the decentralization of services and the performance and quality of the Regional Centers; 5) the development of a more comprehensive Diversity Plan to help focus campus priorities; and 6) closing the assessment loop- demonstrate that assessment data and program review outcomes are being used to inform change at the institutional and departmental levels. A comprehensive review of campus actions relating to the recommendations referenced by the Commission is included as Appendix B, Response to Commission Actions and Visiting Team Report. In addition, the university has responded to issues raised by the WASC Retention and Graduation Rate Committee (Appendix B, Response to Retention and Graduation Rate Committee Evaluation-Fall 2012). [CFR 1.9]

The FPU Community

Located in the central San Joaquin Valley in California, FPU is situated in a region sometimes referred to as California’s Appalachia. Despite living in one of the most productive agricultural regions in the United States, San Joaquin Valley residents have the lowest average income in California. The area is also one of great diversity; with students entering local schools speaking one hundred and one different languages. Many students are the first in their families to graduate from high school and have a goal to graduate from a university.

The college was founded in 1944 and changed its name to Fresno Pacific University in 1997. The “new” university consisted of three schools: Fresno Pacific College, Fresno Pacific Graduate School, and Fresno Pacific School of Professional Studies. In 2005, the university was restructured to include four schools: the School of Business; the School of Education; the School of Humanities, Religion, and Social Sciences; and the School of Natural Sciences. In 2003-2004, FPU established regional campus centers in Bakersfield, North Fresno, and Visalia. These centers offered courses mostly for adult students pursuing graduate degrees or enrolled in the university’s new degree completion program. In 2010, the Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary became a part of FPU resulting in a name change to the Fresno Pacific Biblical Seminary. The Seminary then became the fifth school under the university umbrella. In 2011, a new Regional Center was introduced in Merced and approved through the WASC Substantive Change process.

The central document that guides the mission and values of FPU is The Fresno Pacific Idea. (Attachments: A1: Fresno Pacific Mission, Vision and Values; A2: The Fresno Pacific Idea). Created as a live, evolving document open to dialogue and interpretation, this statement characterizes the University through three metaphors: a Christian University, a Community of Learners, and Prophetic.
Grounded in Anabaptist Evangelical theology and Mennonite tradition, *The FPU Idea* calls for the building of community, inclusion of voice, embracing diversity, peacemaking and reconciliation, and prophetic action in serving the community and the world. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.4, 1.6]

FPU is classified by the Carnegie Classification system as Masters M: Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs) that provides undergraduate and graduate education to a diverse population, with an emphasis on teacher preparation and professional/applied programs. FPU offers more than 47 bachelor and master degree programs in over 60 subject areas. Recent data for 2010-2011 indicates the university awarded 724 total degrees, equated to 531 baccalaureate degrees and 193 master's/seminary degrees. The university has an annual budget of over $47 million, a combined (FPU and FPU Foundation) endowment of $11.3 million, and a foundation with assets under management in excess of $24 million. The university is regionally accredited for all of its educational programs and locations by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Based on Fall 2011 census data, approximately 3,603 students (2,538 bachelor degree students, 786 master's degree or certificate students, and 24 non-degree students) study and learn on the main campus in Fresno or in one of the university’s regional centers (in Visalia, Bakersfield, North Fresno, and Merced). Another 3,918 students are served through the university's Continuing Education activities. Of the 3,603 students, 67.38% are female and 16.37% are first generation students. Of the entire student body, demographics related to ethnicity show the following student mix: 45.90% are white, 34.56% are Hispanic/Latino, 4.83% are African American, 3.31% are Asian, .70% are American Indian or Alaska Native, .20% are Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 1.26% are two or more races, 1.68% are Non-Resident Alien, and 8.0% are race unknown. [CFRs: 1.2, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.10, 4.1]

**Update on FPU’s Context**

The years since the last WASC accreditation visit in 2003 have been eventful. While the university has made many routine changes, seven major contextual opportunities can be identified that have influenced the current milieu of the university. They reflect both internal and external factors and have elicited a proactive, deliberative, and tactical response from the institution.

**1) Leadership Changes**

Further changes have also occurred since our submission of the *Institutional Proposal*. In the space of a little over one year, administrative turnover has brought new leadership to a number of areas in the university, including Enrollment Management, Human Resources, Finance, Athletics, and Academic Administration. Dr. Pete C. Menjares assumed the presidency on July 28, 2012 and become the 11th President of FPU. At the same time, Dr. Stephen Varvis was assigned the permanent role of Provost/ALO after serving as Interim Provost since January 2011. In addition to these key changes in leadership, the university is also in the process of hiring a Chief Financial Officer and a Vice President for Advancement. In addition, the six deans of the Schools and Degree Completion are relatively new to FPU, the two longest having served since 2008. [CFRs: 1.3, 3.1, 3.10, 3.11]

**2) Recession, Financial Stability, and Enrollment**

In 2008-2009, the effects of the “Great Recession” hit FPU resulting in static enrollment against a budget projection of an increase in more than 300 students when total Regional Center and main campus enrollment was 2377 (in effect, nearly a 15% enrollment loss). The combined enrollment compared to budget was approximately 90 in the traditional undergraduate programs, 180 in degree completion programs, and a smaller amount in the graduate and credential programs. Immediately in that year, the university adjusted its expense budgets and lost through retirements and strategic layoffs 10% of its staffing (30 positions out of 325). These expedient changes preceded by two years the downturn in the State of California budget adjustments suffered by public institutions. We are fortunate that through these years donations to the university have remained stable. More information regarding the impacts of this financial picture can be found in Thematic Essay III. [CFRs: 1.8, 3.5, 3.9]

In order to adapt to the economic recession and the impact on the university, FPU chose to be intentional in focusing on varied enrollment strategies to build up our student base. In the fall of 2009, enrollment began to rebound, and in 2010 and 2011 jumped significantly. From 2003 to 2008, enrollment grew from 1818 to 2377, a 30% increase (559 students). From 2008 to 2011, total enrollment grew from 2377 to 3603, a 51% increase (1226 students). Traditional undergraduate and degree completion enrollments have reached record highs; after dropping in 2010, graduate enrollment has regained earlier levels for 2012, despite slight declines in our largest program, Teacher Education (first year credentials). (Attachments: A3: Fall Enrollment Report 2008; A4: Fall Enrollment Report 2009; A5: Fall Enrollment Report 2010; A6: Fall Enrollment Report 2011; A7: Fall Enrollment Report 2012, A8: Report to Board of Trustees, June 2011)

Along with strategic resource allocation and preservation, the university instituted a new pattern of budgeting for enrollment. In addition to the $1 million enrollment contingency FPU has consistently budgeted, the annual budget from 2009 onward has been based on enrollment estimates that are as close to what can be predicted as assured. We budget on worst case scenarios—the minimum we can be assured will enroll. [CFRs: 1.8, 3.5]
FPU also made investments in consulting contracts for new student search and financial aid awarding analyses and procedures, and a price sensitivity study in our various student populations. We subsequently budgeted and awarded more in financial aid. In 2009-10, we were one of only a handful of universities throughout the country that froze their tuition costs; and housing rates were dropped and remained frozen for two years. These efforts along with investments in marketing and student services have resulted in the dramatic increase in enrollment and in increased annual nets to the university, that in turn have allowed the university to continue to expand its efforts, especially in its most cost effective programs—degree completion hosted in the Regional Centers. [CFRs: 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 4.2]

Part of FPU’s enrollment increase has been due to the lack of availability of courses in state institutions. Thus we face the prospect of potential enrollment declines should the budgets for higher education in California rebound soon. However, because we now budget on only assured enrollments, we can proceed with confidence that we can maintain our academic programs, the achievement of student learning outcomes through those programs, and our academic reputation which is the bedrock asset of any academic institution. When enrollments exceed the minimum budgeted projections, we are then able to again strategically invest through surplus funds (compared to budget) in, for example, the start-up costs of establishing the Merced Regional Center. [CFR: 3.5]

3) Regional Centers
The university sees the Regional Centers as a vehicle for extending the mission of the university and offering a FPU education to many throughout the Southern and Central San Joaquin Valley who might otherwise not have the opportunity for higher education. In a region of the state that has one of the lowest Bachelors’ Degree level attainment rates, and one of the highest “some college” and Associate Degree level attainment rates, the FPU Regional Centers have become a prominent part of the FPU structure and mission. Currently, the university has regional centers in North Fresno, Bakersfield, Visalia, and Merced. The first regional center in Visalia and Bakersfield received WASC approval in 2003 and opened in 2004; the North Fresno Center opened in 2005, expanded in 2006 and again in 2011; both the Bakersfield and Visalia centers moved to new larger facilities in 2009; and a fourth, and smaller, center was established in Merced in 2011. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.13]

4) University Designation as a Hispanic-Serving Institution
The university has been recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) since 2009 and is a member of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). One of the challenges that we have encountered with the large enrolling numbers of Latino/a students is to balance academic rigor with access and to demonstrate that quality and access are achievable and mutual goals. Currently, FPU is in a partnership with College of the Sequoias based on an HSI STEM grant to prepare students for successful entry into careers related to math, science, and technology. [CFRs: 2.1.2, 2.1.3]

5) Faculty Rank and Scholarship
To align with professional standards, the university adopted faculty rank, new expectations for scholarship, and a new compensation schedule. The new policies were developed by an ad hoc task force on Rank and Continuing Status (similar to tenure), and were reviewed and approved in an iterative process by the Personnel Committee, Faculty Senate, and President’s Cabinet. In the spring of 2011, the Board of Trustees approved the new policies, and all professors were placed in rank, approved also by the Personnel Committee and the Board of Trustees. The plan also included a more equitable compensation schedule to be phased in over three years. While standard for the vast majority of universities across the United States, this was a significant change for FPU which had prided itself on its egalitarian community founded in Anabaptist ideals. It was also a formal response to WASC responses to the 2007 interim report. For detailed information on faculty rank, continuing status, professional development, and the evaluation process, refer to Thematic Essay III. [CFRs: 2.1, 2.8, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7]

6) Biblical Seminary
On June 1, 2010, the Mennonite Brethren (MB) Biblical Seminary transferred the assets devoted to its Fresno campus to FPU. The assets transferred include primarily the Fresno campus, faculty, curriculum, accreditation history with the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) and WASC, relationship with Mennonite Brethren churches in the four United States MB district conferences outside the Pacific District Conference, records of donors and alumni, and endowments worth roughly $2 million. A study by a MB Biblical Seminary Board Task Force revealed an enrollment decline that extended over two decades in total Seminary headcount and full-time employed (FTE). Further, a morale crisis triggered by the sudden resignation of the former president had unsettled stakeholders inside and outside the Seminary. Finally, as the Seminary anticipated the need for a new approach to theological education in the changing times, it realized that it lacked resources internally and the Board urged realignment with a larger institution, resulting in the merger with FPU. [CFRs: 1.1, 3.8, 3.9]

7) Move from NAIA to NCAA Athletics
FPU is in the process of a three-year candidacy period with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) which began with the 2011-12 athletic season, its final season in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). The university submitted its application for
Many of the above contextual opportunities have occurred over the last eight years, and especially those most recently have been significant for the life and character of the university. We attempted to remain focused on teaching, students, and outcomes when we were forced to confront layoffs and drastic cuts in budgets. Nonetheless, we strived in the midst of rapid change to engage in the practices of study, reflection, and assessment organized around the accreditation/reaffirmation process. FPU has taken to heart the admonition from WASC to frame our reaccreditation efforts as an opportunity to engage in focused inquiry rather than as a report to write or a set of requirements with which we must show compliance. We seek to improve rather than simply to prove. [CFRs: 4.1, 4.2]

**Organization of the Report**

The heart of the CPR outlined in the *Institutional Proposal* consists of a series of reflective essays organized around a set of "Inquiry Questions" based on three initial themes: Student Achievement and Strategic Assessment, Aspects of Diversity, and Resources and Financial Stability. After consultation with WASC regarding the *Institutional Proposal*, we have also addressed two of the student learning competencies from WASC's core essentials: Writing and Critical Thinking. We have also included a discussion on the Rigor and Meaning of Degrees which sets a foundation for further community discussion in preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review stage of the re-accreditation process. Therefore, six discrete thematic “Inquiry Circles” were created to address questions posed for each content area, each group composed of 9 to 14 faculty, staff, students, and administrators. [CFRs: 1.9, 4.1, 4.2]

The Inquiry Circles met regularly and considered these Inquiry Questions from the perspective of the WASC standards related to purposes, integrity, transparency, stability, resources, structures, processes and policies. Led by experienced faculty members, Inquiry Circle discussions were frank and open, with the results communicated to faculty governance, deans, administration, and the Continuous Improvement Committee (CIC) through established procedures. Membership in the circles was determined through volunteers and recommendations by deans and administration in order to balance input across schools and departments and to involve as many stakeholders as possible. The Circles defined the parameters of their Inquiry Questions, aligned them with the WASC Criteria for Review, and divided the Inquiry Questions into smaller researchable questions to provide a systematic framework. Recommendations made by the Inquiry Circles for university consideration were communicated to institutional leadership; these recommendations and any resultant actions have been communicated broadly and are on the FPU accreditation website. Through this process, the Inquiry Circles reviewed policies, procedures, and structures, collected and analyzed relevant data, and told the FPU story with references to institutional memories. The results of these inquiries are presented in the six essays constituting the core of this report. [CFR: 1.9]

The formatting of this document is intentionally distinctive, in response to WASC's instructions that the report should tell our story. WASC asked us to prepare a report that describes who we are, where we want to go, what we have and need in order to get there, how we will be checking our progress, and what kinds of adjustments we are prepared to make in order to reach our destination. Accordingly, each essay is organized primarily as a narrative. However, we also invite readers to take side-trips that afford opportunities to develop a broader sense of our progress on a route which is complex, multifaceted, and full of hope.

Section One of the report contains the six essays as previously mentioned, followed by an integrative essay. In the Conclusion to the CPR, the university looks ahead by summarizing the priorities, challenges, and action steps described throughout the essays. Following the narrative report is Section Two which contains the following documents: Institutional Stipulations Signed by Dr. Pete C. Menjares (Appendix A); Response to Commission Actions and Visiting Team Report (Appendix B); Response to Retention and Graduation Rate Committee Evaluation-Fall
2012 (Appendix C); Stipulated Policies and Statements (Appendix D), and Index of Criteria for Review With Links to Institutional Evidence (Appendix E). Section Two comprises WASW Required Exhibits including the Institutional Portfolio (an updated set of the Basic Descriptive Data that was submitted with the Institutional Proposal) and the FPU Selected Exhibits/Attachments to Support the Essays.

THEMATIC ESSAY I
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

Question 1: What are the processes in place that direct the university's effort to define and evaluate student achievement and strategic assessment?

Over the last decade, efforts have been made to establish a culture of assessment at FPU using direct and indirect measures of student learning, and reflected in the University Academic Assessment Cycle (Attachment B1: University Academic Assessment Cycle), the Co-Curricular Assessment Cycle (Attachment B2: Co-Curricular Assessment Cycle), and the Institutional Framework for Student Learning (Attachment B3: Institutional Framework for Student Learning). There are consistent processes implemented by faculty, staff, and students that direct the university's effort to define and evaluate student achievement and strategic assessment: (1) the institutional academic assessment initiative; (2) the program review; (3) administration of institutional academic and student satisfaction surveys; (4) the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) policy, and (5) co-curricular assessment for Student Life, Athletics, and Spiritual Formation.

Institutional Academic Assessment Initiative

History
Over the past 10 years, academic assessment was overseen by the Undergraduate Dean's Office and other academic deans who led the University Assessment Committee (AC) and Preparatory Review Report
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Students are encouraged to publish their TaskStream e-Portfolio as a webpage at the end of their program. This provides them with a link to the webpage which can then be used in an interview process as a testament to their suitability for a particular job or in graduate school applications. To provide this encouragement to students, the OIE has provided Admissions and Enrollment with a flyer (Attachment B18: TaskStream e-Portfolios_Enrollment-Admissions Flyer) for student distribution, described the e-Portfolio function to the Student Senate and Senate Executive, and posted training on how to create an e-Portfolio on the Campus Cruiser TaskStream homepage. [CFR: 2.6]

The process of executing the institutional academic assessment initiative has been facilitated by the OIE and supported by a communication plan (Attachment B19: TaskStream Communication Plan), an implementation plan (Attachment B20: TaskStream Training Plan), a series of faculty and staff workshops and trainings (Attachments: B21: Professional Orientation Day Training 8-20-12; B22: TaskStream Introduction-Center and Campus Support Staff), and the development of the Campus Cruiser TaskStream homepage that contains 24/7 support information and numerous training materials for both students and faculty. The deans, program directors, and faculty have been instrumental in the success of the initiative. [CFRs: 2.6, 3.4, 4.4, 4.5]

**Program Review**

In the spring of 2012, the AC completed a revision of the Program Review Manual (Attachment B23: 2012.04.27 AC Meeting Minutes). The current version of the Program Review Manual contains details of the process (Attachment B24: Program Review Manual). The purpose of the program review is to foster academic excellence at all levels by examining educational effectiveness, best practices, and evaluating university infrastructure, resources, and needs in relation to that program. Recommendations from this review provide guidance for administrative decisions in support of continuous improvement. [CFRs: 2.5, 2.7, 4.4, 4.5]

Since 2008, and as a result of a recommendation made by WASC (Attachment B25: WASC March 17, 2008 Letter), programs have been on a 7-year review cycle. In conjunction with the AC, the Deans, and the Provost’s Office, the program review schedule was revised in the fall of 2012 (Attachment B26: Program Review Timeline). The review process occurs within a calendar year and is coordinated by the program director with assistance from program faculty. The report is data-driven from both direct and indirect assessment measures and requires both internal and external reviewers. Program reviews will be completed and housed electronically within a secure workspace in the TaskStream system for all
programs completing a program review in 2013 and forward. [CFRs: 2.5, 2.10, 2.11, 4.4, 4.5]

Administration of Institutional Academic and Student Satisfaction Surveys

The OIE is responsible for the administration of two academic surveys. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collects information about undergraduate freshman and senior student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college (Attachment B27: Sample: NSSE11 Executive Snapshot). It also compares FPU student responses to those of students at other Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCC&U) schools in our consortium, providing valuable information that can inform change in practice (Attachment B28: Sample: NSSE11 Mean-Frequency Reports). FPU participates in the NSSE every two years; the OIE is in the process of preparing for the 2013 administration of the survey to occur in February 2013. Historic NSSE data can be found on the Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment page on the FPU Intranet, which will be available for full review by the WASC site visit team in March 2013. [CFRs: 2.5, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5]

For the past 20+ years, FPU used a student perception inventory (SPI) for traditional undergraduate (TUG) students to determine course- and program-level satisfaction. In the fall of 2011, the AC, Faculty Senate, and Academic Cabinet approved the use of the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction survey instrument, use of which was piloted in the spring 2012 semester. As of the fall 2012 semester, IDEA is administered by OIE to students and faculty in all TUG, graduate (GRAD), and degree completion (DC) programs at the completion of each course. IDEA measures student perception of faculty effectiveness in using instructional strategies as well as surveys instructors regarding their course goals. The feedback to faculty summarizes teaching success and enables pedagogical improvement where necessary to advance student success. In the spring and summer 2012 survey administrations, TUG and GRAD saw an approximate 65% return rate. SPI and/or IDEA scores are used in faculty evaluation and the program review processes. The AC is currently considering moving IDEA from paper/pencil administration to electronic online administration as a cost savings measure. IDEA data can be found on the Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment page on the FPU Intranet, which will be available for full review by the WASC site visit team in March 2013. [CFRs: 2.5, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5]

A number of student satisfaction surveys are currently administered by the Office of Student Success and Retention (OSSR). The Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS), the Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS), and Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) are three Noel Levitz student satisfaction surveys administered biennially. The ASPS (Attachment B29: Sample: 2011 ASPS Institutional Summary) specifically targets adult student satisfaction; the SSI (Attachment B30: Sample: 2011 SSI Institutional Summary) targets TUG students; and the IPS (Attachment B31: Sample: 2011 IPS Institutional Summary) targets faculty, staff, and administrators and covers all student populations. The Student Life, Retention, and Enrollment divisions use the results to inform practice and internal departmental change to meet student needs, to improve student retention, and to increase enrollment. FPU also participates in the Higher Education Research Institute’s (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). Biennially, FPU freshman take the CIRP Freshman Survey which gathers data on demographic information, financial aid, secondary school achievement and activities, educational and career plans, and values, attitudes, beliefs, and self-concept (Attachment B32: Sample: 2010 CIRP Freshman Survey-Theme Reports). FPU seniors used to take the College Senior Survey (CSS) [an exit survey] but that has not occurred in a number of years. FPU utilizes this data to improve its understanding of the role of the FPU college experience in the lives of its students and to respond appropriately within a variety of institutional departments. Historic ASPS, IPS, SSI, and CIRP data can be found on the Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment page on the FPU Intranet, which will be available for full review by the WASC site visit team in March 2013. [CFRs: 2.10, 2.11, 4.4, 4.5]

Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP)

The OSSR tracks the satisfactory academic progress (SAP) of all TUG students each semester, oversees the appeals process for academically disqualified students, and coordinates the academic probation process in conjunction with the Director of Academic Support Services. The OSSR works closely with the Financial Aid Office and Faculty Mentors to manage the process. There are several categories of academic warnings in place based initially on the term GPA prior to dismissal. SAP policies are the same for DC students, but addressed by program advisors directly and not by OSSR. SAP policies and procedures can be found in the Academic Catalog (Attachment B33: Academic Catalog: SAP Policies). In each instance, the student, the faculty mentor, and the offices of Financial Aid, Student Financial Services, and the Registrar are notified of the student’s status. [CFRs: 2.2, 2.5, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14]

Co-Curricular Assessment (Student Life, Athletics, and Spiritual Formation)

Currently, FPU conducts co-curricular assessment in three areas—Student Life, Athletics, and Spiritual Formation—reflecting the Co-Curricular Assessment Cycle.
Student Life

The staff in the Division of Student Life (DSL) seeks to support USLOs through a variety of programmatic efforts, educational environments, and assessment initiatives. Each of the initiatives seeks to collect quality data and make good use of the information in the establishment of future goals and objectives, in the determination of both departmental and divisional priorities, and in support of USLOs. [CFRs: 1.2, 2.10, 2.11]

Residence Life has three assessment projects underway in the fall 2012 semester. (1) Student Leader training is being evaluated in terms of the leaders’ relational effectiveness, ability to promote reconciliation, and ability to demonstrate empathy. In this project, leaders are pre-tested, trained, and post-tested and those they serve are asked to comment on the quality of service received related to the three areas of training. This process supports the Service USLO. (2) Students are assessed as to their ability to express their living area expectations and their willingness to engage others when their expectations go unmet. In this project, students create and submit respect agreements after having been trained in the specific areas where students tend to be in conflict with one another. A comparison is then made between the quality of the respect agreement created (as it relates back to the suggested items to be addressed) and the number of formal and informal inter-personal difficulties that are experienced in that living area. This process supports both the Moral Reasoning and Critical Thinking USLOs. (3) It has been noted in past SSI data that the number of weekend activities was not satisfying. To address this, the Residence Life staff has undertaken a project of planning two weekend activities per month. The assessment of this effort will be in the form of participation numbers at the events (with a goal of 10% of the residential population consistently present at events) and in an increase in the SSI scores reporting satisfaction with weekend activities. Data for these projects will be available in the spring 2013 semester. [CFRs: 2.11, 4.8]

The International Programs and Services Office (IPSO) has one assessment project underway. Cultural Awareness Nights seek to educate students about various countries around the world. These evenings address cultural, political, social, economic, and spiritual issues as they relate to the various countries chosen. To assess the effectiveness of the evening, students report at the end what they have learned and how that learning will impact their future. International Office staff review their responses looking for patterns and for ways in which the student responses support the Global Perspective USLO (Attachment B34: Sample Cultural Awareness Night Evaluations). [CFRs: 2.11, 4.8]

The Director of Orientation has undertaken two assessments. The first is aimed at whether New Student Orientation meets the needs and expectations of new students, their families, and the FPU community. New Student Orientation is evaluated via the responses of new students, current student leaders who help deliver the program, the parents of new students, and the various offices involved in delivering New Student Orientation each fall. Surveys are done of the first three groups with the intent of determining participation and satisfaction levels. That information is then shared with focus groups from various offices around campus to look for performance issues, scheduling issues, and any suggestions or ideas for future events (Attachments: B35: New Student Orientation 2010, B36: 2011, B37: 2012; B38: New Student Orientation Review 2010-2012). The second assessment is to determine whether or not Mentor Assistants (MA) successfully aid freshmen students in their transition to the collegiate environment; this assessment is new in the fall 2012 semester. MAs are evaluated via pre and post-tests related to their training, the on-going reports they write in regards to their work responsibilities, and their performance in key areas as reported by the students that they serve. These various surveys and reviews determine whether the Critical Thinking and Moral Reasoning USLOs are being addressed. MAs also demonstrate leadership via the Service USLO. Data for this second project will be available in the spring 2013 semester. [CFRs: 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.11, 4.8]

The various Student Activity groups demonstrate the Service USLO by providing for the entire student body a month-by-month calendar of activities, events, and programs. Additionally, the various groups demonstrate the USLOs Reflection and Critical Thinking as they seek to determine the needs of various students and then address those needs. Via participation numbers and post-event evaluations, the student activities department learns whether or not students felt that the events, programs, and activities undertaken were worthwhile and/or significant in addressing student needs (Attachment B39: Sample Student Activity Evaluations). [CFRs: 2.11, 4.8]

The Career Center has three assessment projects underway and one in development (Attachment B40: SL-Career Services Data). (1) In the spring each year, the Career Center offers its Career Achievement Program. This multi-seminar program offers students the opportunity to learn about resume writing, cover letters, networking, and interviewing. Students are assessed prior to the program as to what they know and the quality of their career materials. These same areas are evaluated again at the conclusion. Statistics are also kept as to any interviews or job offers that are received. Career Center staff evaluates the students’ materials in light of the Reflection USLO. (2) Resume workshops and appointments are held continuously throughout the school year. Students’ career materials are evaluated by the Career Center staff for readability, professionalism, and content. This evaluation supports the Reflection USLO. (3) Two summative program assessment measures are underway: the
Graduating Student Exit Survey, requested when students apply for graduation, and the Six Month Graduate Survey, sent to alumni six months after graduation, currently under development for the May 2013 graduates. [CFRs: 2.10, 2.1, 4.8]

**Athletics**
The mission of the Department of Athletics (ATH) is to provide a highly competitive, distinctively Christian intercollegiate NCAA Division II athletic environment leading to degree completion and a life-long appreciation for community service and engagement. The ATH adheres to the principles of good sportsmanship, integrity, honesty, and fiscal responsibility while maintaining compliance with all relevant regulatory organizations. Through a regionally and nationally successful athletics program, the department creates a forum for celebrating and advancing the university’s overall mission. [CFRs: 1.1, 2.11]

FPU Athletics seeks to become known as a leading regional, Christian university athletics program with a national reputation. Specific attention is given to the development of community, the valuing of all people regardless of gender or ethnicity, the significance of Christian faith and behavior, the opportunities available from a liberal arts education, and competitive excellence in the NCAA Division II. Four of the ATH program goals directly tie to a number of the USLOs: (1) Build Christian Character (USLOs: Moral Reasoning, Service); (2) Ensure Academic Excellence (USLO: Content Knowledge); (3) Achieve Competitive Excellence (USLOs: Content Knowledge, Oral Communication); and (4) Encourage Community Service and Engagement (USLOs: Service, Reflection). [CFRs: 2.3, 2.4, 2.10]

The Department of Athletics conducts assessments according to its Assessment Plan (Attachment B41: Athletics Assessment Plan). The Student-Athlete Perception Inventory (Attachment B42: SAPI) is administered annually immediately following the competitive season of each sport. The Student-Athlete Exit Interview (Attachment B43: SAEI) is administered when a student-athlete leaves the sport program. Both assessments are geared toward the evaluation of the student-athlete experience and growth during participation in intercollegiate athletics. Data is collected and analyzed for continued development of student-athletes during their athletics participation. [CFR: 2.11]

**Office of Spiritual Formation**
The Office of Spiritual Formation (OSF) encourages students to engage with God, each other and the world for the purposes of transformation in all areas of life. Through co-curricular programmatic activities, TUG and DC students are offered opportunities for worship, prayer, evangelism, discipleship, social action, service projects, and short-term missions. Contemporary concerns, university activities, and personal values are examined in light of the Christian faith through programs of cultural, spiritual, and social enrichment. Programs include lectures, films, concerts, service projects, conferences, seminars, bible studies, and cross-cultural missions in the city, region, and around the world. The OSF strives to challenge students to become mature spiritual leaders whose lives are characterized by faithful obedience to God and love for His people. [CFR: 1.1]

College Hour, a bi-weekly worship/teaching service held on the FPU main campus and open to all TUG students, faculty, and staff, has been a fundamental aspect of the life of FPU students and their spiritual development. During this last year, and somewhat based on data from recent Student Perception Inventories (Attachment B44: SSI across OSF), College Hour has gone through several transitions that have positively impacted the program. College Hour was originally held in a nearby church, but is now hosted on the main campus in the Special Events Center. This has been received positively by our students with an overall satisfaction rate of 80% of those surveyed (Attachments: B45: College Hour 2011; B46: College Hour 2012). Additionally, the benefits of the move can be seen in the average number of attendees, which has gone from 136 in the 2009-2010 academic year to 254 in the 2011-12 academic year (Attachment B47: College Hour; Past, Present, and Future). During the last two academic years, an assessment/survey has been taken of College Hour to measure satisfaction. The assessment has been used in the past to help develop topics and speakers to minister to the needs of the students. However, the OSF plans to shift the focus of its assessments/surveys to focus more on OSF PSLOs, which include probing questions regarding students’ spiritual development, diversity, and missional development. OSF PSLOs reflect the following USLOs: Reflection, Critical Thinking, Moral Reasoning, Service, and Cultural and Global Perspectives (Attachment B48: Spiritual Formation SLOs). It is the goal to reflect these USLOs and PSLOs through the pre-assessment given in a November 2012 College Hour and the post-assessment to be given in April 2013. With this new shift in approach to assessment, the OSF anticipates more conclusive information to help it develop further programming. [CFRs: 2.1, 2.10, 2.11]

The OSF seeks to accomplish a variety of goals relating to the spiritual maturity of students at FPU. In general, the goal is to help students develop, apply, and demonstrate a biblical framework for the Christian church’s mission in the world both locally and globally. In working with FPU’s Multicultural Scholars Program effective in the spring 2013 semester, key indicators related to the USLOs Moral Reasoning, Service, and Cultural and Global Perspectives will be assessed. An initial assessment using the Mature Faith Index (MFI) will determine students’ understanding of diversity issues, decision making, and the importance of service. During the program, multicultural scholars will attend workshops and receive training around these
issues. Upon completion of their time in the program, they will be asked to write about their experience and will be re-evaluated with the MFI. Their end scores will be compared to their beginning scores to note any changes. Via these tools, those working with the multicultural scholars will be better able to know what they are learning and what issues have been successfully addressed.

Short-term mission projects provide students the opportunity to articulate the norms and principles underlying a Christian world-view. Early in the meeting period for each short-term missions group, questions are asked of participants in order to assess their learning process and objectives; similar tools are used after the mission's project is complete (Attachment B49: Short-term Missions Assessment). Prior to any short-term mission opportunity, students are invited to gather collectively for focused training at least several weeks in advance. Training is provided through a variety of avenues such as bible study, worship, prayer, book study, community building exercises, and one-on-one meetings with group leaders. [CFRs: 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.7]

The OSF Multicultural Student Group strives to introduce students to various cultures of the world. Through the arts, languages, seminars, bible studies, conferences, and mission trips, students experience diverse people groups, global cultures, a broad Christian worldview and opportunities to learn through co-curricular programmatic experiences. The OSF is considering ways to assess student learning in this group. [CFRs: 1.1, 2.1, 2.10, 2.11]

INFRASETRCTURE

Question 2: What infrastructure does the university have in place to support these efforts?

FPU has a significant infrastructure in place to support student achievement and the assessment of its institutional effectiveness through the identification and assessment of tools, systems, personnel, and data collection. This infrastructure supports both academic and co-curricular areas within the University and includes offices and personnel.

Academic

Effective the 2012-2013 academic year, the OIE was established to centralize academic assessment, co-curricular assessment, and institutional academic and student satisfaction survey data, as well as to provide data for internal program reviews. The OIE is led by the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and includes an Assessment Systems Manager and an Assessment Assistant. There are future plans to expand its personnel. The OIE manages academic assessment using the TaskStream system to provide programmatic and university student learning outcomes data for missionial, continuous improvement, and program review purposes. TaskStream is a cloud-based, customizable, electronic assessment management system. It facilitates performance-based outcomes assessment and allows FPU to articulate a unique narrative of the academic assessment being conducted across the University. TaskStream helps FPU ensure we are delivering a student-centered learning experience while achieving university, program, and course student learning outcomes. The OIE assists the departments of Athletics, Student Life, and Spiritual Formation in addressing similar purposes for co-curricular assessment. [CFRs: 2.6, 4.2]

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is led by the Director of Institutional Research as the full-time staff member, and is supported by a student worker and three members of the Office of Systems Analysis, which is part of the Department of Information Technology. The OIR is currently seeking a second full-time staff member. The OIR provides quantitative demographic, retention, and graduation data to government and other internal and external entities, and is presently working with the OIE to improve the availability and accessibility of data relevant to program assessment, including the format in which it is delivered. [CFRs: 3.1, 4.2]

The Office of Student Success and Retention (OSSR) is led by the Associate Dean of Student Success and Retention. The Director of Academic Support Services and the Student Success Coordinator report to the Associate Dean of OSSR, who, in turn, reports to the Dean of TUG students. The OSSR tracks all students enrolled in the 4-yr graduation guarantee program, develops the Student Academic Progress (SAP) report for TUG students, oversees the appeals process for academically disqualified TUG students, and coordinates the academic probation, withdrawal, and academic hiatus processes for TUG students. The OSSR oversees the Academic Support Center (ASC). The ASC is part of the OSSR and is led by the Director of Academic Support Services. The ASC has one ¼ and one 7/10-time staff member; additionally, there are 25 student assistants (SA: 7 office assistants, 18 tutors). In a facility doubled in size in 2009, the ASC provides academic services to students, including tutoring, exam proctoring, accommodations for students with disabilities, and online tutoring for DC students. The OSSR offers a College Language and Academic Success Strategies (CLASS) course to students who need training in organization and study skills for success in college. [CFRs: 2.13, 3.1]

The Center for Online Learning (COL) is led by a 4/5-time director, has a full-time multimedia developer, one ¾ and one ½-time instructional designer, and four part-time student assistants. The COL provides training and support to faculty for various technologies associated with effective advising and instruction (e.g., Campus Cruiser and Moodle). The COL provides instruction for online and blended course development and ensures that new online
courses meet certain instructional criteria before being offered. [CFRs: 3.4, 3.7]

The four regional centers (Bakersfield, Merced, North Fresno, and Visalia) are operationally self-contained, providing all services needed for students to complete their degrees. Each regional center is led by a Director, each of whom report to the Executive Director of Regional Centers. Each center has its own support staff and provides all academic services for its students. The Office of Spiritual Formation assists the centers in providing spiritual formation services for students. [CFRs: 1.1, 2.12, 2.13]

Co-Curricular

The Division of Student Life (DSL) is led by the Dean of Student Life. The DSL has one office manager who is supported by 10 SAs. The DSL has six primary areas: Residence Life and Housing/Student Conduct (led by a director with 35 SAs), Student Programs (led by a director with 17 SAs), Orientation/Peer Leaders (led by the DSL Office Manager with 26 SAs), Career Services (1 director, 1 career counselor, 1 SA), International Service/Programs (1 director, 1 recruiter/admissions staff, 4 SAs), and Health Services (1 director, 1 SA). Two programs/services of note are the First-Year Experience for all freshmen, whose goal is to successfully integrate freshmen into the FPU culture, and the Career Services Center, which provides assistance to students in identifying possible career paths and internship opportunities, as well as developing resume writing and interview skills.

The Office of Spiritual Formation (OSF) is led by the University Pastor/Dean of Spiritual Formation and has three full-time and one part-time staff members. The OSF’s goal is to provide spiritual development and services for the entire student body (main campus and regional centers). A key program provided by the OSF is College Hour. The OSF also provides spiritual counseling for all students.

The Department of Athletics (ATH) is led by the Director of Athletics (AD), has four Associate ADs, two Assistant ADs, 10 head coaches, 29 assistant coaches (mostly part-time), 11 other staff members, and two SAs (note: three individuals have dual roles and are counted twice). The ATH oversees 16 intercollegiate sports, is a member of the Pacific West Conference, and is affiliated with the NCAA Division II (second year of candidacy). A goal of the ATH is to insure a complete FPU experience emphasizing academic success and involvement in other aspects of the co-curricular experience. [CFRs: 2.7, 2.11, 2.13]

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Question 3: Specifically, how does the university recognize, value, and support these efforts through resource allocation?

FPU allocates, integrates, and aligns sufficient resources to support student achievement and ongoing strategic assessment to meet its mission.

2002-2009

As noted earlier, academic assessment during the 2003-2008 academic years was overseen first by the Undergraduate Dean’s Office and then by deans who chaired the AC. The impact of the economic downfall during 2008-2009 resulted in the administrative decision to require faculty and staff reductions and to institute a hiring freeze. The exception to this was in the area of enrollment management, which did not incur a staff reduction. Informed significantly by financial considerations, enrollment management staffing remained at capacity, and the administration employed the services of Noel Levitz to navigate the sudden decrease in funding and determine effective strategies to increase enrollment and retention rates. [CFRs: 1.7, 1.9, 2.7, 2.10, 4.5]

2009-2012

The past four academic years (2009-2012) have subsequently seen record enrollment leading to substantial fiscal stability (see detail in Thematic Essay 3). Several strategic administrative steps have been taken to move forward with institutional plans regarding student achievement and strategic assessment. The fiscal stability has provided resources for the rehiring of many faculty and staff as well as the creation of various staff and administrative positions directly involved with student achievement and strategic assessment. These include, but are not limited to, the Student Success Coordinator and Office Assistant in the OSSR, the Director of Institutional Research, the Dean of Degree Completion and an assistant, and an Executive Director for the Center for Online Learning. [CFRs: 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7]

Beginning in 2012, significant resources were provided for the creation of the OIE which included the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Assessment Systems Manager, and an Assessment Assistant, as well as the TaskStream system. Early in the process, resources were also allocated to include stipends for additional hours incurred by faculty to implement the academic assessment initiative. FPU has also put resources towards the purchase and use of IDEA and the various Noel Levitz and HERI/CIRP inventories to provide assessment of the teaching and learning experience from the student perspective. A summary of departmental allocation for the resources indicated is found in Resource Allocation.
ASSESSING THE DIRECTION AND SUPPORT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

Question 4: How does the university assess its ability to ensure that student achievement and strategic assessment are properly directed and adequately supported?

There are several strategies and methods used by FPU to assess its success in aligning the university infrastructure to support student achievement and strategic assessment. They include the program review process, the course syllabi audit, TaskStream training and use, and other forms of faculty and student assessment.

Program Review

Program Review includes the analysis, comparison and evaluation of academic programs with reference to the academic disciplines and professions, outside accrediting and reviewing bodies, and resource and personnel needs to meet the demands of the program, enrollment, and other requirements as individual programs dictate. Program Review requires an internal and academically professional review of program design, elements, and resources. Its purpose is to foster academic excellence at all levels by examining educational effectiveness and best practices, and evaluating University infrastructure, resources, and needs. Recommendations from the program review provide guidance for administrative decisions in support of continual improvement. After a program has been reviewed by an external reviewer, school faculty, and appropriate academic committees, it is housed in the Office of the appropriate Dean as well as the Provost’s Office. [CFRs: 2.7, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8]

Course Syllabi Audit

Each semester, an audit of all syllabi for courses offered that semester is conducted. This audit determines the presence of several key syllabi components: course student learning outcomes (CSLOs), linkage of CSLOs to PLSOs, signature assignment(s) and associated rubric(s), and a credit hour summary reflecting Carnegie unit requirements. Complete syllabi are stored on Files 1, a major information storage location for the institution. Information from this syllabi audit informs one aspect of the Program Review. Some programs that have outside programmatic accrediting bodies have moved beyond this audit process in that their program directors review syllabi for the quality of the syllabus in these areas. [CFRs: 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 4.6]

TaskStream Training and Use

The OIE has scheduled an annual assessment of its own TaskStream training processes for faculty beginning in spring 2013. Use of the TaskStream system by both students (submissions) and faculty (evaluations) will be assessed biannually. [CFRs: 3.4, 4.8]

Other Forms of Faculty and Student Assessment

Different institutional departments conduct a variety of surveys in support of student learning outcomes. The OIE administers two academic surveys: the NSSE for first-year students and seniors and the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system. The HERI/CIRP is administered by the OSSR. The Noel Levitz surveys, including the SSI, the ASPS, and the IPS have been administered in the past by the OSSR; in 2013, the Department of Enrollment or OIE is slated to assume responsibility for them. Most of these surveys provide the opportunity to benchmark FPU against other institutions using them. All NSSE, IDEA, Noel Levitz, and CIRP survey data is available for internal review and use on the Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment page on the FPU Intranet. [CFRs: 2.7, 2.10, 2.11]

The Department of Athletes asks students to complete the SAPI at the end of each season of athletic competition as well as an exit interview, the SAEI, when leaving the program. The OSF is currently developing assessments that can be used to measure its impact on student learning.

Capstone projects, exit interviews, and other forms of student learning are collected and assessed near the end of a student’s academic program completion. The OIE is working with the programs to initiate use of the TaskStream system to administer many of these assessments and to store their related data.

Recommendations in Furtherance of Student Achievement and Strategic Assessment

1) To improve public transparency, the OIE should create an external institutional effectiveness/assessment website that provides institutional survey and programmatic and university assessment data to the general public.

2) By the end of the 2013-2014 academic year, all programmatic formative and summative course signature assignments should be available for evaluation in TaskStream to improve programmatic data; these should be reflective of required courses only. In the case of those programs that permit extensive choice of formative electives within their program (e.g. History), programs should identify those courses most likely to be chosen by students and
designate them as included in programmatic assessment.

3) It is understood that the following are agenda items for the OIE/AC in the 2012-2013 academic year: (1) updating the 2007 Assessment Manual, (2) considering the development and implementation of a sustainable cycle of holistic assessment of USLOs, (3) considering the development of other uses of IDEA scores to broaden the use of the data and moving the survey to an electronic format; and (4) finalizing the proposed data dialogue process to close the assessment loop. It is recommended that the AC complete this work by the end of the 2012-2013 academic year for implementation in the 2013-2014 academic year where appropriate.

4) The AC and the General Education Committee should discuss the assessment of lower division General Education courses and the Focus Series' courses as upper division General Education courses. It is suggested that this might be an initial step into the holistic assessment of USLOs, a second phase of institutional assessment.

5) The co-curricular departments should consider availing themselves of the TaskStream system where it might be appropriate and useful to generate USLO assessment data. These departments should also develop a systematic process for review of their PSLO data and seek the OIE’s help in that regard.

6) The OIE site called “Institutional Effectiveness/Assessment” on the FPU Intranet contains institutional data sets in an easy to access place. This is very helpful to the university community. It is suggested that the OIE facilitate a faculty dialogue around these data on a biennial basis.

7) FPU seniors no longer take the CIRP College Senior Survey (CSS) [an exit survey] that connects academic, civic, and diversity outcomes with a comprehensive set of college experiences to measure the impact of college. Together with the CIRP Freshman Survey, the CSS provides longitudinal data on students’ cognitive and affective development during college. It is recommended that the AC consider the value of this survey to overall institutional assessment and suggest its administration again.

8) The OIE created the Campus Cruiser TaskStream homepage with a variety of training materials available for faculty and students. This central location for TaskStream is very helpful to the university community. The OIE should continue to develop and provide training materials as needed.

9) The Deans should encourage the systematic review of program course syllabi, including signature assignments and their rubrics by program directors, prior to the syllabus audit by their offices.

10) The OIE has created a Program Review workspace within the TaskStream system. It should conduct an annual faculty professional development training on the workspace for those programs conducting reviews in a given calendar year.

THEMATIC ESSAY II

ASPECTS OF DIVERSITY

FPU’s main campus and its Regional Centers are situated within a region characterized by a rich diversity of ethnic groups, socio-economic statuses, cultural and religious affiliations, and educational backgrounds. The university has grown in its commitment to be positioned to serve the full range of diversity these contexts present. As a result, FPU has been honored with HSI status. [CFR: 1.5]

The institution affirmed its commitment to diversity in the 2006 Strategic Plan (Attachment SE3: 2006 Strategic Plan). Goal Two indicates that the university purposes to “recruit and equip a diverse community of faculty, staff, students and administrators” through four strategies: (1) develop opportunities for faculty and staff that foster intercultural competencies and understanding; (2) develop diverse student leadership teams that provide education and service to various institutional constituencies; (3) develop educational opportunities for students that foster intercultural competencies; and (4) recruit and retain a diverse faculty and staff. In the WASC November 1, 2007 progress report, the institution established aggressive diversity initiatives and goals to meet this strategic goal. Unfortunately, a number of issues have prevented it from bringing them to fruition, including the departure of the university’s diversity officer; the subsequent delay in developing a comprehensive diversity plan, shared definition, or vision of diversity; and the financial challenge associated with the ending of the Irvine Grant that provided direct funds for the work of diversity for a season of the university’s life. However, to help balance the formal lack of a diversity officer, FPU appointed a faculty member whose responsibility is to work directly with the Provost on diversity-related matters.

With the installation of Dr. Pete C. Menjares as the institution’s eleventh president, the Diversity Advisory
Committee (DAC) reports directly to the president under the new revised governance structure. His appointment was also highly anticipated because he is widely acclaimed within the CCC&U community as a visionary, spokesperson, and campus consultant in issues related to diversity. Dr. Menjares’ hiring makes FPU only the second of 116 CCC&U member schools to appoint a minority candidate to the office of president. Dr. Menjares has expressed a commitment to bring his substantial background and expertise to bear on the work of diversity at FPU. [CFRs: 1.5, 1.9, 2.12, 2.13]

PROCESSES THAT DIRECT ASPECTS OF DIVERSITY IN RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION EFFORTS

Question 5: What are the processes in place that direct the university’s efforts in recruitment and retention of administration, faculty, staff, and students of diverse backgrounds?

FPU’s administration, faculty, and staff recognize and utilize consistent processes. These processes include: recruitment and retention activities, diverse staff hired to coordinate them, and the recruitment and retention strategies used to secure and retain diverse employees. [CFRs: 1.5, 3.10]

Student Recruitment Activities

The TUG Enrollment division has an Undergraduate Admissions Counselor for Diversity and Outreach, three full-time Spanish-speaking admissions counselors, and several bi-lingual student workers, including one who speaks Hmong. Counselors trained in financial aid lead college preparation presentations in Spanish at the Tulare County and Fresno County College Nights and at the Fresno County College Fair. The department publishes a Spanish newspaper for parents, recruits first-generation Hispanic students through e-mail outreach on Zinch.com, offers the STEM program to first-generation Hispanic students, and provides Spanish interpreters for parents during annual admission events. The department participates in several community and professional organizations including the Association of Mexican Educators (AMAE) Conference, the Nuevo Futuro College Fair for Hispanic students, the National Hispanic college fairs, and the Youth Conference for Hispanic Mennonite Churches. The DC and GRAD level counselors also strive to recruit and admit diverse student populations by utilizing student demographic trend data to assess how best to target potential students. Student demographic data over the past three years indicate that Hispanic and Latino students make up approximately 40% of the DC and 30% of the GRAD student populations. These demographic trends inform the advertising medium and positioning. Hispanic and Latino students have been specifically selected to provide testimonials for use in advertising; their voices and images have been specifically featured in Hispanic radio spots and print ads. Approximately 35-40% of all adult student advertising and recruitment materials feature people of Hispanic and Latino decent. Our advertising images proportionally reflect student ethnic diversity. [CFRs: 1.5, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14]

In an effort to serve their diverse populations, the Regional Centers have been intentional about employing staff members who reflect the diversity of their contexts. Visalia Center bi-lingual employees provide enrollment and admissions information in Spanish. Bakersfield Center’s staff includes Caucasian, Hispanic, African American, and Filipino members. North Fresno Center staff includes Caucasian, Asian, and Hispanic members. Program Representatives at the Regional Centers visit local community colleges to meet diverse student populations there. Regional Center staff members also participate regularly in a range of community groups, which enables ties with diverse communities to be fostered. Materials also are distributed to the Hispanic and Latino Chambers of Commerce in each region, as well as additional niche groups that focus on people of Hispanic/Latino decent. The Fresno Pacific Biblical Seminary admissions department has developed sponsorships and scholarships for Hispanic students and is currently creating additional scholarships for international students and students from diverse backgrounds. Within the seminary admissions office, Hispanic staff members make up 60% of the part-time staff. [CFR: 3.1]

The International Programs and Services Office (IPSO) seeks to recruit international students to FPU to study in the Intensive English Language Program (IELP), TUG, and GRAD programs. The IPSO Director speaks French, Kituba, and Lingala; other staff and recruiters speak French, Spanish, Russian, Romanian, and Mandarin. IPSO also utilizes FPU faculty and alumni travelling abroad to recruit students by providing brochures and information packets to prospective students living abroad and to Education USA centers. The IPSO provides recruitment materials in several languages, strategically advertises and communicates with students through email, Skype, Facebook, Viber, and QQ, and provides an online IELP application and handbook (Attachment C1: IELP Student Handbook) through the IPSO website. Students can also find brochures for TUG programs and IELP on the IPSO website in Chinese, Russian, Thai, and Arabic; IPSO is in the process of adding French and Spanish translations. IPSO recently integrated its Undergraduate Admissions website with the American Undergraduate Admissions website, Experiencefpu.com. Lastly, IPSO utilizes Zinch.com, a website in China, to recruit Chinese students, and Salesforce to centralize efforts and communicate more effectively. Successful enrollment of international students is directly correlated with the increase in funds for staffing over these past several years (Attachment C2: New & Continuing International Enrollments). [CFRs: 1.5, 3.6]
Student Retention

The university also has made a number of provisions designed to encourage the retention of students of diverse backgrounds. With the growing number of first generation students on campus, the Student Life division led the development of the course CP-152, College Success and Transition, which addresses the needs of all students, with a specific emphasis on mentor-mentee relationships that has proven to be critical in retention of these students, and CLASS which was mentioned earlier and which is geared for diverse students. Another significant retention effort, begun in 2011 with funding from a five-year Title V grant, is FPU’s STEM program. The STEM Learning Community prepares students for successful entry into careers related to math, science, and technology. It is specifically for Hispanic students or those who demonstrate financial need, as well as for those who are the first in their family to go to college. Working in conjunction with the English Department and the Dean of DC, the Regional Centers offer writing tutors on site to assist students who are challenged with writing in English. [CFRs: 1.5, 2.12, 3.6]

The IPSO has developed a number of approaches to fostering success and retention among international students. It equips international students with the tools and resources necessary to study at FPU. Orientation provides international students with a handbook which includes information on how to adapt to life in the United States/Fresno, overcoming culture shock, immigration information and advice on how to stay in status, life at FPU, health information etc. (Attachment C3: International Student Handbook). Students are also introduced to individuals such as mentors, professors, and service office personnel on campus; the relationships fostered assist in retention of these students. The IPSO also helps international students adjust to life on campus by reviewing the cultural, educational, social, and emotional information available to them. It provides students with off-campus services such as Social Security, Bank accounts, immunization information, the purchasing of cell phones, laptops, groceries, and bedding. Finally, it also helps international students remain in status and offers regular visa advising updates. [CFR: 2.13]

The ASC also works with students under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 2008 to ensure that those with unique needs have equal access to all educational experiences which assists in retention efforts. Disabilities take diverse forms, including physical and sensory disability; learning disability (including Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: ADHD); mental health and emotional disability; and chronic health disability. Physical accommodations in classroom and lab space, modifications of classroom presentations, and modifications in testing and course requirements are all ways to provide access to students with disabilities. Assistive technology is also available on all FPU campuses. [CFR: 2.13]

Faculty, Staff, and Administration Recruitment and Retention

While modest strides have been made, FPU should increase its commitment to diversity in faculty and staff; this continues to be an area requiring further attention. FPU has demonstrated limited efforts to recruit faculty of diverse backgrounds. As faculty search committees commence their work, they are provided a list of potential periodicals and websites where positions might be posted, including HispanicOutlook.com, the Asian American Psychological Association, the Association of Black Psychologists, and National Latina/o Psychological Association, as well as regional resources like the Bakersfield Californian and the Visalia Chamber of Commerce. Despite this, the university has not adopted consistent recruitment protocols to assure that faculty openings are posted in venues that strategically appeal to applicants of diverse backgrounds. [CFRs: 1.5, 3.1]

Intentionality in hiring diverse staff is seen in two areas. The OSF has been intentional in cultivating gender and ethnic diversity in its hiring practices. Current employees include an African-American male, three Hispanic women, and one Caucasian male. Athletics staff employment has been both informal as well as intentional in attempts to build ethnic diversity and gender equity. Recent hiring has reflected an emphasis on gender rather than ethnicity. Both the women’s volleyball and basketball programs now have female head coaches. All female teams, by department policy must have at least one female on the coaching staff. Men’s soccer and men’s and women’s tennis each have Hispanic male head coaches. [CFRs: 1.5, 3.1]

Recommendations of ways in which FPU might strengthen its capacity in the recruitment of faculty, staff, and administration of diverse backgrounds include (1) developing standardized approaches to recruitment, (2) providing access to, and awareness of, appropriate resources to aid in minority recruitment, (3) making the budgetary commitment necessary to enlarge the university’s efforts in this area, (4) developing ways of educating and informing those making hiring decision on issues of diversity, (5) exploring how issues of diversity can be intentionally integrated into new employee orientation, and 6) increased awareness of ensuring that diverse persons serve on search committees. [CFRs: 1.5, 3.6, 3.8, 4.2]

ASPECTS OF DIVERSITY IN CURRICULAR AND CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAMMING

Question 6: How is diversity defined and integrated into the curricula and co-curricular programs across the university?

Over the years, FPU faculty, staff, and students have integrated effective diversity strategies into many
programs and services to provide an excellent educational experience.

Curricular Definition and Integration

The university’s schools and programs have made strides to address issues of diversity. Some of these efforts have been informed by a commitment to the value of diversity, while others have also been influenced by professional credentialing or accreditation standards within specific fields. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7]

The foundation of the TUG curriculum is provided through the General Education (GE) program; two of its PSLOs address concerns related to diversity. The first is PSLO #2: Students will demonstrate comprehension of their own and other people’s stories in relation to personal, cultural and historical contexts, which is largely embedded in the Jesus and the Christian Community course, the Civilizations series, and in the Focus Series. It is also part of the Modes of Inquiry breadth course offerings insofar as those courses help students encounter diverse ways of thinking and living. The second is PSLO #8: Students will demonstrate competency in multi-lingual communication. This PSLO, embedded in the foreign language requirement, is one way of encountering peoples and cultures that use a language other than one’s own native language. In addition to these two PSLOs directly related to cultural diversity, there is a diversity of disciplines and methodologies that students encounter in the course of their General Education experience. For example, diversity of communication is found in PSLOs #4-8 (oral, written, mediated, quantitative, and multi-lingual). In the college preparation course CP-152, three of 15 class sessions directly focus on defining, valuing, and understanding diversity. This course, and its place within the curriculum, is currently under review as part of a larger process devoted to reviewing the First Year Experience. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.2]

Beyond this, some of the academic units on campus have done an effective job arriving at a shared framework for understanding diversity. For example, the School of HRSS’s approach to diversity is being guided by the following affirmation: HRSS seeks to empower others to speak from within their ethnic culture and to value their ethnic heritage. Ethnic and religious issues would then be afforded a privileged status in the learning community, as significant precursors to learning. Given the experiences of Guatemalan Indians, Iraqi Sunnis, Tibetan Buddhists, Ukrainian Catholics, Ethiopian Christians and other persecuted minority ethnic and religious groups around the world, HRSS advocates for the voiceless and recognizes the gifts they possess (adapted from Dueck & Reimer, 2009: pp. 73-74). [CFRs: 1.5, 2.2a, 2.2b]

Other schools have integrated diversity related themes into their curricula. Several FPU Biblical Seminary faculty members use authors from diverse ecclesial, ethnic, and gender backgrounds. Some classes, like Global Christian Theologies and Person and Family Culture, explicitly invite students to focus upon various aspects of diversity. All seminary students are required to participate in a series of courses entitled Cross-Cultural Encounter/Cross-Cultural Counseling. These courses focus on exposure to diverse cultural settings in Los Angeles, Fresno, and International settings (e.g., Honduras, India, and Guatemala) and help students to develop cultural awareness and competency. The seminary is also in the process of becoming a sponsoring institution for the Hispanic Summer Program, a theological summer session for students interested in Hispanic Theology taught by leading Hispanic theologians. The credential programs offered by the School of Education follow the professional accreditor’s standards in issues related to diversity. The School of Education works with these guidelines to ensure members of its faculty are knowledgeable concerning these topics and its students demonstrate proficiency in their understanding of same. Furthermore, all programs continually review and update their program curriculum to comply with diversity requirements. Diversity is addressed in virtually all courses in the School of Business. Coursework includes the study of societal norms, customs, family relationships, ethical issues, humanitarian concerns, integration, culture clash, and more, all as it relates to business. The School of Business presents numerous philosophical approaches and theories for students to conceptualize and conceive a working definition of diversity informed by The FPU Idea. Collegiality, academic community activities, pedagogy dialogues, research innovations, and idea debates are encouraged for all faculty members in order to appreciate and strengthen the diversity of an academic community. [CFRs: 1.5, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.7]

Finally, the IPSO also plays a key role in promoting diversity as a part of the university curricular experience by helping to link FPU students to information on opportunities to study abroad (Attachment C4: Open Doors: Study Abroad). Most recently, in partnership with Student’s International, FPU has begun its own semester-long program in Costa Rica. This has provided FPU students with a cost effective way to study abroad while being registered and earning credits at FPU. [CFRs: 1.5, 1.7]

Co-Curricular Definition and Integration

FPU has made progress in the appreciation of culture, language, and diversity of Christian faith through the efforts of the OSF, which has intentionally made diversity one of its PSLOs. The OSF, together with the DSL, offers a range of co-curricular activities designed to serve FPU’s diverse student population and to create opportunities for students to encounter diversity in a variety of ways (Refer to Thematic Essay 1). In response to the needs of commuters and an increase of transfers, the Transfer Club
and Commuter Council were developed. The IPSO also serves domestic and international students through a variety of co-curricular activities. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.5]

One co-curricular area in which diversity has been an intentional focus is Athletics. In July 2011, FPU was accepted into the membership process of the NCAA Division II. The recent transition to the NCAA has brought with it significant changes for the ATH, including the expectation for a Strategic Plan for Athletics, now revised (Attachment C5: Strategic Plan for Athletics 2013-2018), the FPU Athletics Diversity Plan (Attachment C6: FPU Athletics Diversity Plan 2012-2017), and the FPU Athletics Gender Equity Plan (Attachment C7: FPU Athletics Gender Equity Plan 2012-2013). Per NCAA expectations, the FPU Athletics Diversity and Gender Equity Plans are being operationalized effective in the fall 2012 semester. The NCAA-mandated Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) was formed to reflect diversity and gender. SAAC representation by gender is guaranteed with ethnic diversity being intentional. SAAC and the ATH department has been extremely active in the southeast Fresno area with community engagement and service projects designed to create awareness and appreciation for all types of diversity. During the academic year 2011-12, FPU engaged GoodSports, LLC to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of institutional compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972. In its final report, GoodSports determined that FPU Athletics is currently Title IX compliant. It was, however, noted that this compliance would become increasingly tenuous unless a female sport is added in the near future. FPU must remain committed to providing athletics opportunities for women in compliance with Title IX while at the same time working to provide programs that reflect ethnic diversity and the growing male-female gender-ratio issue within the FPU student body. [CFR: 4.1]

**Aspects of Diversity, Institutional Assessment, and Use of Data**

There are a number of departments and schools that have utilized data both to achieve and assess diversity-related goals. For example, the DSL reviewed retention numbers to determine if student leader training opportunities related to diversity exist. The Enrollment division provided results from their enrollment census to various schools, departments, and offices to alert them of the needs of students from various population groups. These include the various needs of older adult populations (technology challenges), religious and non-religious affiliation (spiritual formation issues), and the military (sensitivity to FPU’s pacifist tradition). The Schools of Education and Natural Sciences used data to drive their decisions to establish the goal of improving Hispanic student access to, and success in, programs in their schools. Both used data readily available from the institution to apply for Title V grants. In each case, the grant writers from each school used data derived from student records to determine the underrepresentation and/or underperformance of the Hispanic population in their schools. This data was used apply for these grants. [CFR: 1.5]

The university has several tools at its disposal that assist in assessment of its diversity objectives. The Noel Levitz and HERI/CIRP surveys mentioned earlier are examples. The OIR generates a number of reports disaggregated by ethnicity and gender. Datatel® – the campus management software systems – identifies each student by various categories (gender, ethnicity, age, etc.) and can generate disaggregated reports on student qualification for admission, academic achievement, and other forms of analysis based on aspects of diversity. The TaskStream system is able to disaggregate data by gender and ethnicity. [CFR: 4.5]

FPU does not lack institutional awareness or inclination to address aspects of diversity. From The FPU Idea and its existing Strategic Plan, the institution makes clear its commitment to be inclusive and demonstrates this commitment in many formal and countless informal ways.

**Recommendations Related To Diversity**

1) The university should appoint a Diversity Officer to champion issues of diversity across the institution and clarify the role of the Diversity Advisory Committee.
2) The university community should develop a shared definition of diversity, consistent with The FPU Idea and informed by the university’s Christian commitments.
3) The university should develop, adopt, and implement a comprehensive diversity plan. The OIE should assist in the development of a means to assess the diversity plan.
4) There should be a dedicated line item affirming the work of diversity as a budgetary priority within the university.
5) The university should develop consistent recruitment and retention practices, undergirded by necessary budgetary resources, to strengthen and stabilize the diversity of faculty, staff, and administration.
6) The Undergraduate Academic Committee (UAC), the Degree Completion Academic Committee (DCAC), and the Graduate Academic Committee (GAC) should ensure greater integration of diversity related content across the university’s curricula.
7) The university should commit to increased resourcing of the university’s disability services.
8) HR guidelines related to diversity should be formalized and operationalized.
THEMATIC ESSAY III
RESOURCES AND FINANCIAL STABILITY

DEFINING STRUCTURES, PROCESSES, AND RESOURCES

Question 7: What are the structures, processes, and resources (human, physical, financial, technological, governance, and planning) that define and support student achievement, strategic assessment, and aspects of diversity?

Over the last decade, FPU has created new infrastructure to support outcomes of student learning and has expanded and reconstituted existing programs, facilities, and services. Infrastructure is used here in an inclusive sense to indicate physical structures and the campus environment, support staff, technological and material resources for learning, and policies and procedures that guide the efforts of the university in these areas. Evidence presented in this essay affirms the capacity of the university to support student engagement in learning, of service units to assess the needs of students and report them productively, and of the university to gather and process data regarding effectiveness strategies employed by the university in regards to resources and financial stability.

Throughout the preparation for the CPR, study methods were developed to assist the institution in assessing its capacity to achieve and sustain core purposes and educational effectiveness. Within the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity, the elements of human resources, physical resources, fiscal resources, technological resources, organization and governance structures, and institutional planning inform this essay. [CFRs: 3.1-3.11]

Human Resources: Faculty and Staff

FPU’s dedicated and qualified faculty and staff are central to the university’s ability to support student learning and achievement, strategic assessment, and aspects of diversity.

Faculty

Faculty ensures academic quality and is central to the educational effectiveness of the university. Faculty roles and responsibilities are described in the Faculty Handbook and its supplemental Part 2. Faculty has the responsibility for the curriculum and student learning in their areas of expertise. [CFRs: 2.4, 2.6, 3.8, 3.9]

In the 2010-11 academic year, the administration and faculty developed, and the Board of Trustees approved, a system of rank for the faculty (Attachment D1: Faculty Rank and Salary Placement Policy). The primary goal was to develop and reward a culture of scholarship among the faculty. A task force was formed to develop policy for rank placement and evaluation. An iterative process was performed through the late fall 2010 and spring 2012 between the Task Force, Personnel Committee, the President’s Cabinet, and the Faculty Senate, along with updates to the Board of Trustees. This included the definition of what would be constituted as scholarship so as to reflect values specific to FPU. According to the WASC March 17, 2008 Letter, these have been the first steps in developing “explicit understanding of how scholarship, teaching and community service are valued and weighed in terms of evaluating faculty for promotion.” Adopting faculty rank has been a momentous shift for the faculty in light of its history and values, and was an important step in “developing expectations of scholarship, community service, and the culture of research typical of a university,” as identified in the same letter. It is still too early to see what the scholarly fruit will be, though the faculty bookshelf in the President’s suite now has more than sixty volumes, but there is no doubt that it will have a significant impact on both the amount and level of scholarship and research in the future. For detailed information on faculty rank, continuing status, professional development, and the evaluation process, (Attachments: D2: Faculty Handbook: Chapters 4 and 6, and their expansion in Attachment D3: Supplemental Part 2). [CFR: 2.8]

A few other actions have helped spur scholarship. The implementation of a Provost Grant for Research in 2008 has helped stimulate research projects. Similarly, after being repealed in 2008-2009 during the recession and the following year (2009-2010), funds for faculty development have been restored above their previous levels. More recently, an increase in funding (approximately 50% over the prior year’s budget line) has been allocated to provide additional funding for faculty who engage in research and scholarship activities, such as those faculty members who present papers at academic conferences. This has been a positive step in encouraging scholarship. Evidence that the culture of scholarship is becoming acculturated is the increased number of faculty who are using the professional development funding. [CFRs: 2.8, 2.9, 3.4]

Posting of positions and hiring procedures have been regularized, with emphasis on terminal degrees, record or promise of scholarly achievement, and specialized training. Prior to 2012, faculty development had been a joint effort of the Deans and Provost, with no particular assignment
for oversight. This year, an additional step was made in offering a partial assignment to one of the deans for work particularly with new and early career professors.

**Staff**

FPU has dedicated staff members who support the faculty and administration and who contribute to the educational effectiveness of the university. The university recognizes that there is some disparity within staff compensation that is under review by the HR department. Currently, staff members receive periodic salary increases and promotions occur periodically; yet, among these employees, the perception is that they do not occur often enough. Over a significant period of time, some support staff members may receive a slightly higher designation, referred to as an in-range progression, if their performance warrants such a change. These in-range progressions are distinct from the periodic salary increases that the class receives. Reclassifications may occur pursuant to a desk audit that reveals that the staff member is performing substantially different duties than those identified in his or her position description. New assignments or transfers to different departments are periodically available, and may include up to a 5% increase for the staff person. Generally, opportunities for advancement are enhanced when employees obtain additional skills, training, or education and then apply for higher positions. [CFR: 3.1]

There was an impact on staff positions as the university weathered the effects of a down-turned economy and the drop in enrollments during 2008-09. Examples include a decrease in FTE from five to two in the Office of Spiritual Formation and from 13.5 to 8 in Student Life, along with lesser reductions in Advancement and Student Services offices. The university has been strategically resolving these impacts to bring staffing up to a level that is in alignment with students served. [CFR: 3.1]

**Human Resources Department**

The Human Resources (HR) department is currently in the midst of an extended period of transition. Over the last few years, the department has been hampered by inadequate staffing, which has permitted its staff to do just the minimum to provide information and onboarding services needed in support of FPU’s growth. Fortunately, this has been changing rapidly in the last year. In the spring of 2012, a new Executive Director of Human Resources was hired. In the summer and fall of 2012, three additional staff were added in the department. [CFR: 3.1]

The department is in the process of better aligning FPU’s personnel policies and practices with the university’s mission and has undertaken an evaluation of them. Currently, HR provides some training and professional development opportunities that help staff improve skills and prepare to make beneficial transitions. Examples include training on sexual harassment and FERPA regulations. Based on a successful pilot completed in fall 2012, HR is implementing in spring 2013 the ConnectionsNow! customer service training university-wide for new hires. [CFRs: 3.1, 3.4]

**Physical Resources**

Physical space at FPU has increased substantially over the past decade, with addition of the Seminary buildings and grounds to the footprint of the main campus and in the additional space acquired through the Regional Centers. Currently, the main campus consists of 386,081 square feet of space and 1,072 rooms, including 41 classrooms, 13 laboratories (science and computer), 15 study areas, 18 conference rooms, 352 residential units, 309 offices, and 281 general use and support rooms (Attachment D4: Main Campus Map). [CFRs: 3.1, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1]

In the Regional Centers, there has been substantial growth in physical space to accommodate students and faculty. The Bakersfield Regional Center is 22,012 square feet with 13 classrooms and 12 offices. The Visalia Regional Center is 31,685 square feet with 22 classrooms and 18 offices. The Merced Regional Center is 4,803 square feet with four classrooms and four offices. The North Fresno Regional Center has been expanded twice to a total of 18 classrooms and 23 offices, with a total space of 23,366 square feet.

While the university’s Campus Master Plan (Attachment D5: Master Plan), developed in November 2007, laid-out an aggressive capital improvements program (i.e. residence hall, performing arts center, library, and completion of the athletic complex), the economic downturn combined with a corresponding reduction in capital project donations dictated that the university reposition itself by taking a more fiscally conservative approach towards its implementation. Since that time, and continuing today, the university has concentrated on the implementation of goals and strategies as set forth in the university’s 2006 Strategic Plan, including improving existing facilities such as classrooms, housing, and grounds; expanding the number and size of the regional centers; acquiring properties needed for future expansion; and completing the outdoor athletic complex. [CFRs: 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.6]

Examples of improvements and the acquisition of properties and facilities that have taken place in support of the 2006 Strategic Plan and that were done to provide for the growth that occurred include:

- Campus-wide improvement of classrooms and housing, including remodeling, new furnishings and multi-media equipment, such as from 2009-2011 replacement of mattresses, lounge, game room, and kitchen furniture throughout the main campus and seminary residence halls. Renovation of all classrooms was completed in 2011 and 2012, including upgrades to electronic equipment.
Remodel of existing space into a student lounge/study area and the creation of two additional study areas on campus (completed in November 2012).

Major remodel and expansion of an outdated weight training center into a state-of-the-art Fitness Center for both athletes and the general student body (scheduled to open January 2013).

Installation in 2012 of a larger capacity, more efficient chiller at the Central Plant to better meet the cooling needs of the campus thus enhancing the learning experience.

Acquisition of four additional houses, resulting in the University owning 26 of the 30 properties in the area designated for future capital expansion, and of five houses and 12 condominiums within close walking distance of the main campus to meet projected student housing needs.

Construction of Phases I and II of the baseball complex including the covered baseball training facility, and completion of Phase II improvements to the soccer/track stadium (i.e. field lighting, terraced-berm seating, and parking lot).

Currently, excellent space is available for all programs hosted in the Regional Centers; classrooms on the main campus are in excellent condition and appreciated by both faculty and students. Residences on the main campus and in newly acquired properties are also in good condition. A review of all houses on adjacent streets is underway to determine what will be needed to bring them up to standards set forth in the policy adopted by the President’s Cabinet in October 2012 (Attachment D6: Housing Policy Statement). The most pressing need is office space on the main campus for administrative offices. A campus-wide study of main campus facilities is underway to allot space more efficiently.

**Financial Resources**

With the reorganization of the university into four schools and the leasing and expansion of new Regional Centers from 2005-07, the university’s budget was reorganized and budgetary decisions were centralized under the President, Provost, and CFO. Budget priorities were shifted to develop regional center marketing and enrollment growth, as well as to cover costs, and athletic teams were added (Swimming in 2008 and Baseball in 2009) together with their additional expenses. The purpose of these moves were to prioritize growth, stabilize the financial model of the institution by developing new programs offered in regional centers, to develop Fresno Pacific as a regional, Master’s level university, as well as to raise the profile of the university in the region. Some felt that academic programs were not given high enough priority, and that budgetary decision-making was not transparent enough. The regional center expansions and growth of the DC program in particular were intended to assist in securing a more sound fiscal foundation for the university, and they have proven this strategy to be effective (Attachment D7: Regional Center Net Report). [CFRs: 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7]

When the financial crisis hit in 2008-09, it was felt immediately in the fall of 2008 and through the spring of 2009 with the loss of about 300 students compared to optimistic budget projections (actual enrollment remained even). By January 2009, a plan was in place to cut expenses, reduce staff and faculty through attrition and layoffs by 10%, sell unused property, and rebalance the budget. At same time, marketing and enrollment were preserved from any cuts and quickly expanded with the goal of filling the regional centers to cover the increased lease costs, as well as to restore the university to a sound financial foundation. In the budget year 2009-10, the process of establishing revenue budgets based on enrollments was revised to match best practices in the enrollment profession (Attachment D8: Narrative of CFO and VP Enrollment from Merced Sub Change). Enrollment grew by 50% over three years from fall 2008 to fall 2011, with the greatest growth in the DC programs, but also with substantial growth in the main campus TG program. FPU responded to the crisis sooner than most institutions, and our former president was consulted by a number of other institutions as they attempted to re-establish their financial footing in the next two years.

During the crisis, the Board of Trustees mandated detailed plans from the administration, regular reporting, and the establishment of a reserve to be funded through budget surpluses by 2015 (Attachment D9: Board of Trustees Mandate). In the spring of 2009, the Board also mandated that an annual reserve of 1.5% of unrestricted revenue would be accumulated to protect against future economic difficulties. The university enjoyed annual surpluses due to careful budgeting and restrictions on expansion of fixed expenses. As of April 30, 2012, the reserve is in the amount of $4,072,908, the accumulation of four years reserves mandated by the Board. Currently, the reserves are required to be about $2,582,807. As of April 30, 2012, the reserve was funded two years ahead of its requirement. The Board has since authorized use of some of the excess reserve to fund capital projects, including purchase of properties for student housing, campus renovation, and other campus maintenance projects (Attachment D10: FPU Ratios 2012 and Reserve Tracking Report). [CFRs: 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3]
positions were filled, plus replacements for retirements or resignations. Goals for faculty student ratios and for teaching by regular faculty as compared to adjunct are being revised by the deans and Provost in order to ensure both that teaching loads are covered adequately, and also that we do not over-staff some areas. Nonetheless, some faculty members consistently cover too many overload units and complain, justifiably, of overwork. Efforts by the deans to develop well trained adjunct instructors, plus the hiring of new professors, are now relieving some of the overload and will continue to provide relief in the coming years. Generally, though, staff and administrative workloads continue to be overly heavy, both in the upper administration as well as in support areas.

Current budgets are adequate in most cases, but renewal and capital expenses, as well as resources for major maintenance projects have been taken from reserves built in excess of the required amounts, with Board of Trustees approval. Projects with this kind of funding include renovation of residence halls, purchase of houses and duplexes for student housing, rebuilding of the central plant and chiller units, and capital expenses for information technology. Some offices which suffered more severe cuts have added staff, particularly the OSF and HR. The university’s technology system functions well, now wireless throughout the main campus and regional centers, and new cataloging and research systems have been added to the Hiebert Library, providing easier and greater access to electronic resources throughout the university student and faculty populations. An allotment of $100,000 for faculty development was established for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years, but was cut by more than 50% for the 2012-13 year and will need to be restored (expenses have not been cut for fiscal year 2013, drawing now on funds restricted for faculty development). A new budgeting policy and procedure was prepared by the administration in the fall of 2012 and reviewed by the Budget Advisory Committee and is currently being implemented (Attachment D11: 2013-2014 Budget Process).

The Building on Excellence capital campaign is partially funded, and many have delayed pledge payments. Several large potential donors ($5 million plus) have delayed making commitments toward the goal of $34 million through the recession. Thus, badly needed facilities for music and theater, as well as an education building, remain on the drawing board until final funding becomes available. Fortunately, loyal supporters of the university continued to give during the downturn and annual fund giving has remained stable (Attachments: D12: Financial Table-Building on Excellence; D13: Building on Excellence Campaign Summary).

The financial data provided in the tables accompanying this CPR reveal growth in the annual current fund budget from total revenues of $36,686,253 in fiscal year 2009 to over $52 million in fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Net assets increased by $6,280,790 and $2,084,680 for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 respectively. The large increase in 2011 was partially due to the merger of the Seminary with the University (approximately $3.2 million). Each fiscal year has resulted in a positive balance and audits for all of these years have been clean, the result of hard work and some sacrifice by the entire faculty and staff of the university.

A contributing factor to the increasing financial stability of the university was refinancing of the university’s debt. In April 2011, the university opened a $15,000,000 reducing line of credit with interest at one-month LIBOR plus 1.75%. Each year, the maximum principal that could be outstanding under this obligation is reduced by $600,000. In May 2011, this line of credit together with accumulated cash, was used to pay then outstanding long-term debt. As a result of this refinancing, together with monthly payments on the new obligation, long-term debt of the university was reduced by $7,567,000 as of April 30, 2012 compared to April 30, 2011. These changes in debt structure are reflected in the required financial data table submitted with this report.

With current (FY2013) tight budgets due to softening enrollments in DC and continuing declines in continuing education (despite growth among TUG and stability in GRAD programs), the second half of the salary step increases linked to the implementation of faculty rank have to date been delayed. The first half resulted in an average 6% salary increase for ranked faculty in fiscal year 2012 (beginning August 2011). This partially offset years in which increases in salaries were not awarded. The second half of the planned salary increase is still to be awarded as two step increases for ranked faculty were planned to occur within the two following fiscal years after the process was first implemented. This delay has not been greeted with enthusiasm by the faculty who expressed their disappointment through official action of the new Faculty Senate in spring 2012 (Attachment D14: Senate Letter to Administration/Board, April 2012). Step increases for promotions and the new merit increases intended for implementation in spring 2013 are similarly delayed, with hopes of awarding with the next step increase. We clearly have work to do in bringing revenue and expenses into harmony and covering the costs associated with development of faculty and as a mediumsized Master’s level regional university that encourages the faculty in scholarship characteristic of such a university.

In light of this, the university has invested in institutional research personnel to stabilize reporting and to deepen analysis of data. Miscoding in IPEDs reporting has made basic meaningful comparison with peer groups difficult (Attachment D15: Comparative Data Sheets-IPEDS). This has now been corrected (Attachment D16: FPU Correction of IPEDS Reporting). The university’s auditors report...
sound financial ratios (Attachment D17: Financial Data Table) and Board-mandated reserves are ahead of schedule as noted above. Because of limited information and financial analysis of revenue and costs of various programs of the university to the broader university community, it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of budgeted priorities in carrying out the university's educational mission, and its goal of the continued development of an academic culture appropriate to a regional Master's institution. The first tasks of the new CFO must be to establish long range budgets, to provide analysis of costs and efficiencies of programs, and trajectory of expenses as indicative of priorities over time. A further step must be to ensure that academic plans are fully integrated into the budgeting process as we move beyond the recession. [CFR: 3.5]

Technology Resources

A key element in student achievement and strategic assessment is technology, which has undergone a significant transformation in the past ten years. Information Services (IS) is primarily a services department that seeks to respond to the technological needs of the university. IS generally seeks to follow industry trends for maintenance and replacement of equipment. Through careful use of available resources, IS has managed to roll out and support a wide variety of hardware and software offerings that support instructional aims, administrative functions, and physical plant operations. Examples include Moodle (learning management system platform), TaskStream (assessment initiative), Campus Cruiser (student/faculty portal), Datatel (student information system), and Sales Force (student administrative system). Though expenses have grown each year, the IS line item is essentially earmarked for subscriptions (bandwidth, software), service contracts, and maintenance needs. [CFR: 3.7]

In the past five years, the number of computer-equipped classrooms was doubled as well as adding 100 machines for student use (Attachment D18: Computing and Information Systems Table). In this same period, bandwidth has been upgraded from 10Mbps to the current 80Mbps. Within a few months, bandwidth will be increased to 200Mbps to further speed and expand potential for student achievement (Attachment D19: IT Data Comcast Agreement). An array of technological resources have been marshaled toward supporting student achievement and strategic assessment, including 92 multi-media-equipped classrooms, 19 video conferencing rooms, 25 student computer laboratories (yielding a 12 students: 1 computer ratio) across the university (Attachment D20: 2012 Multi Media-VCon-Lab Counts). [CFR: 3.7]

Feedback from students and faculty regarding the functioning of IS has noted general satisfaction and trends of improvement (Attachments: D21: Yearly Survey Comparisons-Faculty; D22: Yearly Survey Comparisons-Students). Responding to a need for greater support of students—particularly in the DC population—in using academic technology successfully, a 'Tech Tutors' program is being launched as a coordinated effort between IS and COL. IS has also made online training available via Atomic Learning tutorials that faculty and students can access as needed and these resources are being increasingly utilized (Attachments: D23: Atomic Learning Data Reports 2008; D24: 2009; D25: 2010; D26: 2011; D27: 2012). [CFR: 3.7]

IS has also been instrumental in implementing two major initiatives in the institution: one in the library and one in OIR. In a major improvement initiative implemented by Hiebert Library in 2011-12, the Encore search system replaced an antiquated online method to make searching of all library holdings accessible via one search field (Attachment D28: Library Narrative and Statistical Table). Additionally, IS is working with OIR in the design, development, and implementation of a data warehouse to house internal and external institutional data except for that housed in the TaskStream system. [CFR: 3.7]

Organizational Structure and Governance

Responsibility for university governance rests ultimately with an independent Board of Trustees which appoints and evaluates the President. The President has full-time responsibility for the university and is supported by a team of vice presidents, including the Vice President for Academic Affairs (the Provost), a Chief Financial Officer, and others, each with clear areas of responsibility as evidenced in the organizational chart. Senior leaders are highly qualified full-time administration. A shared governance system involves administrators, faculty, and staff in several university policy committees: the UAC, the DCAC, the GAC, the Enrollment Cabinet, and the Academic Cabinet. These are complemented by a Faculty Senate, the School Caucuses, and the Associated Students. The Faculty Senate and new governance policies balancing faculty responsibility for curriculum and academic personnel matters and administrative responsibility for the university as a whole was developed in the 2010-2011 academic year and approved by the Board of Trustees in June 2011. This included revision of membership guidelines and a change in voting rules in all academic committees as well as the Senate. The governance system, designed for broad consultation and collaboration, supports the institution’s educational objectives, reflects a commitment to participatory processes, and supports the university in moving more aggressively towards evidence driven decision-making. [CFRs: 1.3, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3]

The university's organization and culture are best characterized as decentralized, with such positive attributes as creativity, innovation, empowerment, and shared governance. At the same time, this decentralization
has the potential of allowing policies to fall between offices and responsibilities to blur. However, the Provost has taken steps to reorganize and realign administrative roles to reapporportion tasks, simplify reporting lines, and streamline decision-making. By realigning responsibilities, restoring vacant positions and upgrading others, the Provost has more effectively apportioned tasks and functions to meet the needs of the university (Attachments: D29: Provost Letter to Faculty Regarding Structural Changes and Appointments; D30: Academic Policy Decision Flow Chart).

For over ten years (2002-2012) D. Merrill Ewert was President of FPU, and he brought to the university a sense of identity, direction, and change. This was a coming-of-age as the university became aware of its potential. As the university's reputation as a first-class Christian university increased, so did student demand, and the university was consequently forced to modify its strategic plan as well as to refine its enrollment management policies. The campus needed to respond nimbly to the challenges confronting it, seeking ways to maintain high quality while still accommodating moderate growth. Thus the stage has been set for a new Administration to move the university beyond its earlier horizons and into a future shaped by its expanded role in the educational environment. Now a new president and new administrative officers are poised for future development of the university.

MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF STRUCTURES, PROCESSES, AND RESOURCES

Question 8: How can FPU ensure that its structures, processes, and resources (human, physical, financial, technological, governance, and planning) are maintained and enhanced to promote long-term sustainability and support to successful delivery of Student Learning Outcomes and the university’s mission?

To ensure that its structures, processes, and resources are maintained and enhanced, FPU is in the process of developing a new Strategic Plan that will be dependent upon effective strategy execution at all levels of the university and in aligning effective and creative leadership, adequate resources, and appropriate accountability mechanisms. Continued stable and growing enrollment is also a key to long term stability. [CFRs: 4.1-4.8]

Institutional Planning

The university has conducted formalized planning for the past 40 years, demonstrating a commitment to improvement through planning informed by environmental scans, data collection, and periodic review and analysis by all stakeholders. FPU has recently embarked upon a re-examination of its 2006 Strategic Plan (which was updated in 2010) and is in development of a new Strategic Plan. This exercise is now engaging multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning, including faculty, staff, students, board members, alumni, donors, pastors of the Pacific District Conference of the Mennonite Brethren, and local businesses and community members (Attachments: D31: Strategic Plan Update; D32: Strategic Planning Announcement).

The strategic planning process has already begun and is being led by the President. A planning group of dedicated and capable individuals has been established and is meeting regularly. Data and feedback were initially gathered through short surveys and then broadened into face-to-face meetings with staff, individual departments, and committees. This phase will continue into January with open sessions where anyone has the opportunity to provide input to the process, and continued committee and individual meetings. The planning group will then begin formulating the plan by the end of January and through February. It is anticipated to be completed and presented to the Board of Trustees by March 1, 2013.

Enrollment

As an enrollment driven institution, FPU has developed a professionally functioning enrollment team to ensure that enough students enroll to support the faculty and administrative operations necessary for a university that achieves its mission and outcomes. And each student population must be ready for the level and difficulty of university work. The Board of Trustees approved enrollment goals in June 2008, after the appointment of a new Vice President for Enrollment Management, and created a standing Enrollment Committee (Attachment D33: Enrollment Goals Approved by Board-June 2008). The five year goal of 1250 traditional undergraduates was virtually met with 1225 in fall 2012. Diversity goals were surpassed, as were DC annual goals. GRAD goals need continued work, and perhaps more realistic revision (See Sample Enrollment Reports as evidence in the Introductory Essay in this CPR). [CFRs: 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.8]

The departments in each of the enrollment areas (TUG, DC, GRAD, Seminary, and the allied student service offices: Financial Aid, Student Accounts, and Registrar) have each preformed at remarkable levels. Even with the rapid of enrollment in each area, incoming preparation has remained stable while diversity has grown. Also each area has developed the technical tools necessary for achieving annual and long-term goals. In the TUG, area this has included an annual contract for enrollment management with Noel-Levitz and RuffaloCody; in all areas, the primary tool has been the use of the customer relations management system, SalesForce. And in addition regular marketing studies have been conducted through Stamats (university branding and Seminary), Noel-Levitz (undergraduate program needs analysis), and EduVentures (adult undergraduate, graduate, and

As in some other areas of the university, the next step will be to refine the systems created in the last five years for the achievement of the new strategic enrollment goals now being set. These in turn will need to be closely aligned with academic planning. In addition, leaders of the team are being sought for undergraduate admissions and a VP for Enrollment Management and Student Services. These efforts are now under the direction of Interim VPs for Enrollment and Student Services.

Commendations

In response to the economic downturn in 2008 and its direct effect on the institution, the university responded immediately to stabilize its programs, budgets, and personnel. In addition, new financial policies under Board of Trustees guidance were established to guard against future uncertainty. Strategic planning is in process, the campus is good condition, and academic and administrative leaders are rapidly moving forward with policies and practices needed for a growing and creative institution. IS is working to ensure its resources are being efficiently deployed and managed. Hiebert Library is keeping pace with the evolving nature of libraries as information portals (Attachment D37: Library Strategic Plan). The physical plant has seen major improvements. The OIR is building a data warehouse to provide for greater accuracy and ease of availability of information. A new Strategic Planning committee is actively working. Institutional capacities are in place to support the achievement of student learning outcomes. [CFRs: 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.10, 3.11]

Recommendations for Resources and Financial Stability

1) The Rank and Scholarship effort and the Staff classification and salary study will be completed according to plan.
2) Financial analysis of past efficiencies and priorities must be produced to help test and ensure that resources are deployed strategically for the achievement of the mission and student learning outcomes set by the university.
3) Long range budgets must be developed and linked to strategic, enrollment, academic, and financial plans.
4) Technology and other plant and capital renewal plans and budgets need to be more fully coordinated with academic and financial plans.
5) The Strategic Plan must be coordinated with financial, enrollment, academic, technology, and facilities planning.
6) Enrollment planning and recruitment should be continued in harmony with Strategic Plan goals and more fully integrated into academic and institutional planning.

From the three themes identified in the Institutional Proposal, the CPR now moves to three remaining essays: two essays based on the WASC required student outcome competencies – FPU has chosen Writing and Critical Thinking – and one thematic essay on the Rigor and Meaning of Degrees. These are followed by the integrative essay.

THEMATIC ESSAY IV

WRITING

History of Writing Initiatives since 2003 WASC Visit

During the last 10 years, the English Department has made only minor changes to the GE writing courses for TUG because assessment shows that they serve our students well. Incoming students take an English Placement Test (EPT). Based on their scores, they are registered into either COM-110AB (a year-long stretch course), COM-110 (the regular one-semester course), or COM-110H for honors students. [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 4.3, 4.7]

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the department did a self-study to determine if some students would benefit from a remedial course below the level of COM-110AB (Attachment E1: Data on Incoming Freshmen). After analyzing quantitative data on lowest-scoring students and qualitative data from interviews with them and their instructors, we concluded that those who failed or dropped out of COM-110AB were not struggling with the level of instruction but were not doing the work that was required, primarily due to lack of motivation. Since national studies continue to cast doubt on the usefulness of remedial coursework, we have continued to use our
stretch model. The most recent pre-test and post-test data shows that students in the stretch class raise their scores from 5.58/12 to 7.29/12 and increase the amount of writing from 3.13 pages to 5.04 pages (Attachment E2: EPT Pre- and Post-Test Comparisons).

In 2008, three years after the creation of the new SAT Writing test, the English department studied student scores and found a remarkably clear correlation between the SAT Writing and EPT. 98% of students who received at least 500 on the SAT Writing passed into COM-110. In 2009, the university started waiving the EPT for students with a 500 on that test and let them take a one-semester class, while still testing the other students to give them a second chance to demonstrate their writing skills. The English department has since added two new versions of COM-110 to meet diverse student needs. We offered the honors course COM-110H for the first time in fall 2008, when the University Scholars program was launched. In fall 2011, we began to offer COM-110AB sections designated for the students in our STEM grant program.

While the TUG courses have changed very little, the university has made enormous improvements in the area of DC. The minutes of the DC Program Committee and DCAC demonstrate how often writing issues have been on the agenda in the last few years (Attachments: E3: Writing Issues in DC Program Directors Meeting Minutes; E4: Writing Issues in DCAC Meeting Minutes). In 2003, the university offered few GE courses of any kind in DC, including writing courses. There was no writing placement test and no writing tutoring program. Students were expected to be proficient in writing and no resources were available to help them other than assistance from instructors and some options from the ASC on the main campus. The English Department was not involved in creating, revising, or overseeing the DC writing courses until 2009, when academic departments were given oversight of all courses in their areas. When that transition took place, there was one DC writing course available: COM-111 Academic Writing. Most instructors taught COM-111 as a basic writing course, with short personal or persuasive essays, but with little to no research required. The English Department recognized that the course was not comparable to the traditional course COM-110, which culminates in a 10-12 page research paper. Therefore, COM-111 was redesigned to focus on the process of creating a 10-12 page research paper in APA Style, which was made the standard style for DC in 2010 (Attachment E5: COM-111 Sample Syllabus). A second course was created, COM-109 Critical Thinking and Composition, to teach more basic writing skills and to meet the GE Critical Thinking requirement (Attachment E6: COM-109 Sample Syllabus). Meanwhile, the English Department Chair made sure that all instructors of writing courses were fully qualified. Currently, 71% of instructors have a BA in English and 58% have an MA in English. 96% have experience teaching English at another institution (Attachment E7: DC English Adjuncts).

In spring 2011, the English Department piloted an early placement test (EPT) for DC students, using the same test questions and format as the one for TUG (Attachment E8: DC EPT Grading Rubric). During 2011-12, students took the test during the first few weeks of their first cohort class and were given recommendations to take certain writing classes based on their scores. This was changed to provide earlier writing assessment in 2012-13. Incoming students are now required to take the test within their first six months. Those students whose scores indicate a need for further writing instruction are required to take their choice of one writing course in the first semester: COM-109, COM-111, or LANG-170 English for Academic Purposes. In fall 2011, the English Department launched a writing tutoring program (Attachment E9: DC Tutoring Job Request). Student tutors now work twelve hours per week in the Regional Centers. In September, the department received permission to hire a Lead Tutor, a position which will become a half-time staff position as budget allows.

Current Status of Writing Programs and Resources

To give a snapshot of what is happening in the English Department in fall 2012, the work of the Writing Inquiry Circle has been a significant element. The group met several times to discuss writing issues. Members from different schools and centers interviewed faculty and students to get their ideas about what should happen to improve student writing and we have collected and discussed a variety of data included in this report.

Tutoring Hours for Writing in the ASC

Data from ASC Tutoring Information (Attachment E10: Writing Essay Data Sets) on the main campus shows a rise in the number of hours devoted to writing tutoring over the last two years. There are currently enough tutors to help all students except at peak times during the year. Since the ASC is funded by the OSSR, it prioritizes GE students and only helps upper-division and graduate students when tutors are free. If the university wants to provide consistent tutoring for those populations, there will need to be funding from additional sources.

DC Tutoring

The English Department is closely monitoring the use of DC tutors so that more can be added as needed. Budget information indicates that the university has spent about $29,000 on the tutoring program in the last year. Data gathered in September indicates that the tutoring program is off to a strong start, with students returning for multiple sessions. An interesting data point in the Visalia Comparison (Attachment E10: Writing Essay Data Sets) indicates that there are lag times in the summer when the tutor is not greatly needed, but there are other times that are very busy and students are being turned away.
Grading in GE Writing Courses
Some exciting Grades and Grade Inflation (Attachment E10: Writing Essay Data Sets) data from TUG and DC writing courses indicates grade inflation is not a reality in the writing program. DC grades are slightly lower than TUG grades. For the past two semesters, the average GPA for all writing classes in DC was 2.36 and 2.61, while for TUG it remained steady at 2.82. COM-110AB seemed like a source of grade inflation (30-38% A grades) but there turned out to be an explanation. During that year, the STEM students were all placed into COM-110AB for the sake of the cohort model, regardless of their writing abilities. Therefore, there were a large group of students who did not need a developmental class and received unusually high grades. Further research showed that the number of A grades is typically 20-25%, which is in line with other courses.

Writing across the Curriculum

After two years of discussion, the English Department is launching a Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) program for TUG majors. FPU currently has minimal writing requirements for all students because it lacks a 200-level GE course or a formal WAC program. A major problem has been how to bridge the gap between COM-110 and the skills required for upper-division coursework. Transfer students also struggle to adapt to upper-division requirements for which they are often ill prepared by their transferable writing courses.

The English Department has worked with faculty from across the university to develop a plan for a WAC program based on designated 300- or 400-level writing courses tailored to each major or group of majors and taught by faculty in those programs. There is one such course already. The cross-listed course SOC-461 / PSY-310, Introduction to Social Science Research, currently teaches students in the Sociology, Social Work, and Psychology programs how to research and write a scholarly paper in these disciplines. Although the English Department did not develop this course, we have been monitoring it closely, have examined the enrollment and curriculum, and have invited two different instructors to speak to the department about the pros and cons of the current model. The English department is in conversation with the Biblical Studies department about the possibility of creating a course in their program. The plan will be to roll out new courses gradually, incorporating a developing sense of best practices.

Other Recent and Current Initiatives

- Developing blended syllabi and online curricula for COM-109 and COM-111 to meet the new requirement that all DC courses become blended in spring 2013. The materials for COM-109 were completed in October 2012 and COM-111 is ongoing (Attachment E12: COM-109 Sample Blended Syllabus).
- Entering data into TaskStream on students’ performance on the signature assignments in COM-109 and COM-111. All instructors began doing this in September. This is the first set of DC GE courses to be evaluated in TaskStream. The English Department volunteered to use its courses as a model, which demonstrates a commitment to assessment.
- Assessing writing assignments in the GE curriculum overall. The GE Committee collected this data in 2003 and the English Department recently asked for an updated list (Attachment E13: GE Writing Survey FA12). There does not seem to be much improvement in the sense that there are still shorter, personal essays than long, informative or persuasive essays.
- Working with a university Inquiry Circle to create an Information Literacy module to be housed on the library website and used by students in multiple courses. This will guide students through the steps of choosing an appropriate research topic, finding and incorporating appropriate sources, and avoiding plagiarism.
- Assessing the first two semesters of a new one-unit graduate class: LANG-770 English for Graduate Academic Purposes. The Writing Inquiry Circle invited the director of the IELP to speak about this class and possible expansions to address the profound need for graduate writing instruction and support. There are many students who desire to take this class but it is capped at 8 students per semester. The English Department may want to add a graduate writing course as well, perhaps called COM-710.
- Creating a new upper-division DC writing course, Credit for Life Experience Portfolio, to help students learn to write Experience Portfolio in order to receive credit for prior work. This will begin in fall 2013.

Recommendations for Continual Improvement in Writing

The following presents three categories where the Writing Inquiry Circle sees opportunity for improvement and the items within each. The goal for the English Department is to accomplish at least one item in each category within the next few years. The items listed first in each category are the top priorities.

Faculty Preparation, Training, and Evaluation

1) Develop faculty workshops on topics such as evaluation techniques, rubrics and grading, peer review, plagiarism, and APA and other styles.
2) Develop more common rubrics for designated populations of students or types of assignments.
3) Develop a plan for English Department faculty or program directors to observe classes across the curriculum and give feedback on writing issues, just as the English Department currently does for DC writing instructors (Attachment E14: English Department Instructor Observations). The Dean of DC has already made a schedule for observing courses.

4) Develop an evaluation procedure for instructors, especially for cases in which the department hears reports of faculty teaching APA incorrectly, not using APA when it is required by the program, grading writing according to wrong information, etc.

Assessment of Student Writing

5) Collect data on types and lengths of writing assignments in upper-division courses similar to the data collection on writing in GE courses. A Provost Research Grant has been procured for that purpose.

6) Develop a policy requiring EPTs for TUG transfer students even if they have already passed an equivalent to COM-110. Now that there is an EPT for DC programs, it would be advantageous to apply this testing to TUG transfer students. If students do not meet FPU minimum writing standards, they could take COM-110, LANG-171, or a specially designed course.

7) Assess upper-division and senior-level writing. Assessments in addition to those connected to the current Institutional Academic Assessment Initiative would be helpful, e.g. evaluating sample writing assignments from across the curriculum based on a common rubric. This reflects the possibility of holistic assessment recommended for the University Assessment Committee this year. An exit exam is another option, perhaps as part of an upper-division writing class.

8) Assess how well graduate students are prepared for writing demands and what resources (tutors, courses, WAC programs, writing labs) may benefit them.

Student Skill Building

9) Create further courses in the WAC program. After the Biblical Studies course has been created, the English department plans to approach areas like the Natural Sciences, where faculty have shown interest in adapting a current course into a writing course.

10) Develop workshops and/or weekly emails for students on writing topics, perhaps led by tutors in the centers.

11) Add tutors to the centers. Currently, some students are being turned away or having to wait one or two weeks to be served, which is very detrimental in six-week courses. It would also be desirable to replace all student tutors with staff members, since it is difficult to find qualified students and they have to be replaced very often because they are usually enrolled in 18-month degree programs.

12) Move toward requiring more than one six-week course for DC students who score very low on the placement test. This was the English Department's initial proposal, which was approved by the DCAC and then withdrawn and replaced with the current requirement in which students choose one course. The English department still believes that struggling students would benefit from more than one course.

Assessment of Student Writing

5) Collect data on types and lengths of writing assignments in upper-division courses similar to the data collection on writing in GE courses. A Provost Research Grant has been procured for that purpose.

6) Develop a policy requiring EPTs for TUG transfer students even if they have already passed an equivalent to COM-110. Now that there is an EPT for DC programs, it would be advantageous to apply this testing to TUG transfer students. If students do not meet FPU minimum writing standards, they could take COM-110, LANG-171, or a specially designed course.

7) Assess upper-division and senior-level writing. Assessments in addition to those connected to the current Institutional Academic Assessment Initiative would be helpful, e.g. evaluating sample writing assignments from across the curriculum based on a common rubric. This reflects the possibility of holistic assessment recommended for the University Assessment Committee this year. An exit exam is another option, perhaps as part of an upper-division writing class.

8) Assess how well graduate students are prepared for writing demands and what resources (tutors, courses, WAC programs, writing labs) may benefit them.

Student Skill Building

9) Create further courses in the WAC program. After the Biblical Studies course has been created, the English department plans to approach areas like the Natural Sciences, where faculty have shown interest in adapting a current course into a writing course.

10) Develop workshops and/or weekly emails for students on writing topics, perhaps led by tutors in the centers.

11) Add tutors to the centers. Currently, some students are being turned away or having to wait one or two weeks to be served, which is very detrimental in six-week courses. It would also be desirable to replace all student tutors with staff members, since it is difficult to find qualified students and they have to be replaced very often because they are usually enrolled in 18-month degree programs.

12) Move toward requiring more than one six-week course for DC students who score very low on the placement test. This was the English Department's initial proposal, which was approved by the DCAC and then withdrawn and replaced with the current requirement in which students choose one course. The English department still believes that struggling students would benefit from more than one course.

Critical thinking is the cornerstone of liberal arts education. Its local importance is ratified through institutional mission established in The FPU Idea—the university encourages members of the FPU community toward a reflective and critical perspective on the nature of humanity and its relation to the world. Thus, the liberal arts enlarge the foundation for life-long learning and for advanced study in a discipline or profession. Critical thinking capacity findings are outlined at two levels, including (a) critical thinking in programs and courses, and (b) artifacts designed to assess critical thinking learning outcomes. Capacity findings provide the basis for a third section summarizing recommendations for structural/organizational change supportive of critical thinking, and implementation of assessment metrics for critical thinking learning and transformation. [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 4.3, 4.7]

Critical Thinking in Programs and Courses

The Critical Thinking Inquiry Circle implemented a capacity mapping strategy aimed at providing a starting point for future discussion related to establishment of consistent and measurable critical thinking outcomes across the institution. As a first step, the Inquiry Circle identified the location and wording of critical thinking outcomes in curricular programs and courses. This was accomplished with the help of the OIE which provided PSLO information for those programs directly assessing critical thinking. Findings suggested a wide variety of operational definitions trending in different directions (Attachment F1: Critical Thinking Learning Outcomes). Undergraduate programs associated with
humanities, writing, and GE emphasized critical thinking with fairly abstract descriptors. Words like inductive, deductive, theoretical, perceptual, analytical, critical, and value-oriented were noted in critical thinking descriptions and PSLOs. Undergraduate and graduate programs associated with career-oriented professions such as business, nursing, kinesiology, criminology, ministry leadership, and child development emphasized more concrete aspects of critical thinking. Words like proficient, integrative, applied, skills, problem-solving, methodology, and evaluative were noted in respective PSLOs. The Inquiry Circle interpreted these differences to suggest a continuum of operative critical thinking at the university anchored by theory at one pole and praxis at the opposing pole. Neither pole is more or less relevant to institutional mission as understood through the FPU Idea. These differences likely reflect specific program objectives in terms of student preparation. The Inquiry Circle concluded that future work to articulate a cogent definition of critical thinking at FPU must be sensitive to the needs of diverse programming, from general education to preparation for externally licensed, professional service (i.e., nursing).

A second capacity-mapping step was taken in the strategic interest of understanding critical thinking at FPU. This qualitative step was undertaken to obtain narrative responses from curricular program directors and co-curricular directors on how critical thinking is understood, evaluated, and developmentally framed within their areas. Qualitative prompts were distributed via Survey Monkey and face-to-face interviews with these colleagues. Whereas PSLO mapping suggested variance in operational understanding of critical thinking across the institution, the narrative response set seemed to emphasize points of convergence and overlap (Attachment F2: Critical Thinking Qualitative Response Set). Several responses focused on critical thought as critique, where students acquire expertise related to evaluation of information and argument for the purpose of synthesis leading to alternative conclusions. With regard to evaluation, program directors favor written expression as an effective instructional and graded medium associated with critical thinking. A qualitative prompt was included on matters of developmental significance—exploring the extent to which operative understanding of critical thinking might be changed or modified depending on whether the student audience consisted of lower-division, upper-division, or graduate students. At a general level, program directors expect incrementally elevated student sophistication regarding critical capabilities across the collegiate experience. The Inquiry Circle did not explore the nuances of critical thinking as defined at these developmental levels, nor did we consider differences regarding assignments and evaluation.

In summary, the capacity mapping results tell an interesting story. Critical thinking is widely incorporated into curricular and co-curricular programs at FPU. Regarding PSLOs, a considerable variety of critical thinking definitions and applications are evident. This diversity is roughly aligned with a colorful array of program, degree, and course offerings at FPU. With regard to the future, some work may be necessary to create a more coherent understanding of critical thinking rooted in the FPU Idea. The narrative response set preliminarily suggests this may not be a large problem given strong anecdotal agreement on the basic parameters of critical thinking. The emphasis on written and spoken verbal expression in evaluation demands much from faculty and students alike. The great importance of critical thought to a liberal education makes these efforts necessary and worthwhile. One Inquiry Circle colleague noted that critical thinking lives at the center of how FPU graduates will make judgments based on a moral compass—critical thinking becomes the conscious lens for moral maturity.

**Critical Thinking Artifacts**

Artifacts used to assess critical thinking correspond to the breadth of programs and means by which critical thinking may be demonstrated. The expression of critical thinking is appropriately broad. Written work is the dominant artifact form, but it also includes oral and multi-media forms and activities that are viewed and evaluated by others. Course-generated activities and artifacts include discussions, presentations, papers (research, theme, reflection), exams, analyses, plans (business, lesson, storyboard), projects (senior, other), practicum, and internships. Rubrics have been or are in the process of being developed to assess many of these activities in TaskStream or otherwise. As with the variety of definitions of critical thinking, refinement of the artifacts collected and the rubrics used for assessment will benefit from inter-departmental collaboration.

Non-course-embedded artifacts are in the early stages of incorporation. The Dean of Natural Sciences and the GE Program Director are trained on the Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) and will pilot its use in the spring 2013 semester. The use of standardized tests (e.g., CAAP, CAT, CCTST, and CLA) and student engagement and perception surveys (e.g., SSI, ASPS, CIRP, and NSSE) will provide inter-institutional comparison data. SSI, ASPS, CIRP, and NSSE data are available for a number of years and need to be examined to this end.

Co-curricular activities contribute to the development of critical thinking. The DSL and the OSF link their PSLOs to the Critical Thinking USLO. This demonstrates breadth of commitment to and understanding of critical thinking. Additional areas of student engagement that contribute to the development of critical thinking, such as student employment and athletics, need to be brought into the conversation. Artifacts and rubrics need to be developed.
Critical Thinking Oversight and Training

Critical thinking is identified in course, program, and university SLOs. Evaluation of the outcomes for courses resides with the instructors and becomes part of program reviews. Methods for evaluating Critical Thinking PSLOs are in the early stages of development for most programs. This includes course level rubrics and processes for evaluating artifacts and the results at the program level. Program reviews report the findings and make proposals and are submitted to the appropriate academic committee for review (UAC, DCAC, or GAC). Currently, the AC is tasked with evaluating data related to the Critical Thinking USLO; it compares information across programs and facilitates institution-wide collaboration around improvement.

Recommendations for Improvement of Critical Thinking

1) Develop a work group around critical thinking with representation from all facets of the institution.
2) Articulate a cogent definition of critical thinking at FPU that is broad enough to allow disciplinary and programmatic differences. The definition should be rooted in The FPU Idea.
3) Develop program- and university-level assessment tools and processes that move beyond those associated with course level assessment.
4) Develop artifacts related to assessing critical thinking in co-curricular areas, including athletics, student life, and student employment.
5) Make use of currently available data from national resources (NSSE, SSI, ASPS, and CIRP) in order to establish baselines and trends in perceptions of critical thinking.
6) Implement inter-institutional measures, e.g. CAT.

RIGOR AND MEANING OF DEGREE

Academic rigor is determined not just by what is taught, but how it is taught, and how it is assessed. A rigorous curriculum is focused, coherent, appropriately challenging, and differentiated by level. FPU’s academic core purpose expresses our acceptance of responsibility, beyond merely delivering instruction, to doing all that we can to see that students learn well, supported by an environment of academic excellence, innovative programming and spiritual vitality. The core purpose further emphasizes that our responsibility includes being attentive to many curricular and logistical issues to ensure that the coursework completed by students leads to a timely degree. Finally, and importantly, our academic core purpose expresses the idea that FPU degrees will be highly valued by students, by employers, by graduate schools, by specialized accrediting bodies, by the public, and by the state/federal legislature that provide funding for students at the university.

FPU has an approach to learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change. Our curriculum, which is based on the liberal arts, provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g. science, culture, and society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. A liberal education helps students develop a sense of social responsibility, as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings. The broad goals of FPU's liberal arts focus have been enduring even as the courses and requirements that comprise a liberal education have changed over the years. [CFRs: 1.1, 1.7, 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8]

Definition of Degrees

Deliberation about the rigor and meaning of degrees was emphasized at the FPU Professional Day, August 20, 2012 as the faculty and administration met to consider the criteria outlined in the Lumina Foundation's 2011 publication, the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP). Utilizing both the Spider Web construction and Degree Profile Matrix, small groups of faculty and administrators plotted the Bachelor's and Master's programs at FPU according to the criteria (Attachment G1: FPU Professional Day Meeting Agenda). Based on that review, several key observations were noted by faculty and administrators who participated in the collaborative exercise and used the schemas found in the DQP:

- All university faculty agreed that all five spider-web strands in the DQP [civic learning, applied learning, intellectual skills, specialized knowledge, broad integrative knowledge], are represented in their assigned programs at least moderately. Balance in the areas of emphasis was evident and a clear strength of most programs.
- FPU graduate programs tended to be more specialized in focus than undergraduate programs.
- FPU graduate programs tended to assume that "broad, integrative knowledge" was already a part of students'
The Rigor and Meaning of Degree Inquiry Circle built upon this university-wide work session by gathering quantitative and qualitative data, and discussing degrees offered at FPU. The key question that continued to surface from these discussions was: What should FPU graduates know and be able to do as a result of their FPU experience? [CFRs: 1.2, 4.7]

The OIE is implementing an assessment process articulating SLOs identified by the faculty for each degree program. These statements derive from Bloom’s cognitive taxonomy expectations for student learning outcomes. The Inquiry Circle compared an audit of the degree criteria from the Lumina document to a selected sample of PSLOs at FPU. Numerical values on a Likert scale were assigned to the verbs of both the PSLOs and Lumina degree statements. This study revealed strong compatibility between the FPU degree programs and the Lumina document indicating an adherence to professional academic standards in FPU degree programs (Attachment G3: Spot Audit: SLOs and Bloom’s Taxonomy Audit).

The Inquiry Circle also tested the faculty’s opinions about the congruence of SLOs with the defining document of the university, The FPU Idea, through a questionnaire administered via Survey Monkey to faculty to see how the key framework outlined in the foundational document influenced the development of SLOs in their classes/programs. While there is strong affirmation of the centrality of The FPU Idea, there is less agreement as to its influence on the learning outcomes and academic status of existing programs. The USLOs, revised by the AC and approved by the Faculty Senate, lists a set of competencies. The USLOs, though utilized by the OIE, neglect to emphasize such unique characteristics of The FPU Idea like reconciliation, peacemaking, and student-professor partnership as the metaphors for learning. Further review is needed to consider framing these as components of the current USLOs or in making these as stand-alone and distinct USLOs. [CFR: 1.2]

Summary of Additional Findings Based on a Review of Structure, Policies, and Practices

The Inquiry Circle also examined structures, policies, and practices that exist to ensure academic integrity and rigor throughout the university. As noted earlier in the CPR, the university leadership enacted a restructuring from a student population-based organization with three units to an academic model of disciplinary schools in 2004-2005. Today, the schools house Bachelor’s, Master’s, and potentially Doctorate programs along with instructional delivery modes such as blended and online programs. The five school structure includes school caucuses, at which each school can address issues regarding its academic

skill sets and that most graduate programs sought to build on this acquired knowledge.

- It was noticed that other strands, particularly applied learning and specialized learning, also built on broad integrative knowledge. As such, broad integrative knowledge seemed foundational to the educational experience at FPU, not only in terms of what we are teaching students, but in terms of how we build to higher levels of knowledge.

- There was a strong desire to continue the dialogue throughout the institution about what FPU means by Bachelor's and Master's degrees, given the obvious differences in what the programs associated with them value.

- Groups found it easier to explain their programs and the learning competencies when they looked at the tri-fold description of areas of emphasis rather than the web diagrams. The descriptions of each value in the tri-fold were very clear and easily grasped. However, the web falsely implied that the values listed next to each other were connected more similar to each other, either in terms of their meaning or how they are practiced. Conversely, the web implied that values such as applied and specialized were almost opposing ideas, given how far away they are from each other. The working groups wondered if these values were either independent from each other or connected to each other or both. The working groups also felt that the web graphic did not make this clear.

Overall, this work was a good introduction into the discussion about the components of rigor—content, pedagogy, assessments, and alignment of these with the DQP (Attachment G2: Sample Work-Faculty DQP) Rigor is more than difficult work or a set of expectations the university has for its students. It is our academic integrity interwoven with our institutional mission and our philosophy of learning. It was apparent from this activity that academic rigor and meaning of degree can be defined in a number of ways. For faculty, academic rigor is delivering demanding coursework that supports students in stretching their minds. Our faculty engage all students in learning experiences where students are able to connect what they learn today to what they learned in the past; and to what they need in the future. We must now work to clearly differentiate rigor at each degree level.

The review also allowed faculty and administrators to look at FPU’s student learning outcomes and how they may or may not align with the framework as defined in the DQP. While we believe that areas of learning are covered in several layers of learning outcomes (student, program and university levels), institution-specific content may not be so aligned. This must result in further discussion and action. [CFR: 1.2]
programs, including rigor and meaning of degree. [CFRs: 1.2, 1.3, 3.3, 4.7]

One purpose of the academic program and policy committees is to review changes including the addition of new courses, degrees, and programs; revisions or reductions in programs and courses; and policies that affect programs (Attachment G4: Role and Responsibilities Chart). Responsibility for academic quality, including rigor, resides with the UIAC, DCAC, GAC, and the Academic Cabinet. Based on a recent internal survey of FPU faculty, results indicate that meaning of degree should be aligned with The FPU Idea as well (Attachment G5: Faculty Survey 2012). The benefits of ensuring a link between The FPU Idea and meaning of degree are evidenced in a recent policy change regarding plagiarism (Attachment G6: Academic Integrity Policy); the implementation steps and approach of which are testimony of the adherence to FPU values in academic practice, rigor, and meaning of degree. [CFRs: 1.2, 1.7]

While recognizing that there are population differences between the DC and TUG programs that might affect the rigor and meaning of degree, calls for a stronger articulation between them have resulted in significant changes over the past few years. Some of these include an audit of adjunct faculty teaching outside their primary academic preparation (e.g. Attachment E7: DC English Adjuncts), assessment of credit hours (Attachment G7: Credit Hour Progress), an introduction of a blended delivery model of instruction (Attachment G8: Blended Syllabus Template) effective in the spring 2013 semester, and a move toward formal faculty evaluations as discussed in Thematic Essay III. In addition, the university has appointed a full-time Dean of DC who bears responsibility for monitoring and addressing best practice for this population. [CFRs: 3.3, 4.6]

Recommendations Regarding Rigor and Meaning of Degree

1) Define expectations for degrees: BA, BS, MA, MS, M.Div, and MBA utilizing the Lumina DQP and attention to dialogue about institutional academic expectations. All face-2-face, blended, and online programs should be included in this articulation.
2) Engage in a process to adopt competencies for all baccalaureate students based on the DQP and with consideration of the current GE PSLOs and USLOs.
3) Explore connections between the mission and vision of the university, The FPU Idea, and rigor and meaning of degree.
4) Create effective strategies to ensure consistent applicable rigor and meaning of degree across all populations and degree levels.

INTEGRATIVE ESSAY

INQUIRY AND REFLECTION INTO ENGAGEMENT AND LEARNING

This Integrative Essay summarizes the University’s progress in response to the major recommendations by WASC Commission in 2003. At the midpoint of this re-accreditation cycle, the essay also integrates the six themes of the self-study, reflecting on the process itself and anticipating its implications for the future. It concludes with a review of outcomes met for the capacity stage and progress already made towards the effectiveness stage.

Progress Since the 2003 Review

FPU has addressed the three principle recommendations made as a result of the WASC Commission Review of the 2003 Self-Study and has implemented improvements in each area throughout the past ten years. Specifically, the university has refined and institutionalized effectiveness strategies, including the management of data in academic program review processes, and the use of appropriate forms of assessment to enhance student learning. Likewise, the university has a more clearly defined collective definition of research, scholarship, and creative activity that honors disciplinary perspectives. The university has embedded these scholarly expectations in its faculty hiring, continuing status, and promotion processes and has increased institutional support for faculty scholarship. The university has taken steps to develop more initiatives around areas of diversity, but we believe even more strategic goals and initiatives should be developed, implemented and assessed. A detailed description of these actions is in Appendix B: Response to Commission Actions and Visiting Team Report.

Reflections and Implications

FPU chose to use Inquiry Circles to conduct the study through their serious collegial engagement with the terms, issues and evidence of the study. The Inquiry Circles made several observations about further refining university knowledge of and support for learning, engagement, and diversity. These observations are included at the end of each thematic essay and include various enhancements aimed at promoting engagement in learning, updating critical support unit plans, and further refining data collection and dissemination practices.

The work of the Inquiry Circles underscores several values held in common throughout the University. Through the inquiry process, the Inquiry Circles themselves have become learning communities. The review model created by the self-study team is widely participatory, evidence-based, intellectually stimulating, and meaningful to the university. While the formal Inquiry Circle structure will
be dissolved once the accreditation review cycle is complete, the university fully expects that the liaisons, networks, and friendships developed during the self-study will continue to inform university practices. The Inquiry Circle process can serve as a model for future intramural organizing that parallels, not replaces, established university governance procedures to sustain a university committed to student learning.

Although the inquiry questions are presented as discrete entities for the convenience of organizing the inquiry and self-study report, the university recognizes the inextricable connections among support for student learning, engagement, teaching, and scholarship. The inquiry process discovered several issues that transcended each inquiry and accumulated within larger areas of importance. The issues outlined below describe in broad strokes the potential impact of the work of the self-study as it prepares for the next phase. These issues will form a focus for the Educational Effectiveness Review, taking greater shape and contributing to the future direction of the university.

**Reflective Essays**

FPU has a commitment to student learning and student success. The commitment is expressed in its mission statement, its values statement, and its strategic priorities. FPU operationalizes this commitment through the recruitment, retention, and graduation of a diverse and high-quality student population, a purposeful structuring and nurturing of the total education of students, the maintenance of superior student support systems, and a systematic assessment and evaluation of efforts to promote student success.

**Essay I** showed that the assessment of student learning at FPU is an iterative process beginning with the identification of student learning outcomes, followed by development and delivery of instruction to help students meet those goals, the design and implementation of multiple methods for assessing students’ performance and experience, and the use of assessment results to inform change. Whether at the level of the classroom or the institution, the essence of this feedback loop is unchanged.

At FPU, we believe that good assessment of learning attempts to capture the full range of learning and the depth of the university experience inside and outside the classroom. It includes assessment of co-curricular activities and resources, students’ perceptions of their experience, rates of retention and completion, and student learning. It is also authentic assessment, reflecting actual student learning because the assessment process is integrated into the normal academic life of students and faculty, rather than being an extraneous add-on. This approach to assessment conforms to acknowledged principles of good assessment practice.

Because learning varies across the disciplines, assessment that can inform curricular change and improve student learning must be primarily the work of experts in those disciplines - our faculty and departments. At FPU, therefore, this means that institutional assessment of student learning is a bottom-up inferential process, rather than a top-down deductive and prescriptive one. The process begins in the classroom, moves through departmental assessment of majors, informs the colleges in which those departments reside, and finally, gives us a picture of how well all our students are learning.

At FPU, diversity is integral to excellence. The university values and honors diverse experiences and perspectives, strives to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promotes access, opportunity, and justice for all. **Essay II** showcased many of the components that support our efforts in varying aspects of diversity, but we have not been moving as aggressively as we should be given the demographics of our students and the region. It is important for FPU to cultivate an institutional vision and commitment to diversity while ensuring an equitable environment for all members of the community. This means paying more attention to policies and practices involving management, leadership, communication, resources, scholarship, and community. It includes focusing attention on the demographic composition of FPU and our surrounding community of the San Joaquin Valley to be certain that we know who are our students, faculty, staff, and community partners in order to better serve and work with all. In addition, we address our institutional systems as a means of better serving all faculty, students, and staff. Because FPU's mission clearly states that the University exists to educate diverse learners and transform communities by expanding the boundaries of knowledge and discovery, equity and diversity are linked to FPU’s success and the academic achievement of FPU students.

**Essay III** focused on the elements of human resources, physical resources, fiscal resources, technological resources, organization and governance structures, and institutional planning pointing out some identified strengths and challenges. The University is on sound financial footing. The percentage of income derived from tuition, however, is high and should be monitored carefully. While the university’s human resources, physical resources, and technological resources are adequate and reflect the growing importance of linking these to support student learning, these elements must remain a major priority in the planning and budget processes of the university. The engagement process of developing a new Strategic Plan for the university should be an opportunity for the university to once again align its planning in enrollment, academics, advancement, budget, and the Master Plan, in support of the university mission and our commitment to student success.
The changes described in Essay IV, and particularly the recent implementation of the English Placement Test, have created the opportunity for the university to assess more systematically the effectiveness of its writing programs. The university plans to track these data with the goal of refining lower-division GE coursework as well as providing a measure of success for feeder institutions. In addition, the English Department is currently studying the efficacy of its writing programs across all levels and exploring additional ways to improve the assessment of writing at the upper division level. It is paying particular attention to the ways in which student learning outcomes related to writing may be better reflected in assessment.

Essay V highlighted some of our work in assessing critical thinking within the academic programs. A shift in how we define and assess the student learning competency of critical thinking is occurring in the university. This comprehensive plan for outcomes-based accountability represents a focused direction for student learning outcomes and competencies, such as critical thinking, that will be refined and expanded for several years to come. As part of the program review process, student learning outcomes in the area of critical thinking will be included in regular reports on the assessment of student learning outcomes and competencies, as are all other competencies. Additionally, the enhanced focus will substantially strengthen the capacity of the university to promote educational effectiveness. The activities and strategies identified through this self-review process will enable the university to gather data that puts a finger on the pulse of what is happening in our General Education programs in TUG and DC, as well as in each major and program across all levels.

Essay VI pointed out the work begun to define the rigor and meaning of our degrees. The dialogue that initially occurred around the Lumina DQP and then which was taken up by the Inquiry Circle continues to stimulate conversation across the university. Through an active discussion of the rigor and meaning of degree, the university seeks to ensure that it can answer the questions revolving around what FPU graduates should know and be able to do as a result of their degrees, especially as a reflection of The FPU Idea and in furtherance of academic integrity.

INSTITUTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Momentous and challenging changes over the last ten years call for corresponding boldness in organizational adaptation and implementation of wide ranging initiatives. Based on this self-study process, a number of overall recommendations have been identified:

1) Define and differentiate the meaning and rigor of degree levels throughout university programs.
2) Complete the implementation of the revised assessment system for student learning outcomes and core competencies; organize systematic processes, information, and analysis for improvement in the achievement of student learning outcomes.
3) Continue to infuse data and analysis throughout the university from retention and graduation rates, enrollment, and assessment to financial trends, human resources, and facilities with corresponding benchmarks.
4) Develop long-range budget and financial plans, linked with the Strategic Plan, and including Board-mandated reserves, appropriate internal transparency, and sufficient physical and human resources.
5) Develop a comprehensive diversity plan, including a focus on a diverse faculty to support the diversity of the student population.
6) Successfully implement the complete rank and scholarship initiative in ways that complement, support, and enrich the faculty passion for teaching and student learning.
7) Complete the staff classification and salary review and revision and implement changes.
8) Continue the integration of the Regional Centers, blended, and online programs into the traditional FPU academic experience, including all aspects of university services and mission appropriate to the populations served: student services, academic quality and rigor, spiritual formation, community experience, and service orientation.
9) Ensure that the mission and vision, the FPU Idea, of the university remain central to its ongoing work and future development.

CAPACITY OUTCOMES AND PREPARATION FOR THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PHASE

Our Institutional Proposal focuses the work of the self-study through the prism of engagement and learning and identifies major outcomes for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. Through an examination of multiple sources of evidence, FPU has demonstrated its core commitment to capacity. The University has expanded its Institutional Research infrastructure and service delivery and has refined institutional capacity and organizational structures and systems for quality assurance. Outcomes have been met, as detailed throughout this report.

We conclude the capacity and preparatory stage of our assessment satisfied with the utility of our review and eager to frame the next stage of our self-study through the Inquiry Questions, having ascertained that they remain cogent, researchable, and focused on student learning. Through the examination of assessment results and thoughtful consideration of evidentiary implications, we will shift our focus to educational excellence and to the future.
FPU is well on its way toward the Educational Effectiveness Review even as we put the finishing touches on the draft of our Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. We have found the process rewarding and stimulating: rewarding because we have gained new insights about how to modify our existing practices to better serve our students and stimulating because our thoughts have been quickened and our resolve strengthened by the promise of greater effectiveness in our educational service to our students.