

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM
ACCREDITATION REVIEW

To Loyola Marymount University

September 24-26, 2014

Team Roster

Team Chair: Robert L. Niehoff, President, John Carroll University
Assistant Team Chair: Patricia L. Prado-Olmos, Director & Professor of Education, California State University San Marcos
Kristine L. Chase, Professor of Economics and Graduate Business, St. Mary's College of California
Cyd Jenefsky, Vice Provost, Strategy and Educational Effectiveness, University of the Pacific
Herbert Lee, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Professor of Statistics, University of California Santa Cruz
Barbara Goss Davis, WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WSCUC Senior College and University Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission.

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and Reaccreditation Process 3
- B. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor 6
- C. Response to Issues Raised in 2008 Special Visit 7

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring their Integrity, Quality and Rigor 8
- B. Achieving Core Competencies 11
- C. Defining and Promoting Student Success 16
- D. Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future, and Planning for the Changing Environment for Higher Education 19
- E. Integrative Essay 23

SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

- A. Compliance Checklist 24
- B. Self-review under the Standards 24
- C. Required Data Exhibits 24
- D. Response to Finance Review, and Retention/Graduation Review 24
- E. Continued Momentum in Assessing Student Learning 24
- F. Continued Momentum in Program Review 24

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW 24

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Checklist 27
- B. Credit Hour Review 32
- C. Student Complaints Review 34
- D. Marketing and Recruitment Review 35
- E. Transfer Policy Review 37
- F. Off-Campus Location Review 39
- G. Distance Education Review 43

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

Loyola Marymount University (LMU) traces its historical roots to Saint Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus and the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. Each group has a long tradition of establishing educational institutions and LMU is the result of continued growth and development in the Los Angeles basin that embodies a conjoining and blending of these traditions. The Society of Jesus established educational institutions in the Los Angeles region beginning in 1911. Focused on the education of boys, the Jesuit institutions grew to include high school and college curricula. The Jesuits moved their Loyola College of Los Angeles to the present Westchester campus in 1929 and achieved status as a university one year later. Along a parallel path, the Religious of Sacred Heart of Mary began teaching women in 1923. Ten years later they opened Marymount Junior College in Westwood and began granting baccalaureate degrees in 1948 after growing to four-year status.

Marymount College moved to the Loyola College of Los Angeles campus in 1968. After five years of sharing facilities and faculties, the two institutions merged to form Loyola Marymount University. The expanded university, under the direction of the Board of Trustees, maintained the century-old mission of Catholic higher education in Los Angeles. The LMU vision is grounded in the history of the four-century old Jesuit educational philosophy as well as the history and traditions of the Marymount and St. Joseph's Sisters. This historical tradition is captured in the LMU mission:

The encouragement of learning

The education of the whole person

The service of faith and the promotion of justice

Each of these mission tenets is grounded in the institutional commitment to Roman Catholicism and the fundamental inspiration of the combined heritage of the Jesuits, the Marymount Sisters and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange.

The institution currently enrolls approximately 6,000 undergraduate, 2,100 graduate, and 1,250 law students. It offers more than 50 undergraduate degree programs, 36 master's degree programs, an education doctorate, and a Juris Doctorate. The Westchester campus comprises 142 acres on a bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean, and the law school is located in downtown Los Angeles on a Frank Gehry-designed campus. The new, state-of-the art William H. Hannon Library has served as an intellectual and social hub on the Westchester campus, and the new LEED-certified Life Sciences Building will greatly enhance science education when it opens in fall 2015.

Both Marymount College and the Loyola College of Los Angeles were fully accredited as independent institutions. Upon the merge of the institutions into Loyola Marymount University in 1973, WSCUC acted to accredit the institution with a visit at a time deemed appropriate by staff. An interim visit was conducted in 1977 and the Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation with the next full visit in for spring 1983. LMU proceeded to submit Substantive Change proposals as needed and to retain full accreditation for the next two decades. A Special Visit was conducted in spring 2008 as the result of issues identified during an Educational Effectiveness Review in 2003. The Special Visit resulted in the Commission action to continue accreditation, continue with the Capacity and Preparatory Review in spring 2013 and a request that the institution include as an aspect of the institution's 2013 self-study a response related to continued progress in institutionalizing assessment of student learning within the context of a culture of evidence. In September 2012, following changes to the WSCUC

institutional review process, the previously scheduled CPR and EER visits were replaced by an Offsite Review in fall 2013 and an Accreditation Visit in spring 2014. In November 2012 the Accreditation Visit was rescheduled to fall 2014. The Offsite Review was conducted in December 2013 and the Accreditation Visit was conducted in September 2014.

The Accreditation Visit team carefully reviewed all materials submitted by LMU. These materials included the institutional report, supporting evidence, LMU website, materials submitted to WSCUC in response to the Offsite Review Lines of Inquiry and the confidential email account. The team divided responsibilities for carefully evaluating evidence within each of the institutional report essays and the WSCUC 2008 Standards. Each area was assigned a primary author with a back up author.

The team met before the visit began to review the Lines of Inquiry, identify issues for exploration and develop questions for interviews. During the site visit team members conducted interviews with a range of campus members. Interviews included the president, Board of Trustees, provost, ALO, deans, other administrators, faculty, students and a variety of staff members. Throughout the site visit, the team examined the outcomes of interviews and refined topics and questions for subsequent interviews. The team members maintained open communication and carefully considered the evidence offered by individual team members and the institution. The team collectively developed the final commendations and recommendations based on deliberate and thoughtful analyses of the evidence gathered from the institutional materials and campus interviews.

LMU has six offsite locations including a high school site in Oakland, the law school in Los Angeles, a satellite campus in Los Angeles, a center in Orange, and branch locations in San Francisco and San Jose. The Marywood center in Orange, CA that houses a MA in Pastoral

Theology program was visited as a part of this review. LMU also offers one program through a distance education online delivery model. The MA in Reading Instruction program was examined as part of this review.

B. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

The LMU institutional report was well organized, clearly written and presented a comprehensive snapshot of the institution. The report was supported by evidence directly linked to assertions in the report. The team found the report to be helpful in developing an understanding of the institution and its mission as well as the current condition of the institution. The team noted the report was data rich while also limited in reflective analysis of some of the data.

Institutional involvement in the review and report preparation included multiple sectors of the campus community. In February 2012, the president constituted a WSCUC Self-Study Steering Committee composed of individuals from across campus units and divisions, including faculty and administrators. Under the leadership of the Dean of the School of Education and Graduate Dean, the Committee engaged in a deliberate and focused agenda of activity geared to preparing a draft of the self-study report. Five writing groups were formed to assist the Steering Committee in the development of the self-study report. The Steering Committee engaged with multiple groups and constituencies across campus including the president, senior administrative leadership, faculty senate, key faculty committees, graduate program directors and department chairs. Drafts of the essays were reviewed by the Steering Committee, and several groups reviewed drafts of the self-study report.

LMU employed a methodology of rigorous inquiry and self-reflection throughout the review. The review process was aligned with several high priority university initiatives already

underway that related to planning, evaluation and educational effectiveness. The institution effectively used evidence to support its assertions and positions in the institutional report.

The institution's self-review, according to one interview, was a valuable process and "everything we've done has been for us, to make us better." The process of gathering evidence allowed the institution to identify areas where evidence existed, in some areas it existed in abundance. The process also identified areas where evidence gathering and review can be improved. According to those with whom the team spoke, LMU has developed a greater understanding of its effectiveness, systems of quality improvement and student learning.

The institutional response to the Lines of Inquiry addressed the team's issues and questions to a certain extent. Given that WSCUC does not require a narrative to accompany to submitted materials, it was challenging to develop more than a cursory understanding of the update.

C. Response to Issues Raised in 2008 Special Visit

In the June 25, 2008 Commission action letter, the Commission outlined concerns as well as specific areas for action. The areas for concern included creating a culture of evidence, linking long-range financial planning to learning, enhancing whole-person education and education in service of faith and creating a learning organization. The Commission letter also included a request that the "institution include as an aspect of the institution's 2013 self-study a response related to continued progress in institutionalizing assessment of student learning within the context of a culture of evidence."

In its institutional report, LMU documented progress in each of the areas of concern from 2008. Evidence gathered from the institutional report, appendices and interviews indicated LMU has made substantial progress in addressing each of the areas of concern. Annual assessment,

program review, strategic planning linked to budget and mission, and enhancing the whole-person education are well established, readily identified and discussed and was evident in repeated interactions with LMU faculty and administration. LMU addressed progress toward developing a culture of evidence throughout the essays in the institutional report.

LMU has experienced significant changes in leadership since the 2008 Special Visit. David W. Burcham was unanimously elected the 15th president of LMU in October 2010. (Note: After the visit, on October 6, 2014, President Burcham announced he was stepping down from the presidency.) President Burcham restructured the provost's position to be named the executive vice president and provost. This position is both the chief academic officer and chief operating officer. The following positions report directly to the EVP/Provost: Senior Vice President for Business and Finance and CFO, Senior Vice President for Student Affairs, Senior Vice President for Administration, the six college/school deans and the Dean of the Library, two vice provosts and four associate provosts. Four of the college/school deans on the Westchester campus are new as of 2010 as reported by LMU. An office of assessment was established in July 2008 with the hire of a Director of Assessment. Two additional positions, a Research Associate and an Associate Director of Survey Research, have been added since 2008. Finally, two additional full time positions were added to the Office of Institutional Research.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring their Integrity, Quality and Rigor

LMU has clearly taken seriously the charge to define the meaning of its undergraduate degree. The institution has defined 22 undergraduate learning outcomes (ULOs) clustered into four pillars: the encouragement of learning, depth of understanding of an academic discipline, education of the whole person, and service of faith and the promotion of justice. The first pillar

includes the five core competencies from the WSCUC Standards (CFR 2.2a) plus lifelong learning. The third and fourth pillars are more specific to the mission of a Jesuit institution (CFRs 1.1, 1.2).

LMU revised its core curriculum, implemented in fall 2013. The revision was based on assessment of the previous core and was driven by the faculty. The new core is meant to better reflect the institutional mission, and to overlap with the ULOs. There are 25 learning outcomes associated with the new core.

To ensure the quality and integrity of the degree, an elaborate network of assessment structures has been developed. The Assessment Advisory Committee oversees assessment of ULOs, at the typical rate of two per year. The first four years saw the assessment of all five core competencies (even though WSCUC did not require this assessment for Pilot 2 institutions). These assessments are based on an institution-wide sample of student work. The Core Curriculum Committee oversees assessment of the core curriculum outcomes, at the rate of about two per year. The team concluded that assessment is faculty-owned (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4).

At the graduate level, an LMU degree is based on expectations of student learning of advanced disciplinary knowledge and skills, valuing of diverse perspectives, and development of compassionate and ethical leaders who work toward the achievement of an equitable society.

The Academic Planning and Review Committee (APRC) reviews new academic programs or major revisions to existing programs (CFR 2.1). It also facilitates the program review process. LMU has created a substantial program review process (revised about six years ago) that starts with a self-study and culminates with a formal memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the program chair, the dean, and the provost (CFR 2.7). Program learning outcomes (PLOs) and their assessment are reviewed as part of the program review (CFRs 2.3,

2.4, 2.6). The team reviewed completed self-studies, external reviews and, when available, internal feedback reports from the faculty Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), action plans and MOUs. The team did not find the follow-up three-year assessment plans that were specified in the guidelines. Completion of program reviews has been sluggish. Since 2008, 22 of 27 programs without external accreditation have started the two-plus year process. Of these, only 12 had completed their self-studies and external reviews by the time of the onsite visit, and only six of these programs had completed the MOU stage. Program review documentation was incomplete and inconsistent between programs, and no centralized electronic archive was provided for the program review process.

The team commends the APRC feedback reports issued to programs. The reports identify misalignments between proposed actions and the findings in self-studies and external reviews, request that programs meet LMU expectations for assessment of learning outcomes, and question requests for resources not supported by the program review documents.

The team discussed the program review process with various members of academic leadership (faculty committees, deans and administration), as well as faculty who had recently completed external reviews. Comments indicated that the process most frequently stalled in the multiple review, approval and feedback steps required between the deans and the program faculty during the multi-year review process (CFR 2.7, 4.3, 4.4).

At the same time, every constituency the team engaged on this topic praised the usefulness of program review and its contribution to the “cultural shift” of institutionalizing assessment at LMU (CFR 4.8). The strength of the APRC was corroborated onsite with praise by multiple constituents for the strength and added value of its work. One leader remarked that the “APRC process has already paid big dividends. It has refined the way we look at programs

and put programs' feet to the fire." Many commented on the value of collective reflection and the contributions of external reviewers.

The team recommends that LMU move more expeditiously to complete the program review process, ensuring that all reviews are completed in a timely manner, and that all result in an MOU, an action plan, and a follow-up assessment plan. The APRC is scheduled to review the process in the coming year, which provides an opportunity to retain the strengths of the current process and modify it as needed to make the process more timely, efficient and valuable for constituents.

The team commends LMU for providing substantial resources to support the many assessment processes, particularly the staff support across multiple offices (CFR 4.5). In particular, the assessment office staff members have been highly effective in instilling a culture of assessment. The team was impressed with the way in which the multiple layers of assessment have been linked and coordinated, and the extent to which assessment has been institutionalized (CFR 4.6). During the onsite visit, the team heard multiple examples of how assessment results have been used to guide changes for the improvement of programs (CFR 4.7).

Achieving Core Competencies

Across the past four years, LMU has developed a robust infrastructure to assess student achievement of the 22 learning outcomes LMU expects of all its undergraduates (ULOs). The five core competencies WSCUC requires for all undergraduates are included among these 22 ULOs (CFR 1.2, 2.2a, 2.3). The Assessment Advisory Committee, chaired by the Director of Assessment, oversees the ULO assessment process. As part of Pilot 2 in the revised WSCUC reaccreditation process, LMU is still under the 2008 Standards and is not required to have assessed any of the core competencies for its offsite and onsite reviews. Nonetheless, the

university has already completed its first cycle of assessing all five core competencies (written communication, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, creative and critical thinking, and oral communication) in addition to the ULO on ethical reasoning and action. The institutional report and appended assessment reports document the levels of student achievement for each of the core competencies.

The assessment methods for each outcome followed a similar process: collection of a pool of direct evidence from a course or courses usually taken by juniors and seniors from across the university; a random sample was then drawn from this pool. If a test was used (Critical Thinking Assessment Test for creative and critical thinking or iSkills for information literacy), then a random sample of seniors was asked to participate. For the first two years, a group of graduate Teaching Fellows, eventually replaced by groups of faculty, used a modified VALUE rubric to evaluate the sample work. This analysis of direct evidence was then triangulated with survey data, such as NSSE data or LMU's Undergraduate Alumni Outcomes Survey. The analyses of each outcome were compiled into concise, clearly written reports shared with faculty, staff and students. As indicated in the institutional report, and confirmed repeatedly in conversations onsite, faculty and other service providers (such as the library, Center for Teaching Excellence, Academic Resource Center) actively engaged in a variety of follow-up conversations about the findings in order to enhance student learning. The final step in the process is surveying undergraduate departments to determine actions taken for improvement.

The follow-up conversations about the ULO results appear to be robust. For example, after disappointing results in oral communication, students are now being encouraged to utilize rooms available in the library to practice their presentations. The Academic Resources Center has enhanced its resources on oral communications skills. At a student research fair that included

oral presentations, faculty across disciplines discussed oral presentation requirements in their courses and discovered the absence of explicit learning opportunities and feedback devoted to teaching students these skills. As well, the provost and deans discussed the ULO assessment reports at their recent retreat on academic quality and rigor, and the deans followed up with their faculty in their colleges to work on improving oral communication skills, among others. Departments have not yet been surveyed on this outcome to determine actions taken for improvement.

Prior to the visit, the team had concerns about the sustainability of this assessment process given the large number of ULOs, the extensive time allotted to complete each assessment cycle, and the complexity and expense of the assessment processes and infrastructure. These concerns were allayed once onsite. Every conversation—from the president and provost to the deans, faculty leadership and program faculty—affirmed the meaningfulness and utility of the extensive assessment and program review processes underway in the university. When questioned about the sustainability of the elaborate assessment processes, the president and provost independently affirmed assessment as a “top priority” that has already added significant value and will continue to be funded at LMU. Others described it as sustainable because the complex system is a product of many years of assessment development at LMU, not something that started all at once. Another feature that generates confidence in its sustainability is the enthusiasm for and widespread faculty participation in some part of the ULO assessment process, whether it be contributing evidence, helping to develop a rubric, participating in analyzing one of the ULOs, or discussing the significance of the results for student learning in their own program. It appears that there are multiple ways for faculty to engage in the ULO assessment process without requiring overly burdensome time and labor commitments.

According to the institutional report and confirmed by the team, the assessment of the ULOs has: engaged faculty in every stage of the assessment process, thereby generating interest in the results; produced empirical data to inform curricular, pedagogical and student support improvements; and provided professional development for faculty in the areas of pedagogy, creating assignments, and enhancing student learning. The value of this process was corroborated during onsite interviews. Every group with whom the team met—including the Faculty Senate Executive Board, the deans, Student Affairs Research and Assessment Committee, the Assessment Advisory Committee, the University Core Curriculum Committee, the Academic Program Review Committee, program faculty—spoke about the value of assessment at LMU.

Many commented on major shifts in attitudes toward assessment since arriving eight, ten or more years ago: from initial resistance to the extra work to eventually understanding the value it adds to their teaching. As one faculty stated, “I see it differently now even in my own teaching, when I write the learning outcomes, when I sit down to talk with students. I see it as a tool for bringing them along and showing them what they’re supposed to be doing.” Another faculty member remarked, “These processes nudge, force, encourage us to change, including those who are assessment-averse.” Many groups mentioned how the ULO assessment process has been instrumental in spreading faculty awareness, buy-in, engagement and ownership of assessment (CFR 2.4).

The ULO assessment process is also credited with inspiring the outcomes-based design of the newly adopted core curriculum. All of the 700-plus courses that have been approved for the new core had to be explicitly aligned with the core outcomes, and all course proposals had to have assessment plans explicitly tied to activities and evaluation of student work. The

University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC), which oversees the implementation of the new core curriculum intends to build on the ULO assessment to evaluate the additional 25 learning outcomes in the new core, especially because many of these core outcomes apparently overlap with the ULOs. When this group, too, was questioned about the complexity of having so many outcomes and such a complex assessment task, members of the group readily articulated the benefits of the new outcomes-based design and the integration of the assessment process with that already underway for the ULOs. The Director of Assessment sits on the three key assessment committees (Assessment Advisory Group, UCCC, Student Affairs Research and Assessment), providing connections among the work of the various groups.

Team members repeatedly heard reference to a “huge cultural shift” or “paradigm shift” that has occurred at LMU in the past six to seven years. The institution-wide enthusiasm for assessment, the consistent articulation of its added value, and the development of a strong support infrastructure for assessing student learning outcomes are clear evidence of such a shift (CFR 3.4, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7). LMU is clearly a leader in the region in evaluating the core competencies now required of as part of the 2013 institutional review process. The first round of core competency evaluations have illustrated strengths and deficiencies in each of the five areas; but they now know much more about their students’ learning and are actively seeking to improve the pedagogy, curriculum and support services to strengthen student performance. It was clear that LMU has developed processes that are meaningful and useful to faculty, staff, students and administrators. The institution is modeling a culture of assessment (CFR 4.8). The team encourages LMU to continue its leadership in this area and also be mindful of finding ways to simplify the processes as they mature.

Defining and Promoting Student Success

The institution defines student success both in terms of retention and graduation as well as academic learning and learning related to their Catholic mission, including areas such as the development of the whole person, intercultural competence, and habit of service (CFRs 1.1, 2.9). Accordingly, their efforts to enhance student success span all of these areas.

Overall, the team found that LMU reviews a broad spectrum of quantitative and qualitative data about student success and has carried out significant work across the institution to understand retention and enhance persistence. The Institutional Research Office provides data and analysis to programs, for example, helping identify topics for an intervention course for the law program to improve student success in the program; subsequent analysis showed that average grades went up in some areas as a result, but went down in others, leading to further revisions to the intervention course.

The Retention and Graduation Committee report of May 23, 2103 indicated that retention and graduation rates were good, with the possible exception of African-American transfer students. The institution provided an additional year of data for the site visit, and the graduation rates are much higher. For undergraduates, the most recent overall six-year graduation rate is 75.8%; the rate varies by race and ethnicity from 67.3% to 88.9%. The overall lower division transfer six-year graduation rate is 74.0%, varying from 70.8% to 82.1% by ethnicity, and the overall upper division four-year graduation rate is 79.1%, varying from 69.2% to 80.5%. Thus the previous three years now stand out as anomalous when compared to years before that and the most recent year, and the team is no longer concerned about this graduation rate. For masters and EdD students, the ten-year historical average five-year graduation rates vary from 70% to 78% depending on the degree, with the exception of the MS degree, which has only a 45% graduation

rate. This particularly low five-year graduation rate for MS students was explained to the team to be the result of a substantial fraction of the MS students transferring to an MSE program after they had matriculated at LMU (CFRs 2.7, 2.10).

Improved graduation and retention rates are the goal of the institution's Retention Strategic Plan. The plan covers five main objectives areas, which are roughly data collection, advising, first-year experience, experiential learning, and student life, and breaks these down into forty-six specific strategies. The plan has a three-year implementation window. The year two status report was provided to the team, showing that roughly half of the strategies were marked as achieved, with progress on most of the others.

LMU provides a wide range of student support services, ranging from academic, to ministry, to community-based learning, to student life. Notably, the Athletics Department is part of Student Affairs, which has the benefit of keeping it integrated with the division's focus on supporting student success. Analogous to the academic enterprise, five learning outcomes derived from the campus ULOs have been defined for Student Affairs co-curricular activities, and a substantial assessment process has been created to monitor success and guide improvement. All departments in the Student Affairs division assess a common outcome each year, which last year concluded with a poster fair to share results and methodologies. One department each year conducts a program review, including a self-study and external review. Faculty and staff also review the results internally and provide suggestions for improvement. Members of the Student Affairs Research and Assessment Committee commented on the value of the process for generating guidance for improvement. This group will be reviewing and revising the administrative program review process this year to help programs develop three-year action plans out of the process. It is noteworthy that there is a full-time assessment person in

Student Affairs, and that there is significant coordination of assessment efforts between Student Affairs and the academic side (CFRs 2.10, 2.11). The academic and student affairs assessment committees share information between them and have begun to coordinate some assessment efforts, such as coordinating surveys and moving toward a sampling model for research to reduce over-surveying. Representatives from student affairs assessment also sit on one of the ULO assessment committees, as the ULOs are recognized as applying to the entire student experience.

In addition to all the direct evidence collected through the academic assessment described in Essays 1 and 2, as well as the co-curricular assessment described above, surveys provide a wealth of indirect evidence for many student success measures, including ULOs from pillars three and four (education of the whole person, and service of faith and the promotion of justice) and other mission-related measures. LMU tracks enrollment of graduates in professional schools, such as medical and dental schools, and the institutional report shows enrollment rates much higher than the national average. Alumni are also surveyed for post-graduate success measures (CFRs 2.6, 2.7).

Based on meeting with the Vice Presidents for Intercultural Affairs and for Mission and Ministry, as well as published documents by them that were provided to the team, the team learned that at LMU, diversity is understood through the lens of the Catholic mission and through ecclesial documents. The institutional vision for inclusivity is aided by seeing every human being as a child of God, embracing a commitment to the common good, and sharing a concern for the cultural progress of all people, especially the poor and afflicted. There is a desire for dialog so that the church can both share the wisdom of the Catholic faith as well as learn from the world. This leads to efforts to recruit and retain diverse students, staff, and faculty (CFR 1.5). Similarly, academic freedom is understood through the lens of the pursuit of truth

and the role of a Jesuit university being one where the church engages the wider culture. Thus the institution perceives value in having a dialog and experiencing different points of view (CFR 1.4).

Student government activity appears to be primarily focused on event programming, with only a thirteen-member student senate involved in consultation with the administration and faculty senate. Based on interviews with various administrators and student leaders, the team is under the impression that formal structures for student consultation are not well-developed. Certain administrative and faculty committees have student senate representation, such as Trustee committees and some university committees, but these committees often have specific purviews. For items falling outside these very specific purviews, it was reported to the team that student government consultation appears to be done on an ad-hoc basis. The team encourages the institution to consider exploration of whether a more formalized structure for student government consultation would be beneficial.

In summary, the team commends LMU for integrated planning based on the academic core of the institution, flowing from the strategic plan and leading to well-defined learning outcomes at the undergraduate degree, core competency, program, course and co-curricular levels. An elaborate network of assessment structures, sufficiently resourced and supported by staff, generates ongoing conversations about students' success across the university and provides regular feedback for continuous improvement in their efforts to support students effectively.

Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future, and Planning for the Changing Environment for Higher Education

In the institutional report, LMU discussed the various ways that it both carefully husbands its current resources and plans for future sustainability. LMU can be proud of its history of clean financial audits, balanced budgets and sound fiscal practices (CFR 3.5). LMU

provided additional evidence of sustainable financial management through a discussion of its “composite financial index,” reflecting more than just annual balanced budgets. While the report showed a fall in the index for 2012, more recent results obtained during the onsite visit show a return in 2013 and 2014 to the top category of financial strength.

As a primarily tuition-supported undergraduate institution, LMU appropriately focuses on maintaining strength in undergraduate enrollment, but also notes the enrollment challenges in some graduate programs, particularly the Loyola Law School. This parallels the substantial enrollment declines nationwide at law schools. Discussions with the president, CFO and other members of the executive team confirmed that LMU has in place a conservative plan for addressing this reduction in revenue now and into the future; LMU has the financial resiliency to weather this current “enrollment storm,” (CFR 3.5).

LMU also focused on sustaining educational effectiveness with adequate resources in the institutional report. The new assessment and program review infrastructure discussed earlier in this report is a key part of this focus. In addition, within the budget process at LMU, significant resources (\$15 million since 2007) have been devoted to faculty development, faculty scholarship support, academic and student support assessment and information technology training (CFRs. 3.4, 3.6, 3.7). Helping LMU to generate these resources is a zero-based budgeting process that forces each budget unit to find resources for many new initiatives within their own area by repurposing existing resources. Program units only receive new resources if linked carefully to the LMU Strategic Plan (CFR 4.2). Like many comparable institutions, LMU finds that linking actual resource allocation with strategic goals has been a challenge, and self-identified this in the institutional report as an area for improvement. When the institutional report was written (October 2013) the university stated that LMU “has *just developed* the process

for integrating the [unit] plans into the annual budget process [emphasis added].” By the time the team visited campus only one year later, LMU had successfully implemented the process for FY2015. The team was impressed with the level of acceptance and support for the strategic budget process, across faculty, staff and administration.

LMU has recognized and responded to the changing landscape of higher education. This focus is reflected in several themes within LMU’s Strategic Plan: increasing affordability, maintaining competitiveness in the market for students, being accountable for the quality of education provided and supporting excellence in graduate education.

LMU’s focus on affordability has led to moderation in tuition increases over the past several years as well as an ambitious plan to increase the endowment in support of financial aid. It is quite evident from the team’s conversations that the Board is very engaged in the institution’s discussions about affordability and also very concerned about increased levels of student debt. The Board is asking hard questions about ways to reduce the net cost of an LMU education (CFRs 3.9, 4.1). This is a topic that should continue to be on the university’s agenda for the foreseeable future.

Closely related to affordability in public discussions of higher education is accountability for the quality of education and the level of student learning. As described at length earlier in this team report, LMU has instituted a comprehensive program of assessment across all university units. Further, budget allocations are closely tied to the Strategic Plan and zero-based budgeting forces individual units to carefully assess any new initiatives.

Maintaining competitiveness for LMU has driven key changes in both technology and graduate education. LMU has adopted (June 2014) a “Vision Statement for Blended and Online Learning: Guiding Principles,” the product of the Technology-Enhanced Learning Subcommittee

of the Provost's Planning Council. This statement is backed by significant resources and continued work by the Subcommittee, which is charged with identifying issues in the initial implementation of the Vision and which includes significant faculty representation (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). An example of increased resources is the level of support for technology-enhanced curriculum development in the School of Education: multiple instructional technology and design specialists are available to help faculty implement technology in their courses, along with funds for faculty to take in-house courses on technology-enhanced curricular design. One issue of concern to the visiting team was that the Subcommittee charge only extends through December 2014: the team hopes that LMU will at that point establish a permanent and representative group that continues to own the pursuit of the new vision for technology in student learning.

Graduate education, outside of the Schools of Business, Education and Law, has not traditionally been a focus at LMU. Instead, programs have grown organically and on an ad hoc basis without institution-wide standards for funding, quality or approval. The intent of the Strategic Plan is to increase LMU's focus on graduate education, recognizing that "the changing employment marketplace suggests an increase in the number of working adults seeking professional or graduate-level training...and changing economic conditions ...put pressure on students to complete their ...studies in less time." (Strategic Plan 2012-2020, Theme 2: Leadership in Graduate Education.) At the time of this visit, LMU is just at the initial stages of this endeavor. A part-time allocation of one current dean's time has been directed to graduate education, and a Graduate Education Task Force has been formed and charged with creating the guidelines for implementation of the plan.

While draft guidelines have been developed for financial and academic approval of new programs, the team urges LMU to consider whether full-time and permanent oversight of this section of the strategic plan might be needed to insure the strategic growth in graduate education that the plan envisions. In addition, the metrics currently in place for measuring progress on the plan should reflect the objectives and actions delineated in the plan (CFR 4.3). For example, how many “innovative opportunities for students to complete both an undergraduate degree and a graduate degree” have been developed (Strategic Plan 2012-2020 Theme 2); what new resources have been devoted to graduate student services? The metrics, while they represent currently available data, only tangentially reflect plan objectives. The team notes that this recommendation about strategic plan metrics applies across all themes of the plan.

Integrative Essay

In the Integrative Essay, LMU outlined the learning that occurred as a result of engaging in the self-study and preparing for the review. The institution noted that the process affirmed the work the university has focused on for the last few years in key areas linked to student success and academic development. LMU also noted areas for improvement including career pathways, graduate education, and aligning resources with strategic priorities.

During the site visit, evidence reviewed by the team indicated LMU appropriately identified areas of success and areas for improvement in the institutional report. Furthermore, the team noted that progress had been made in all of the areas that the institution had identified as opportunities for improvement. The team found evidence that processes had been established or tightened to better align resources with strategic priorities. Discussions with key stakeholders and internal campus constituencies in the areas of career pathways and graduate education had

progressed. Indeed, interview evidence indicated the areas for improvement are now priorities and are targeted for further action.

SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

LMU presented a thorough and organized electronic exhibit portfolio. The team examined the materials and exhibits provided as part of the review and noted no concerns with any of the required items. Furthermore, the team noted no concerns with the items listed below in A-F.

- A. Compliance Checklist
- B. Self-review under the Standards
- C. Required Data Exhibits
- D. Response to previous reviews, including Commission actions, finance review, and retention/graduation review
- E. Assessment of student learning
- F. Program review

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

It was clear to the team that LMU thoughtfully and carefully prepared for the site visit. The self-study was carefully crafted and involved broad participation across the LMU community. The self-study fulfilled the intended outcomes for the complete comprehensive review in such a way that LMU gained a strong sense of what has changed since the 2008 Special Visit, what is working well, and what are the potential growth points in the future. The team found no problems, concerns or issues with any of the WSCUC Standards.

Commendations

The LMU community is to be commended for:

1. An effective strategic planning process that has resulted in strengthening a culture of shared values, and a focus on academic excellence. The strategic plan serves to integrate many activities

and initiatives across the university. Indeed, the strategic plan guides prioritization of institutional commitments at multiple levels within the institution.

2. The extent to which the culture of assessment permeates the institution. The multiple layers are comprehensive, complex, and integrated, and characterized by strong support structures.

LMU has engaged in a meaningful assessment of all five undergraduate core competencies.

3. Demonstrating sound fiscal management. Thus the institution is able to invest in strategic initiatives to move the institution forward and be resilient in the face of major challenges in the higher education environment.

4. Strengthening relationships and communication within the administration and between the administration and faculty. LMU community members noted strong faculty governance and consultation with the administration, as well as improved trust and transparency.

Recommendations

The team recommends that LMU:

1. Continue to evolve the metrics in the strategic plan to be more reflective of institutional values and to ensure that they effectively measure the achievement of progress on strategic plan goals in actionable ways. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.6)

2. Take steps to ensure timely completion of the program review process including MOU, action plans, and follow up assessment plans. (CFR 2.7)

3. Carefully monitor recently launched initiatives (CFRs 2.1, 2.2a, 2.2b)

including:

A. the core curriculum and the impact on student learning within the core and subsequent learning in their major courses of study.

B. the university-wide impact of the switch from a 3 unit to 4 unit curriculum in Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts with particular attention to impact on student progress to the degree; impact on faculty workload; and how the unit change may affect programs of study students select. For example, will differential course units in one college limit double major or minors and/or will differential course units discourage students from interdisciplinary study?

C. potential growth in graduate education that will require additional resources, leadership and commitments to graduate students services which the institution has not yet identified.

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Checklist
- B. Credit Hour Review
- C. Student Complaints Review
- D. Marketing and Recruitment Review
- E. Transfer Policy Review
- F. Off-Campus Location Review
- G. Distance Education Review

COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST FOR REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION

(For Pilot 2 institutions)

Name of Institution: Loyola Marymount University

Review Date: December 10, 2013 and September 24, 2014

Instructions to institution:

Please provide a link to each document designated below, or note where hard copies are filed. Be sure that the reviewer will be able to see where this document is published or located. If the listed document is not available but a comparable document is available, please reference that document. Information or policies published in the institution's Catalog can be referenced as such and not repeated. If a requested document or policy is not applicable to the institution, please mark NA.

The Commission expects institutions to complete the compliance audit once. In subsequent reaffirmation reviews, the institution will update only those documents that have been revised.

Instructions to team:

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report as appropriate.

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	WSCUC Check
1.1	Mission statement	http://mission.lmu.edu/missionstatement/	X
1.2	Public posting of student achievement	http://academics.lmu.edu/spee/officeofinstitutionalresearch/officialstatisticsandotherreporting/studentachievement/	X
1.3	Organization chart	See Appendix A	X
1.4	Academic Freedom Policy	In Faculty Handbook, page 27 http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademic/rankenure/documentsandpdfs/LMU%20Faculty%20Handbook_2014-15.pdf	X

1.5	Diversity statements and procedures	<p>President's statement on diversity: http://academics.lmu.edu/president/diversity/ Discriminatory Harassment Policy: http://admin.lmu.edu/media/admin/hr/FINAL%20Discriminatory%20Harassment%20and%20Complaint%20Process%20Rev.02%2024%202014.pdf Guidelines for recruiting faculty for mission and diversity: http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademic/s/provost/documents/RECRUITING%20AND%20HIRING%20TEACHER%20SCHOLARS%20FOR%20MISSION%20%20070912.pdf</p>	X
1.6	Documents setting forth authority of controlling or sponsoring entity	N/A	
1.7.a	Catalog (online) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies	<p>University Bulletin: http://bulletin.lmu.edu/</p>	X
1.7.b	Student complaint and grievance policies	http://academics.lmu.edu/registrar/services/studentconsumercomplaintprocess/	X
1.7.c	Grade appeals policy	http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=250#Grades and Grading	X
1.7.d	Faculty complaint and grievance policies	In Faculty Handbook, page 27	X
1.7.e	Staff complaint and grievance policies	See Appendix B	X
1.7.f	Employee handbook or equivalent	<p>All Human Resources policies and procedures are available on an internal website. New employees sign a form acknowledging that they have been informed about how to access these policies and accept responsibility for reading them. See Appendix C In addition, information about employee benefits is available at http://admin.lmu.edu/hr/benefits/</p>	X
1.7.g	Redacted examples of student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, degree levels, etc	See Appendix D	X
1.7.h	Policies for changing grades	http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=250#Grades and Grading	X

1.7.i	Tuition and fee schedule	http://bus.lmu.edu/controller/osfs/studentaccounts/tuitionfeesroomboard/	X
1.7.j	Tuition refund policy	http://bus.lmu.edu/controller/osfs/studentaccounts/refunds/refundpolicy/	X
1.7.k	Policy on credit hour; processes for review of assignment of credit; examples of reviews of syllabi to ensure equivalency among kinds of courses	http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademic/provost/documents/LMU%20Credit%20Hour%20Policy_Final.pdf	X
1.7.l	Policy on human subjects in research, if applicable	www.lmu.edu/Assets/Academic+Affairs+Division/Academic+Grants+Office/downloads/Human+Subjects+Policy+2008.pdf	X
1.8	Independent annual audits of finances	Audited financial statement submitted with WSCUC annual report.	X
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each	http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=265	X
2.2	For bachelor's degrees: General education requirements	http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=248	X
2.6	Placement data, if available	These are reported in the institutional report, in Essay 3	X
2.7	Program review process and schedule	http://academics.lmu.edu/spee/aprc/	X
2.8	Policies regarding faculty scholarship and creative activity	See Faculty Handbook, p 18 See also research-related policies at http://academics.lmu.edu/orsp/policies/	X
2.10	Policy on student evaluation of faculty	See Faculty Handbook, p 7	X
2.12	Academic calendar	http://academics.lmu.edu/registrar/academicresources/academiccalendars/ (on the semester system)	X
2.13	Examples of recruitment and advertising materials	http://admission.lmu.edu/ http://graduate.lmu.edu/	X
2.14	Policy on transfer of credit	http://www.lmu.edu/resources/articulation.htm	X
3.1	Staff development policies	http://admin.lmu.edu/hr/learningdevelopment/ (not exactly policies but opportunities for workshops and training)	X

3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., full-time, part-time, tenure-track, by program as relevant	For a count of faculty by classifications, and by college and school, see Appendix E See also lists of faculty within each of the colleges/schools: http://bellarmine.lmu.edu/about/ourfaculty/ http://cba.lmu.edu/facultyresearch/meetthefaculty/ http://cfa.lmu.edu/faculty/ http://www.lls.edu/aboutus/facultyadministration/faculty/ http://soe.lmu.edu/faculty/ http://sftv.lmu.edu/about/faculty/ http://cse.lmu.edu/faculty/	X
3.3.a	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures	See Faculty Handbook, pp 7-10 See also Faculty Handbook Addenda, pp 1-30	X
3.3.b	Faculty handbook or equivalent	http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademic/s/ranktenure/documentsandpdfs/LMU%20Faculty%20Handbook_2014-15.pdf	X
3.4.a	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	http://academics.lmu.edu/ofd/newfacultyorientation/	X
3.4.b	Policies on rights/responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	See Faculty Handbook, pp 2-4	X
3.5.a	Most recent financial aid audits	Submitted in LMU's WSCUC Annual Report	X
3.5.b	Last federal composite score if applicable	Submitted in LMU's WSCUC Annual Report	X
3.5.c	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates	Submitted in LMU's WSCUC Annual Report	X
3.9.a	List of governing board members with CVs	List of Trustees: http://www.lmu.edu/about/administration/trustees.htm CVs are maintained in the Office of the President.	X
3.9.b	List of governing board committees with members	See Appendix F	X
3.9.c	Minutes of board meetings for last two years (where located, not actual minutes)	Located in the president's office	X
3.9.d	Governing board by-laws and operations manual	See Appendix G	X

3.10.a	CEO biographical information	http://academics.lmu.edu/president/biography/	X
3.10.b	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of the president/CEO	The Board by-laws empower the Board to hire and remove the president, and define the duties of and evaluate the president. There is no separate policy for evaluating the president. Board minutes confirm that the evaluation of the president takes place.	X
3.11.a	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority if applicable	http://www.lmu.edu/AssetFactory.aspx?vid=79025	X
3.11.b	Faculty governance organization chart if applicable	N/A	
4.1	Strategic plan and related documents	http://academics.lmu.edu/strategicplan/	X
4.2	Description of planning process including plan for monitoring of implementation	http://academics.lmu.edu/strategicplan/provostsplanningcouncil/ (through Provost's Planning Council)	X
4.4	New program approval process	http://academics.lmu.edu/spee/aprc/ (through Academic Planning and Review Committee)	X
4.8	List of major industry or other advisory committees	Each college and school has an advisory committee consisting of industry representatives, community members and alumni.	X

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademics/provost/documents/LMU%20Credit%20Hour%20Policy_Final.pdf
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The current Academic Program Review process includes review of credit hour assignments.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Schedule of on-ground courses: http://academics.lmu.edu/media/lmuacademics/officeoftheregistrar/documents/schedules/Fall%202014%20Schedule%20of%20Classes.pdf
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 3
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? online
	What degree level(s)? MA
	What discipline(s)? Literacy
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or	How many syllabi were reviewed? 12

equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	What kinds of courses? Laboratory, clinical, practicum
	What degree level(s)? Graduate and undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Chemistry, Education, Communication
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 10
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? MS, MA, MBA, BS, BA
	What degree level(s)? Graduate and undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Economics, Philosophy, Communication Studies, Marital and Family Therapy, Business Administration, Civil Engineering, Environmental Science
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Program information from the Bulletin: http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=265

Review Completed By: Herbert Lee
 Date: 9/25/14

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records. (See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where? http://academics.lmu.edu/registrar/services/studentconsumercomplaintprocess/
	Comments: The “Loyola Marymount University Resource Card” is available on the web and is annually shared with students and faculty: http://bellarmine.lmu.edu/media/lmustudentaffairs/administration/2014-2015_Resource_Card.pdf
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Please describe briefly: The procedure is outlined in the policy: http://academics.lmu.edu/registrar/services/studentconsumercomplaintprocess/
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments: Individual offices maintain records of student complaints that are presented to their office. When a student complaint is presented that touches on multiple offices (e.g., Financial Aid, Registrar, Student Affairs’ Dean’s Office) the staff in those offices work together to resolve the issue, and all keep records of the incident. If a pattern of complaint occurs then staff track and investigate the pattern, including reaching out to other offices.

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The Director of Admissions affirms that LMU has never and will never provide incentive compensation to employees or third parties for their success in securing student enrollments.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Information about the typical length of time to degree is available at the following link: http://academics.lmu.edu/spee/officeofinstitutionalresearch/officialstatisticsandotherreporting/studentachievement/ Overall cost of the degree is shown at: http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=246
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Information about the kinds of jobs for which graduates are qualified can be found on colleges' and programs' websites. Several examples are provided below.

<http://cfa.lmu.edu/academics/careerpathways/>

<http://bellarmine.lmu.edu/politicalscience/thedegree/>

<http://bellarmine.lmu.edu/sociology/students/alumniintheworkplace/>

<http://cba.lmu.edu/academicprogramscenters/undergraduateprograms/majorsdegrees/accounting/careerpaths/>

<http://cba.lmu.edu/academicprogramscenters/undergraduateprograms/majorsdegrees/aims/careerpaths/>

<http://cse.lmu.edu/department/biology/degreeprogram/careers/>

<http://cse.lmu.edu/department/civilengineering/careers/>

<http://sftv.lmu.edu/programs/undergrad/production/>

<http://sftv.lmu.edu/programs/grad/wptv/>

<http://soe.lmu.edu/admissions/programs/bilingualeducation/>

<http://soe.lmu.edu/admissions/programs/counseling/>

Information about the employment of graduates:

<http://studentaffairs.lmu.edu/administration/osvpsa/researchassessment/post-graduateoutcomes/>

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

Review Completed By: Herbert Lee

Date: 9/25/14

TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? http://bulletin.lmu.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=250&hl=transfer&returnto=search#Transfer_Credit_and_Articulation
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The policy states the criteria established by LMU regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education: “Approved undergraduate courses with a grade of C (2.0) or higher may be counted for LMU credit. Credit will not be accepted for courses which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are taken at colleges not accredited, trade schools, extension programs, or correspondence programs or have been identified as being remedial or in other ways as being non-transferable. • Are taken on a CR/NC or Pass/Fail basis where the CR or Pass grade is not equivalent to a grade of C or higher. • Are identified as duplicates to course work already completed (excludes courses that may be taken multiple times for degree credit). • Exceed the limitations of resident requirements. • Exceed the 60 semester hour maximum allowed for undergraduate course work from community colleges, or exceed the 90 semester hour maximum allowed for undergraduate course work from four-year institutions.”

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

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

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

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

Review Completed By: Herbert Lee

Date: 9/25/14

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Loyola Marymount University
Type of Visit: Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Patricia L. Prado-Olmos
Date/s of review: September 16, 2014

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

1. Site Name and Address
Christ Cathedral – Pastoral Center
13280 Chapman Ave
Garden Grove, CA
2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

One program is offered at this site – the MA in Pastoral Theology. The current enrollment is one cohort of 17 students. One 3-unit course plus a 1-2 unit pastoral integration component are offered each semester. The program is completed in three years. Faculty based at the LMU Westchester campus travel to teach at the Christ Cathedral site each semester. A liaison oversees the pastoral integration component.

The program began at the request of the Diocese of Orange. The Diocese identified a need for an accredited program in pastoral theology in the region. LMU and the Diocese developed a collaborative partnership and launched the first cohort of MA in Pastoral Theology Students in fall, 2006.

The Roman Catholic Diocese of Orange purchased Christ Cathedral in 2011 from the Chrystal Cathedral Ministries. The site also houses a Pastoral Center and Cathedral Academy school. The MA program is delivered in a classroom located in the Pastoral Center.

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

The review included a visit to the facility in Garden Grove. At the site interviews with the program director, Dr. Daniel Smith-Christopher, Dr. Cecilia Gonzalez-Andrieu and students were conducted. Brief

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
8/21/13

Conversations with Bishop Kevin Vann, Chancellor Shirl Jiacomi (Chancellor of the Diocese) and Olivia Cornejo, head of the institute for pastoral ministries also occurred and serve as evidence for this review.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	N/A	
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	The institution considers this off-campus site as an example of their mission in action. The program began in response to a request from the Diocese in Orange and LMU responded with a commitment of tenureline faculty as instructors, a rigorous curriculum delivery and investment in oversight of student “clinical” experiences at their work sites. In all aspects of administration, curriculum delivery and student support, the program is considered a fully developed LMU program that is delivered at a different site.	None needed
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	LMU faculty are welcomed and supported at the site. Students receive all communications regarding student services and student life from the campus. They appreciate the connection and reported feeling like LMU students. Students travel to the main campus as needed for research purposes. They’ve established their own	None needed

	learning culture at the site.	
<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)	The physical environment is supportive of instruction. The classroom is fully equipped as a “smart” classroom. The site is run as a Pastoral Center for the Diocese of Orange. As such it is fully occupied and staffed. The site is open and staffed when students arrive. The faculty and students know the Center staff. A liaison who serves as the supervisor for the Pastoral Integration Component of the MA program is also on site.	None needed
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	All advising, counseling, library, computing and other student services are provided by the main campus. Students reported that all main campus personnel are responsive to requests and that they have not encountered problems in this area.	None needed
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Full-time, tenure line faculty teach the courses. They are compensated for travel to the site. The faculty retain complete control over curriculum development and assessment of student learning.	None needed
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	The program was designed by main campus based tenure line faculty. The MA curriculum at the site is the same as the curriculum delivered at the main campus.	None needed

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>The program model at this site is distinct in that it is a cohort model and a cohort is admitted once every three years. Only one cohort is enrolled in the program at any point in time. The retention and graduation rate is close to 100%. Attrition is generally caused by work responsibilities of the students.</p>	<p>None needed</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Student learning is assessed through the same program review process as that used on the main campus.</p>	<p>None needed</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The program faculty recently administered an extensive quality assurance survey to all currently enrolled students and alumni. This survey provided valuable data on the program quality and areas for improvement. Evidence from this survey and interviews suggest that this program needs to be strongly connected to the practical and applied realities of the students. The course sequence may need to be more tailored to reflect the identities, community context of the Diocese and job responsibilities of the students.</p>	<p>None needed</p>

DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Loyola Marymount University

Name of reviewer/s: Kristine Chase

Date/s of review: September 24-26, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs² and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

MA in Reading Instruction, which included review of the following course sites:

- EDES 6354 - Reading Development and Instruction
- EDES 6365 - Introduction to Reading Difficulties
- EDES 6356 – Practicum I: Diagnosis & Intervention in Reading
- EDES 6350 - Linguistics and Reading
- EDES 6103 - Curriculum and Instructional Leadership
- EDES 6351 - Assessment of Reading Performance
- EDES 6353 - Technology and Reading
- EDES 6352 - Seminar: The Reading Professional
- EDES 6995 - Comprehensive Exam: Reading Instruction
- EDVR 6100 - Anthropological Analysis of Cultural Diversity

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

LMU offers just one program via distance education: an MA in Reading Instruction. The program began as a certificate program in 2003 in response to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles to train reading specialists for their schools. It was then approved by WSCUC as a Masters program in 2005. In the early years of the program FTE averaged 15-20 students. Recent FTE enrollments are much smaller (averaging about 3 over the past few years.) Reasons for the decrease include redirection of funds to STEM training and reduction in demand for reading specialists. The Dean of the SOE is committed to revitalizing the program with more focus on reading instruction in urban schools.

LMU uses Blackboard as the platform, and almost all instruction is asynchronous, though some faculty do use platforms such as WebEx for live presentations and evaluations.

² See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

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

This review was part of the onsite WSCUC accreditation review (Pilot 2). The team reviewed the bulletin material (on the LMU website), accessed all of the above courses and read through the available material on each course website, including parts of the student discussion forums, and met with Candace Poindexter, Director, and Ernesto Colin, faculty, in Online Programs.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>A Vision statement for online learning was adopted in summer 2014. This vision statement incorporates the university mission. Up until very recently, online courses and programs have existed on an ad hoc basis primarily determined by faculty interest and capability, as well as in response to outside requests.</p> <p>This particular online program was developed to increase access to a high-need K-12 program aimed at culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse students. This is aligned with LMU’s mission to promote justice and equity.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>LMU, like most institutions, finds this is a challenge for all online courses and programs that do not incorporate at least some face-to-face time. Students are provided with links to all regular student services, as well as library access remotely. They are</p>	

	welcome to participate in graduation. Instructors find that the intensive use of discussion boards and blogs creates interpersonal interaction similar to that in the regular classroom.	
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	The Blackboard platform is used extensively in higher education and is robust. It is supplemented at LMU by live Webinars (such as WebEx) as well as YouTube videos produced by students and faculty. All are provided with adequate instruction on their use. The university IT staff is very supportive and available, though they do not yet have a 24-hour help desk.	LMU, as a “late adopter” of online technology, should take the opportunity to determine single platforms for the various types of online courses: asynchronous, synchronous (webinars) and hybrid. This insures students have a well-supported and consistent interaction with the institution.
<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	Students are provided with online links to all student services offices, and encouraged to use them if needed. The library has been proactive in digitizing video resources needed for the program.	
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	Both full time and part time faculty teach in the program; the majority of the courses are taught by full-time faculty. The full-time faculty teach both online and regular classes; thus the faculty are regularly involved in curriculum development. Support for faculty development in online teaching is extensive: the SOE has 3.5 FTE instructional designers	

	<p>available for faculty assistance in course preparation as well as access to the LMU-wide Center for Teaching Excellence and courses on online teaching offered under the “Quality Matters” grant from the Provost’s Office.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings?</p>	<p>The original program was designed by the current program director in response to a request from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. The program director has continued to direct program design; individual faculty have responsibility for course design. Since faculty teach in both the online and classroom versions of the programs, courses content and quality are the same.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Since its inception, about 3 to 5 students per year have graduated from the program.</p> <p>While the program has not kept specific retention records, the program director estimates that retention is close to 90%.</p>	<p>As this program is revitalized, it is recommended that the SOE maintain more specific data on student demographics, retention, and other salient characteristics, and determine goals for the various metrics.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do</p>	<p>This online program is subject to the same program review process as all programs at LMU. The most recent was done in</p>	

<p>these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>2013, and was based on assessments of student projects administered mid- and end-of-program as well as exit surveys. The assessment showed overall high levels of learning, with specific areas for improvement: how to support English language learners, and how to integrate technology into reading instruction. These areas have been addressed through increased focus in other courses, as well as an added course on technology.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>N.A. All courses in the program are developed at LMU.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>See the above comments on student learning.</p>	