

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

To: Chapman University

March 15 - 17, 2023

Team Roster

Jim Gash, Chair
President, Pepperdine University

Regina Eisenbach, Assistant Chair
Dean, Academic Advising and Academic Programs, CSU San Marcos

Cindy Bumgarner
Assistant Vice Provost and Chief of Staff VPUE, University of California Berkeley

Elizabeth Giddens
Director, Institutional Effectiveness & Strategic Initiatives University of San Diego

Matthew Nehmer
President/CEO, The Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law

Mark Goor
Vice President, WSCUC Review Liaison

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	7
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	7
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements	9
1) Standard 1	9
2) Standard 2	11
3) Standard 3	14
4) Standard 4	16
C. Component 8: Institution-specific themes	18
1) Impact on Students	18
2) Role of Faculty	20
3) Research Office	21
D. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement	22
SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	24
APPENDICES	26
A. Federal Compliance Forms	26
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review	
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	
3. Student Complaints Review	
4. Transfer Credit Review	
B. Off-Campus Locations Review	34
C. Distance Education Review	41

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

The institution that is now known as Chapman University was founded in 1861 as “Hesperian College” in Woodland, California by members of the Disciples of Christ. The school was renamed “Chapman College” in 1934 to honor Charles C. Chapman, a Disciples leader who helped the college survive economic challenges during the Great Depression. In 1954, Chapman College moved to a new campus in Orange, California. Chapman College became Chapman University in 1991 and the Rinker Health Science Campus opened in nearby Irvine in 2014.

Today, Chapman University describes itself as a “comprehensive private research university” with a mission “to provide personalized education of distinction that leads to inquiring, ethical, and productive lives of global citizens.” Its student body comprises approximately 10,000 students, consisting of just under 8,000 undergraduates and just over 2,000 graduate students. Chapman’s faculty consists of approximately 560 full-time faculty and 640 part-time instructors who teach at Chapman’s 11 schools and colleges. These schools are: Argyros School of Business and Economics; Attallah College of Educational Studies; College of Performing Arts; Crean College of Health and Behavioral Sciences; Dodge College of Film and Media Arts; Fowler School of Engineering; Fowler School of Law; Schmid College of Science and Technology; School of Communication; School of Pharmacy; and Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences. Chapman has earned specialized accreditations for its various programs. The Pharmacy School and the graduate programs in the Crean College are located in Irvine at the Rinker campus, while the undergraduate programs in the Crean College and the rest of the schools and colleges are located in Orange. All told, more than 50,000 students have graduated from one of these 11 schools and colleges.

Chapman’s offers 71 majors and 70 minors, as well as 56 master’s degree programs and eight doctoral degrees. In 2021, Chapman sold its subsidiary Brandman University, which offered both online

educational courses and degrees, as well as degree completion programs for non-traditional students. At present, Chapman does not offer any degree programs online.

Chapman is led by President Daniele Struppa, who was appointed by Chapman's Board of Trustees in 2016. Chapman achieved the Carnegie classification as an R2 institution in 2018. Also in 2018, Chapman launched a strategic plan entitled, "Engineering the Future," after which three new schools were created (Pharmacy, Fowler Engineering, and Communication). Following a summer 2022 strategic planning retreat attended by more than 100 members of the Chapman community (including the full Board of Trustees, Chapman's senior leadership team, and the president of the Faculty Senate) and a series of town halls, Chapman launched a five-year strategic plan in early 2023 entitled, "Our Path to Greatness." This five-year plan was cast as the first in a series of three new five-year plans Chapman is embarking upon.

Chapman was first accredited in 1956, was last reaffirmed in 2013, and was approved in 2020 for the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR) that is the focus of this report. Chapman selected *Research and Creative Activity* as its theme.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

Team members independently studied the Chapman TPR institutional report and accompanying documents provided by the institution in anticipation of the accreditation visit. Team members also completed worksheets to summarize the detailed information, noting strengths/areas of good practice, weaknesses/areas for improvement, and specific questions for further inquiry relative to the WSCUC Components, Thematic areas, and Standards.

The chair had two separate conversations with the university president prior to the in-person accreditation visit to the Orange campus. Additionally, the chair conducted an off campus visit to the Rinker graduate campus in Irvine. Team worksheets and meeting notes were synthesized and reviewed collectively during a pre-visit team zoom call and a pre-visit in-person meeting. Chapman's Accreditation

Liaison Officer (ALO) prepared a draft schedule for the team prior to the visit. The team reviewed the visit schedule and assigned team members to specific interview sessions. A confidential email account was established to allow for greater participation from the campus community and to receive any information that might be deemed sensitive. This email account was monitored by the assistant chair and the contents were shared with all the team members.

The accreditation visit began with a team executive planning session on Tuesday, March 14, 2023, at which the team reviewed the final visit schedule and identified specific lines of inquiry for each individual and group meeting. The campus visit started on Wednesday, March 15, 2023. Over the next 2.5 days, the team met with a broad range of campus constituencies, including university leaders, campus administrators, faculty, staff, students representing both undergraduate and graduate programs, and university trustees. All those with whom the team spoke were respectful of the accreditation process and candid in their answers to questions.

The team learned a great deal about the institution, its organizational structure, its mission and values, and its endeavors toward achieving its future strategic goals. The visit ended on Friday, March 17, 2023, with a private meeting between the team chair and university president, followed by a public exit meeting during which the final commendations and recommendations were read aloud. The team recognizes the considerable work that the institution put into preparing its report and in responding to requests for additional documents or adjustments to the schedule. The team thanks Chapman University for providing a smooth visit with warm hospitality and excellent technical support.

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

The team commends Chapman University for the breadth and detail of the review and report. Chapman's institutional report was well organized and thoughtful. The institution's exploration of themes outlined in the TPR proposal seems to have resulted in productive reflection and actions that the university believes will contribute to continued development of its focus on research and creative

activity. It was apparent to the team that significant time and energy was invested in data gathering, writing the essays, and compiling substantial supporting documentation. Data in the report were drawn from document reviews (including direct reviews of student work), surveys (local and national), inventories, and discussions with the various constituencies. The report also thoughtfully addresses issues that emerged from the prior reaffirmation of accreditation. The team appreciates the institution's honest self-appraisal that, while improvements in many areas have been made, there is still opportunity to reach the institution's full potential.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

In its March 7, 2014, letter, the Commission emphasized the following areas in its recommendations: (1) broader dissemination of, and engagement with, data, analyses, and conclusions; (2) Continued attention to monitoring key institutional variables; (3) refining campus perceptions of diversity; and (4) recalibration of faculty promotion and tenure process. An Interim Report focusing on the institution's efforts to achieve greater diversity was submitted in Spring 2017.

Regarding dissemination of data, Chapman provided evidence of strategic efforts to share assessment results, data, and analytical tools to the campus community. In addition, the team found that various participants in meetings seemed comfortable with mentioning data and using it to frame questions or responses. (CFR 1.2, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.6)

In terms of monitoring key institutional variables, Chapman engaged qualified independent auditors and has had unqualified audit reports each year since the last WSCUC report in 2013. Furthermore, the university monitors key variables including enrollment trends, expenditures by month compared to previous years, and spending compared to current year operating budget. The Board of Trustees also received interim financial reports several times a year. Consequently, the team concluded that Chapman has made good progress on this recommendation. (CFRs 1.3, 3.9, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

A central component of reporting progress on diversity and inclusion was provided in the Chapman University Strategic Plan for Diversity and Inclusion. This multi-year, campus-wide effort brought the community together to develop strategic priorities towards making progress on all DEI measures. In addition to appointing Chapman's first vice president of diversity, equity, and inclusion, the creation of that office has provided leadership for diversity initiatives including the Latinx Staff and Faculty Forum, the Black Staff and Faculty Forum, the LGBTQIA Staff and Faculty Forum, the DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) Taskforce, the Disability Advocacy Committee, and the Student

Government DEI Subcommittee. Other accomplishments include mandatory diversity training for undergraduate students, DEI training for faculty search committees, and allocating funds to diversify faculty. In terms of diversifying the student body, Chapman has made progress with all populations. One area that can still be improved is with Black students, whose numbers are still lagging compared to other populations; however, there are clear plans to make progress in that area, as well to support DEI efforts in the curriculum. (CFR 1.5)

The final recommendation, recalibration of faculty tenure and promotion processes, was addressed with three large-scale efforts including: (1) review of unit criteria for tenure and promotion with each of the 11 schools and colleges (with a lens toward ensuring clarity of expectations aligned with the research direction of the institution); (2) ongoing series of workshops on both campuses to give faculty an in-person opportunity to ask questions of leadership and faculty peers; and (3) conversations between the Provost and Faculty Personnel Council to ensure alignment of the application of standards. These efforts seem to address the issue identified by the team and Commission in the last review, yet the work must be ongoing given the different expectations of faculty hired many years ago versus recent hires. (CFRs 2.8, 3.3)

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

In addition to reflecting on these efforts to address the Commission's recommendations, the institution's response to the COVID-19 crisis should be commended. Chapman demonstrated concern for the safety of students, faculty, and staff in their return to in-person instruction in fall 2021. Further, staff was added to the Office of Student Psychological Counseling Services to support mental health needs of students, and free counseling is offered to all graduate students. In terms of financial support, the university's hardship fund was used to help students in need. The institution's strong vision and

principles allowed it to get through the pandemic and continue to make progress towards its strategic goals.

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

Because Chapman has chosen to pursue the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of accreditation, the Institutional Report is focused on the chosen theme of *Research and Creative Activity*. Consequently, it does not address the standards or CFRs in detail. However, the self-review under the standards was the charge of the WSCUC Self-Study Steering Committee who were responsible for Components 1, 2, and 9 along with the federal worksheets.

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1 – 1.4)

Chapman has clear and published mission, vision, and values statements. Also, each major field of study has established program learning outcomes with a rigorous process to assess those outcomes. These assessments, including assessing the general education (GE) program, are published online to provide transparency and inform continuous improvement. The institution also tracks and makes available online measures of retention and graduation.

The university posts academic freedom statements in several offices across campus and they are published in Office of the Provost policies, Faculty and Staff Handbooks, and both the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. There is also a clear Student Code that includes policies governing the student experience.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) is a strategic priority at Chapman, with many initiatives and projects designed to promote DEI across all campus offices. The university also uses hiring criteria that explicitly prohibit discrimination in accordance with all local, state, and federal laws. Similarly, the Office of Admission advances DEI efforts by actively recruiting and encouraging students from diverse populations to apply.

Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.5 – 1.8)

While Chapman has been associated with the Christian Church (the Disciples of Christ) and, more recently, with the United Church of Christ, it is not a faith-based institution, and its institutional and educational decisions are not influenced by any church. This is codified in the University Bylaws, specifying that the Christian Church Board of Trustees are ex-officio members.

The university provides clear information to prospective students about academic programs, co-curricular programs, and campus services. The cost of attendance is made transparent for first year, transfer, and graduate students through a comprehensive website that includes financial advice for specific student subpopulations along with financial aid information.

Chapman conducts an annual Student Services Satisfaction Survey as well as has a clear process for handling all student complaints (including Title IX). There is an active Student Government Association and a Student Concerns Intervention Team to respond to and help with student concerns. There is an Institutional Compliance department, including Internal Audit, that works with the Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees on an annual audit plan. Further, Chapman engages qualified independent auditors on an annual basis.

The university has demonstrated commitment to prompt, honest, and open communication with WSCUC on all newsworthy and/or matters that could significantly affect the accreditation status of Chapman. The effort to maintain compliance with commission policies and procedures has been ongoing.

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

Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Chapman achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success.

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7) Chapman's commitment to teaching and learning was exemplified through the institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance that are developed by faculty in each unit and widely shared among the institution via websites and the annual learning outcomes assessment reports. The institutional learning themes of faculty/student research, global citizenship, interdisciplinary studies, personalized education, and student writing serve as guiding principles for academic programs to ensure alignment to the University's mission and vision.

The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating the achievement of these standards as well. The faculty Assessment Committee, as an example, represents all of Chapman's schools and colleges. It is appointed by the Faculty Senate, with the role of overseeing and evaluating learning outcomes assessment. One of their largest responsibilities is supervising the quality of assessment practices across the institution, encouraging the use of data for the improvement of curriculum and pedagogy to "close the loop."

In addition, all programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The team confirmed that all programs have been through a completed program review or professional accreditation review process in the last seven years.

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8, 2.9) Chapman recognizes and promotes linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. In fact, its TPR theme is clearly focused on this area given its alignment with Chapman's strategic priorities. Past and current strategic planning efforts, as well as an intentional investment in hiring faculty with robust research agendas and

a commitment to student mentorship, enabled the University to rise two levels in its Carnegie classification, from a “Master’s” institution to an “R2” institution, in 2018.

To ensure continued success in this direction, Chapman’s leadership articulates a clear vision for the future with near and long-term goals for elevating its recognition as a prestigious research institution focused on student and faculty outcomes, and for making clear choices in aligning resources—including financial and fundraising—to realize this objective over a clearly defined time period. This is most notably evidenced in its new strategic plan for 2023 to 2028, *Our Path to Greatness*, which lays out the first five years of an ambitious and greater 15-year University plan.

Moreover, the institution creates and maintains an atmosphere that intentionally cultivates a supportive and nurturing relationship between faculty and students. This is done through small classes plus abundant opportunities for both relationship building and student learning accomplished through collaborative research and creative projects. Students throughout the site visit commended Chapman on its dedication to personalized learning and stated that faculty student mentoring/research was a key reason for their satisfaction with the University.

Having said this, there is still room for improvement. While STEM is a clear focus of Chapman’s future, undergraduate research and creative activity opportunities across all disciplines need to be more strongly supported via systematic space utilization review, redesign, and facilities maintenance, as well as faculty incentives and appropriate infrastructure to maintain R2 status. The need for stronger alignment of institutional capacity and resources—including personnel—with strategic priorities was stated multiple times throughout the visit, as well as in institutional report appendices (including surveys). Thus, ensuring the University’s support structures grow at the same time and pace as its agenda focused on research prestige will be important for longevity, student retention, and employee morale. One illustrative example came up in several meetings during the visit - one of the courses that faculty were able to utilize for building student research opportunities (291/491) was cited in the report

but now is no longer structured to offer faculty workload incentives to provide opportunities for engaging students in research. Consequently, aligning support mechanisms with the vision of a growing research institution will be of critical importance moving forward.

Student Learning and Success (CFRs 2.10-2.14) The institution demonstrates that students make good progress toward the completion of their degrees; a significant proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. Chapman's first-year retention rate in fall 2022 was 91.3% overall with 83.6% graduating within 6-years.

The institution has a supportive Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support that collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement. All this information is available on a public website: DataMart. In addition, throughout the institutional report, Chapman described areas where it knows it can improve in its support for the success of all students. Throughout the site visit, there was clearly broad campus support for the strategic diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives which are of importance in closing achievement gaps.

The review team did find that while all degrees awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation (in the University catalogs), academic advising support services should be improved to ensure clearer communication to undergraduate students. Curricular approval processes and degree audit processes may need to be adjusted to ensure clarity, comprehensiveness, and accuracy as well.

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

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

Faculty, Staff, and Administrators (CRFs 3.1 – 3.3)

The team encountered a community of dedicated professionals who are committed to the Chapman mission. Team members were especially impressed by a culture of collegiality and collaboration throughout the university. Words like “family” and “pride” were used by many to illustrate this spirit. Overall, the Chapman personnel encountered—including senior leadership, academic leadership, staff, and faculty—exuded competence in their service to the university and students and held the qualifications required to perform at a high level in their functional area.

The team did observe some opportunities for improvement with how staff and faculty are engaged in strategic planning and personnel resourcing; likewise, with providing opportunities for professional development.

A narrative emerged at our open forums for staff and faculty regarding how the new Chapman strategic plan advanced through the organization. Whereas the board and senior staff reported having a seat at the table for the ideation phase of the plan, others further down the administrative organizational chart, as well as members of the faculty, described a more limited opportunity to offer input on what they saw as an already formed plan. The team also encountered staff members experiencing an imbalance in personnel capacity to keep up with enrollment growth and the university’s strategic shift to STEM programs and associated research. As for professional growth opportunities, the team heard about a desire for more training and development among staff, although the team acknowledges training in technology tools for faculty is documented in the institutional report. Such insights and others informed the team’s recommendation to facilitate greater engagement, shared governance, and transparency around institutional capacity and resources.

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

The team found ample evidence of Chapman as a financially strong and stable institution. The institution's endowment has witnessed healthy gains—from ~\$400M in FY20 to more than \$600M in FY22. For the future, the university has set its sights on growing the endowment to \$2.0B by 2038, informed by a pro forma that assumes an operating surplus of \$20M over the next five years and an average annual return on investments of 7.5%.

Chapman's finances are overseen by an experienced CFO and COO who leads a highly competent financial analysis and planning team (CFRs 3.6 & 3.8). Together they observe high standards for fiscal management, including conducting a "hard close" each month of the school's Profit/Loss and balance sheets.

As documented in its institutional report and strategic plan, Chapman puts its financial resources to work, including investments in technology and high-tech facilities at its main campus and its Rinker graduate research campus.

Finally, the team also saw a strong fundraising foundation at Chapman led by a chief advancement officer who previously served as the law school dean. The university has already surpassed its fundraising target for the fiscal year and is well on its way to realize its \$500M capital campaign target.

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.6 – 3.10)

The review team encountered a Board of Trustees that was engaged and unified in advancing the Chapman mission. They expressed full support of the university's strategic plan and confidence in President Struppa and his leadership team to make it a reality. The Board includes 39 active members (against 45 total seats). The Board demographics include 26 men, 13 women, and 10 members from diverse backgrounds. Trustees serve three-year terms with no term limits and operate across 13 separate governance committees. The team observed a Board that takes its fiduciary responsibility

seriously. The team did, however, have questions about the role and scope of authority of a parallel 31-member Board of Governors. While the explanation was given that the Board of Governors serves as a kind of “training ground” for potential Board of Trustees members, the relationship between these groups was not clear.

The team saw Dr. Struppa as an engaged and visionary leader. We commend his long-view approach to strategic planning, including concerted efforts to deliberately make decisions and allocate resources through the lens of Chapman’s mission and future direction. The president has delegated management of the university’s day-to-day operations to four direct reports: provost and chief academic officer, chief financial officer and COO, chief advancement officer, and chief information officer. The team saw evidence of each management unit staffed by competent administrators who work well together to advance their respective agendas, although the team did recommend that the president review scope with an eye toward reducing the number of the provost’s numerous direct reports.

Lastly, the team observed the presence of faculty governance, led by an active and engaged 50-member Faculty Senate. The team heard from members of the senate who offered numerous observations for shared governance improvements, including more engagement in the infancy stages of strategic planning and a more codified system for collecting faculty feedback in administrative decisions.

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

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

The review team met a vibrant campus community collectively engaged in implementing a new strategic plan while still committed to and rooted in a longstanding campus focus on teaching excellence. A consistent focus on assessing programs and using analysis to make improvements became

apparent in campus conversations with the Faculty Senate, the Assessment Committee, and co-curricular units.

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

The Academic Senate described processes and committees necessary to achieve well-functioning, thorough, and meaningful academic program reviews. The faculty also engage in appropriate assessment and oversight of new curricula (4.2). Based on an assessment of their program review processes, the program review committee adjusted their processes to allow better integration of discipline-specific accreditation into the review process, focusing and improving faculty review and improvement efforts. Faculty and administrators alike felt the program review process was properly connected to resource allocation.

Together with Chapman's strategic attention to growing their research capacity and output, the campus has increased its assessment and institutional research capacity and improved its processes. Recently improved assessment reports were well-received. As mentioned in the institutional report, faculty and staff agreed that more work can be done to improve data collection and analysis processes and to increase their capacity to do so.

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3-4.7)

The Chapman community expressed strong support for the newly implemented strategic plan, though some felt more faculty input could have been solicited. More recognized the plan as forward thinking and in line with the continuing high demand for STEM education. The deans and the Board of Trustees, in particular, felt deeply involved in the development of the strategic plan and the positive direction they felt it would take the campus.

Each person or group met during the team visit described a means of assessment in their area and how it has been used to refine programs. The academic and institutional research/assessment areas described coherent processes for collecting and analyzing data. Co-curricular programs rightly identified

retention rates as significant indicators of student success and sense of belonging on the campus. With newly imagined strategic diversity, equity, and inclusion goals, it seems new opportunities should emerge for assessment of the programs designed to achieve them.

The Chapman culture is student focused, with small class sizes and ample opportunities for faculty-student interaction on coursework, research, and creative activity. Course and program learning outcomes are consistently assessed, analyzed, and utilized for improvement. An example of a possible area for such improvement based on data was identified in the TPR report; it identified some undergraduate research courses in which students had lower GPAs post-engagement in the research or creative activity, thus an area ripe for further assessment and closing the loop.

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

Component 8: Institution specific themes

Impact on Students

The aim of Chapman's TPR was focused on its transformative change from a Carnegie classified "Master's" institution to an "R2" institution. This change has resulted in investments to hire and support research-active faculty, as well as the University's commitment to the teacher/scholar model. This particular section of the report will focus on the teacher/scholar model portion of Component 8 in order to assess the theme's impact on students.

In 2021, despite being in the midst of a pandemic, 62% of Chapman graduating seniors report having had opportunities to work with professors on research and creative activity projects during their undergraduate career. These opportunities were completed through various means: 291/491 student-faculty research courses, other courses aligned to the definitions of "research" or "creative activity," senior capstone and thesis courses, Grand Challenge Initiatives, Engaging the World Program, and paid research positions.

To assess the impact on students with these research opportunities, Chapman compared pre- and post-academic performance before and after an experience. Statistically significant differences were found between the treatment and control groups and/or the pre and post groups. Student learning outcomes were also assessed with growth in skills such as written communication, developing research questions, working independently, oral communication, and innovative thinking.

Going forward, Chapman will continue to measure the impact of research and creative activity on student success (for both UG and GR students) and may choose to implement some of the following action steps in order to improve their teacher/scholar programming:

- Work to create research training opportunities for undergraduates that are more strongly aligned with research productivity opportunities for faculty.
- Identify more opportunities for paid summer research partnerships/internships for all students.
- Prioritize interdisciplinary and collaborative research projects across colleges and departments.
- Develop a college-level annual student creative activity inventory, managed by each dean's office, to capture the details about faculty and student productivity.
- Introduce undergraduate students to research and creative opportunities early and make the connections between R&CA and positive academic and career outcomes.
- Facilitate more faculty panel discussions about student research and creative activities.
- Increase support of research and creative activities at the senior level for undergraduate students.
- Provide workshops and/or training materials to aid faculty members in their design of a curriculum for students who seek to use 291/491 courses.
- Establish a Research & Creative Activities Dashboard to measure student learning.
- Review existing course attributes, along with their operational definitions, and make changes where necessary for inclusion in Chapman's Data Cookbook.

- Increase internal marketing of departmental research opportunities / creative activities to better inform students of what is available to them.
- Revise student hiring procedures to include specific account codes for internal research projects and external research projects.
- Work with the appropriate campus constituencies to develop a new process for tracking funding for student research and creative activities.
- Regularly assess the needs of the students and the faculty engaging in research and creative activities and develop action plans to address any identified barriers to students and faculty engaging in research and creative activities.
- Work to increase the number of first-generation and Pell students who engage in research and creative activities.
- Uniformly track academic and career outcomes for all students engaging in research and creative activities.

It is encouraging to the review team that Chapman has learned where it needs to progress in order to continue making a positive impact on students and their research experiences, as well as having identified specific action steps to take in order to improve. During the site visit, reviewers were able to meet with the TPR committee(s) and verify a consensus on these action steps. To support these efforts, the team does recommend that co-curricular support of the student research agenda be increased.

In summary, the visit team found sufficient evidence that the TPR theme is having a positive impact on student success.

Role of Faculty

The visit team found a campus faculty fully engaged in the questions raised by the TPR theme of *Research and Creative Activity* as well as the changes required to meet the goals of the newly implemented strategic plan. With both a TPR Steering Committee and a WSCUC Self-Study Steering

Committee put into place to lead the self-study and TPR reporting efforts, faculty were given ample opportunity to influence the direction of the theme.

The team was impressed by the deeply embedded faculty commitment to and belief in their role as close mentors to Chapman students and the efforts they make to connect with students on research and creative activities. Some concerns were raised about the removal of the credit faculty could receive in supporting students enrolled in the current 291/491 research courses and what impact removing this incentive would have on faculty willingness to continue this tradition of support for student research. Tracking any impacts of this policy change will be important for Chapman as they move forward. Increasing research and creative activity expectations for the faculty may also begin to create tension for faculty time and workload, potentially influencing how much student-faculty research/creative mentoring will be maintained. The team urges Chapman to pay close attention to both areas as it moves forward on the campus strategic plan.

Research Office

The site team entered the visit curious to further explore Chapman's strategic plan, especially its focus on elevating research and prestige—not to mention its 15-year look ahead into the last half of the 2030s.

The team left impressed by the careful and detailed roadmap not just outlined in the plan, but in practice throughout the university. Investments are already in place, with more to follow, to bolster Chapman's research infrastructure. Examples include expansion plans for the Rinker campus and a long-range financial plan to build the university's endowment to \$2.0B while further leveraging those assets to invest in future strategic objectives.

The team met Chapman's new vice president of research, Dr. Martina Nieswandt, who joined the institution last summer and brings to the cause a distinguished record of scholarly accomplishments and decades of experience. Dr. Nieswandt is well positioned to make an impact as the leader of an

appropriately resourced unit—including nearly 20 professionals clustered across multiple areas of focus, including sponsored research; compliance and IRB; industry partnerships, including patent licensing; and research analysts assigned to high volume of research activity, including proposal development and post-award support.

When pressed on any areas of concern for Chapman’s research agenda, Dr. Nieswandt cited the current campus capacity to house research activity—a matter that will likely be addressed through future strategic plan initiatives.

Overall, the visit team encountered ample evidence that Chapman’s focus on research and creative activity, as outlined in the TPR, is supported by a strong research office and the competent team that advance its mission.

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

Chapman’s institutional report included a thorough study of the approved theme, including evidence to support their findings. The team’s review confirmed that the process of examining the theme, led by the TPR Steering Committee, engaged multiple individuals and campus constituents in both the study and the writing of the report.

The institution was open to results from the TPR project – both predicted outcomes as well as surprises – and used the process to develop detailed recommendations such that the work that went into the TPR project can be useful in moving the institution forward. These TPR recommendations are specific to each responsible organizational unit, thus serving as a roadmap for what each area needs to do to improve upon the areas of concern that were uncovered through the self-study.

In addition to learning from the TPR by making specific recommendations, the institution used the WSCUC reaffirmation process to move forward other essential areas to achieving the campus’s

ambitious goals. Specifically, the reflection includes mention of:

- Using the new strategic plan as a path to achieving excellence
- Addressing changing student demographics, including pursuit of HSI designation
- Growing the endowment, enabling holding tuition levels steady – thus alleviating financial burden on students
- Achieving academic excellence through research and creative activity, including investment in the Office of Research to support faculty efforts
- Slowing enrollment growth, shifting strategy to a model of increased student selectivity
- Focusing on student success, including improving student support services such as tutoring, advising, career, health, financial, admissions, psychological counseling, and disability services

Given the work that went into the TPR and institutional report, corroborated by the meetings the site visit team had with many campus constituents, it does appear that the momentum generated by the WSCUC reaffirmation process will be sustained. It is also clear that the institution is committed to its students and their success, as well as to continuous improvement and achieving excellence.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team was impressed with Chapman’s clear vision for the future with a strategic plan that guides decisions and a strong financial status with successful fundraising. Student success was at the forefront of all operations with an emphasis on building STEM. Faculty and staff were collaborative and supportive. Students praised the close and nurturing relationships with their faculty. And, there was a strong commitment to assessment and program review, leading to continuous improvement.

Commendations

The team commends Chapman University for:

1. Articulating a clear vision for the future with near- and long-term goals for elevating its recognition as a prestigious research institution focused on student and faculty outcomes, and for making clear choices in aligning resources—including financial and fundraising—to realize this objective over a clearly defined time period;
2. Allocating funding to STEM education and initiating investments in the facilities required to deliver these programs;
3. Cultivating and sustaining broad campus support for the strategic diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives;
4. Fostering a tight-knit, familial culture of collaboration and collegiality;
5. Creating and maintaining an atmosphere that intentionally cultivates a supportive and nurturing relationship between faculty and students through small classes and abundant opportunities for both relationship building and student learning accomplished through collaborative research and creative projects; and
6. Ensuring educational effectiveness through faculty commitment to an authentically strong assessment and program review process.

Recommendations

The team recommends that Chapman University:

1. Limit the number and scope of university and school/college leaders and areas supervised by the provost to enable meaningful supervision and oversight. (CFR 3.7)
2. Provide timely and responsive student mental health counseling services at both the Rinker Health Science campus and the Orange campus. (CFR 2.13)
3. Improve undergraduate academic advising services, ensuring students receive timely, useful, and complete information about relevant academic requirements. (CFRs 2.12 & 2.13)
4. Fortify undergraduate research and creative activity opportunities across all disciplines via systematic space utilization review, redesign, and facilities maintenance, as well as faculty incentives and appropriate infrastructure. (CFR 3.5 .5)
5. Facilitate greater engagement, shared governance, and transparency with faculty and staff to identify opportunities to better align institutional capacity and resources—including personnel—with enrollment growth and strategic priorities. (CFRs 3.10 & 4.6)

APPENDIX 1 – FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

1. CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? <i>The policy is part of the Chapman University Curriculum Handbook (https://www.chapman.edu/curriculum-handbook/), which is available to all members of the campus community</i>
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><i>Course schedulers in each school and college conduct a review of the class schedule prior to each term to confirm that meeting times are consistent with the credit hours allocated for each course. For courses in which the meeting times do not appear to be consistent, the Vice Provost for Academic Administration follows up with the school or college to make the needed corrections. Additionally, each degree program at Chapman must complete a comprehensive program review (including a visit by external consultants) every seven years. Part of this process includes a thorough review of program curricula and syllabi. Details of the process are included on the Self Study Template (https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/program-review/self-study-template.aspx) and in the instructions given to external reviewers. As part of the new course approval process, the initiating faculty member must include details on credit length when completing the New Course Approval Form (https://web.chapman.edu/CourseApproval/). Course proposals are vetted by curriculum committees in schools and colleges, and again by the vice provosts for graduate and undergraduate education, respectively. Finally, the Provost’s Office asks academic units to annually review their curricula (at both the programmatic and course level) and submit updates—including updates to credit hours or program length—as part of the catalog revision process.</i></p>
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

	<p>Comments:</p> <p><i>All details for class meeting times are included in the Course Schedule, which is updated and maintained by the Office of the University Registrar</i> https://cs92prod.chapman.edu/psc/CS92PROD/EMPLOYEE/SA/c/COMMUNITY_ACCESS.CLASS_SEA_RCH.GBL</p>
<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 2</p>
	<p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Hybrid</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral</p> <p>BA: IES 451: – Educational Applications of Technology</p> <p>BA: IES 112: – Writing for Educators</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)? Education</p>
	<p>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</p>
	<p>Comments: The Attallah College of Educational Studies offers a small number of hybrid courses.</p>
<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 3</p>
	<p>What kinds of courses? Undergraduate Laboratory Course; Graduate Laboratory Course; Doctoral Clinical Course</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral</p> <p>BS: Lab Course: Molecular Genetics Laboratory</p> <p>MA: Lab Course: Survey in American Cinema</p> <p>Doctoral: Clinical Course: Research Rotations</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)? Biology; Film Studies; Pharmaceutical Sciences</p>
	<p>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</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 9
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? <i>Undergraduate; Graduate; Doctoral</i>
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	BA: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=33&poid=6457&returnto=1650
	BFA: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=33&poid=6473&returnto=1650
	BM: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=33&poid=6484&returnto=1650
BS: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=33&poid=6400&returnto=1650	
MA: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6657&returnto=1708	
MBA: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6601&returnto=1708	
MFA: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6643&returnto=1708	
MS: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6668&returnto=1708	
Professional Doctoral: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6636	
Research Doctoral: https://catalog.chapman.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=34&poid=6681&returnto=1708	
What discipline(s)? <i>Sociology; Dance Performance; Vocal Performance; Biological Sciences; War and Society; Business Administration; Film Production; Pharmaceutical Sciences; Communication</i>	
Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Comments: <i>See appendix 2.2.01 Chapman Master Program Matrix for list of degrees offered, by type, with numbers of credits required in each major or degree. The university requires a minimum of 120 credits for bachelors degrees: see also Undergraduate Degree Requirements. There is a note regarding Internship Credits and Hours in the Internship Policies section of the Undergraduate Catalog. There is a detailed listing of the Internship Credits and Hours in the Registration and Course Information section of the Graduate Catalog. Here is the link to the current graduate program handbooks.</i>	

Review Completed By: Elizabeth Giddens
Date: March 27, 2023

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: <i>As an institutional member of NACAC, we agree to follow best practices for recruitment as outlined by NACAC. We do not employ 'agents' to help us recruit international (or any other) students. In addition, we use federal methodology to determine financial aid need.</i></p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: <i>Cost of attendance and retention rates are included in several print and on-line publications provided by the University. We also provide a true cost calculator on our Financial Aid website (https://www.chapman.edu/students/tuition-and-aid/financial-aid/undergraduate/net-cost-calculator.aspx). Most costs are listed on an annual basis. Financial aid awards remain consistent provided the students' financial needs remain the same and they make satisfactory academic progress towards the degree. Merit scholarships are renewable up to four years for students who enter as freshmen. In an effort to give students a clear roadmap to timely degree completion, Chapman is developing a suggested four-year plan for every UG major, and posting these documents on the new website, which is currently under construction: Suggested 4-Year Plans</i></p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments: <i>All information related to jobs for graduates is kept in the university's Handshake system: https://chapman.joinhandshake.com/login/. The Office of Career and Professional Development administers the First Destination Survey to young alumni to capture information about the employment of its graduates and discloses outcomes on its website.</i></p>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Matthew Nehmer
Date: March 27, 2023

3. Student Complaints Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.chapman.edu/students/services/student-ask/complaints.aspx • Student complaint procedures notice
	Comments: <i>Title IX complaints are handled by Title IX officers in the offices of Human Resources and Student Life. Complaints related to student housing, conduct, and other student matters are handled by the Office of the Dean of Students. Grade appeals are handled according to policies in the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs. For students who are struggling, members of the campus community can contact the Student Concerns Intervention Team (SCIT). Reports of bias, concerns, or other incidents can be made by students at: https://www.chapman.edu/reporting/. Students may also use the EthicsPoint reporting link to make anonymous complaints to the Department of Institutional Compliance. EthicsPoint Reporting.</i>
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, please describe briefly: <i>Student complaints are handled following the procedures used in the Dean of Students Office and tracked in the Advocate software system. Exact procedures for other types of complaints vary widely depending on the nature of the complaint (e.g., as listed above, Title IX, SCIT, Reporting concerns, EthicsPoint, etc.).</i>
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO Comments: <i>Exact procedures for complaints vary widely depending on the nature of the complaint. Should students have questions about where to direct their concern/complaint, staff from the Dean of Students office will meet with the student to help direct the student to the correct person/process.</i>

Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? <i>The Dean of Students Office uses a recordkeeping system for formal complaints called Advocate. Other records are maintained with the appropriate department in accordance with the University records retention policy.</i></p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: <i>Complaints about student conduct/behavior are tracked in the Dean of Students student conduct database (Advocate), as are complaints about students of concern and student sexual misconduct. Records are maintained per the University's records retention policy. Human Resources tracks student complaints about employee and third-party behavior, including discrimination and harassment, in an internally developed system. These complaints are shared with the dean of students' office as appropriate. Student complaints regarding bias incidents received through the Reporting system are tracked and discussed twice monthly by the provost's office, HR, legal affairs, and the VPDEI. Complaints to EthicsPoint are received and dispatched upon receipt to the appropriate office on campus for follow-up, Institutional responses to the complaints are tracked by the compliance office. Academic departments are responsible for maintaining records of complaints about grade disputes per the academic catalogs. Public Safety tracks student complaints and keeps records in accordance with the University records retention policy.</i></p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Regina Eisenbach Date: March 27, 2023

4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? https://www.chapman.edu/students/academic-resources/registrar/student-services/transfer-credit-policies-and-guidelines.aspx
	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? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: <i>All requisite information is included in the policy above and is regularly reviewed by the Offices of the University Registrar, Admissions, and the Provost.</i>

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

1. Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
2. Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By: Cindy Bumgarner

Date: 3-27-2023

APPENDIX 2 – OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW

Institution: Chapman University

Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway for Reaccreditation

Name of reviewer/s: Jim Gash

Date/s of review: March 7, 2023

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed.¹ One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

Chapman University Harry and Diane Rinker Health Science Campus
9401 Jeronimo Road
Irvine, CA 92618

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

The Rinker campus opened in 2014 and is designated as an additional location of Chapman University. Rinker houses the School of Pharmacy and 3 programs within the Crean College of Health and Behavioral Sciences. A total of 6 graduate (master's and doctoral) programs are offered at Rinker. These include Doctor of Physical Therapy, Master of Medical Science in Physician Assistant Studies, Master of Science in Communication Sciences and Disorders, Master of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences, Ph.D in Pharmaceutical Sciences, Doctor of Pharmacy].

The FTE for faculty at Rinker is 75
The FTE for students at Rinker is 617

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

The review of this location was organized as part of Chapman's 2023 TPR visit. The visit was conducted by the team chair, Jim Gash. The visit included the following elements and interviews:

- Tour of the campus facilities, including the construction site of the Campus Center (scheduled to open in summer 2023)
- Meeting with Deans -- Janeen Hill (Crean) and Rennolds Ostrom (Pharmacy)
- Open forum with Rinker students
- Open forum with Rinker faculty

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

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (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?	Not applicable.	
<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)	<p>The Rinker campus in Irvine provides a dedicated and space for graduate health science students to take classes and conduct research in the healthcare arena. The campus is committed to interprofessional education which allows students and faculty from across the disciplines offered at this campus to collaborate. This structure aligns with Chapman’s mission centered around personalized education.</p> <p>The programs at the Rinker campus were also established to specifically address local healthcare challenges and provider deficits in Orange County, CA. The program offerings were conceived based upon a needs assessment in OC and the OC healthcare industry. The programs housed at Rinker include collaborative relationships with regional hospitals, medical professionals, public health organizations, and the bio, pharmaceutical, and medical device industries.</p> <p>Rinker maintains sufficient administrative staff that supports operations and students, as well as staff assigned to each specific school and college represented at Rinker. One concern identified by several students is the perceived shortage of mental health providers, which is reflected in the accreditation team’s Recommendations.</p>	
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In	The Rinker location is integrated into the Chapman experience. Chapman branding is visible throughout the location in all	

<p>what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>buildings. Rinker’s graduate health science students have access to major administrative and support units connected to the Orange Campus location, in addition to having periodic special programming and services unique to the graduate health science student population at Rinker. Members of the provost’s office, student services, and student life are periodically onsite at Rinker. Additionally, workshops offered by Chapman’s Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Office of Faculty Advancement, and other divisions are available for faculty at both Rinker and Orange campuses via Zoom.</p> <p>While not required, Rinker students have opportunities to engage with the Orange campus as well. Students are invited to participate in programs available to all graduate students at the Orange location, including student government. Undergrad students from Orange also have the opportunity to engage with research initiatives facilitated by Rinker faculty.</p> <p>Through attention to integration of the Rinker and Orange locations, Chapman is able to offer students a cohesive experience regardless of where their program is housed. The main challenge identified by the students is the lack of easily accessed and convenient transportation between the campuses, though most indicated that they wouldn’t utilize such transportation often, if available.</p>	
<p><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)</p>	<p>The Rinker campus embraces what is deemed “interprofessional education,” allowing students and faculty from across disciplines to address healthcare challenges in innovative ways. The campus includes seven labs focused on the development of different skills, three</p>	

	<p>active learning centers, an exam room, and a patient evaluation suite. All spaces are outfitted with what appears to be state-of-the-art technology to facilitate hands-on lab work and shared learning. The Campus Center at Rinker, scheduled to open in summer 2023 will provide a dedicated space for, and additional access to, academic and student support, meeting spaces and gathering spaces, dining, galleries, and student services staff. The deans at the Rinker campus routinely meet with the Provost and advocate for needs specific to the Rinker campus. Student questions and concerns surrounding meeting spaces, dining, and student services staff will be readily and fully addressed when this new campus center opens.</p>	
<p><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)</p>	<p>The Rinker location provides career resources, registrar services, disability services, financial aid, library services, business services, and counseling. The new Campus Center will provide enhancements to the services already provided at Rinker. As indicated above, students do have some concerns in this area, but these will all be fully and adequately addressed when the campus center opens.</p> <p>The Rinker programs also have programmatic accreditation which require support services to mirror those provided to graduate students at the Orange location. All health science disciplines at Rinker are currently in good standing with their respective accrediting agencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><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)</p>	<p>Nearly 100% of School of Pharmacy faculty are full-time, as well as the majority of Crean faculty. Part-time faculty are brought in as they have specialty practitioner expertise required for fulfillment of learning outcomes. Tenure, tenure-track, and clinical faculty support core curriculum of programs. Full-time faculty ratios for programs are also required by programmatic accreditors and all programs meet or exceed these</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<p>requirements. Faculty qualifications are also monitored by Rinker’s respective accrediting agencies.</p> <p>Faculty report that they design the curriculum, as they do at the Orange location. Policies in the Curriculum Handbook and the Faculty Manual provide requirements for faculty governance and curricular oversight that is applicable across the institution regardless of program or the instructional location. Additionally, program content is mandated by programmatic accreditors.</p> <p>Rinker faculty participate in curriculum development and assessment through the same processes as their Orange counterparts. Rinker faculty are represented on committees (graduate academic committee, assessment committee, etc.), Faculty Senate, and other Chapman faculty bodies. They follow policies and procedures for assessing student learning that are the same as those required by faculty at the Orange location.</p> <p>Students report strong satisfaction with excellence in teaching across all disciplines with only minimal exceptions.</p>	
<p><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)</p>	<p>Rinker faculty follow the same processes as those required at the Orange location (see above response), and as outlined in the Curriculum Handbook and the Faculty Manual. In addition to the assessment processes required by Chapman, Rinker programs must also submit annual assessment reports to their programmatic accreditors. The School of Pharmacy also has its own assessment office to provide coordination and support of assessment activities.</p>	

<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 Rinker campus is exclusively composed of graduate health science students. The large majority of Rinker students are enrolled full time in a cohort model, complete their programs according to two- or three-year plans, and then sit for state or national licensure exams. Each program boasts strong pass rates, some (e.g., PA) nearing 100%, with impressive employment rates upon completion. The graduate programs at Orange encompass entirely different content and subject matter (e.g., Law, Film, MBA, Computational Sciences, Education, etc.) and do not follow a similar timeline or cohort model.</p> <p>Student outcomes and performance for programs at Rinker are reported as part of the required annual report process for programmatically accreditors. Data regarding student performance is also published on the Chapman website for Crean College, the School of Pharmacy, and Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRADS).</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>The assessment process for SLO review and program review are identical to those used at the Orange location. Representatives from Rinker programs are included on the Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC). Chapman uses additional tools for assessment that may be accessed remotely, including Canvase, the new Nuventive platform, Panther Analytics, and other systems as needed for data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Annual assessment data are collected and aggregated across programs. Students in programs offered at Rinker display learning outcome proficiency at or above those of their graduate program peers (graduate avg. 3.06; Rinker avg. 3.3). Data regarding student performance is also published on the Chapman website for Crean College, the School of Pharmacy, and Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRADS).</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>Quality assurance of Rinker courses and programs follows the same processes as that at the Orange campus. SLOs and programs are routinely reviewed through ongoing assessment that requires annual PLO reporting (currently transitioning to a 3-year cycle) and a 7-year cycle of program review. Annual assessment is conducted by faculty, reviewed by the FAC, and final reports are provided to program and institutional leadership and form the basis for course and program revision and improvement as indicated. Program review includes self-study, external review, and a myriad of data collection and analysis which is compiled and synthesized into a report and reviewed at multiple levels for feedback, strategic planning, and implementation of any necessary improvement initiatives.</p> <p>Course feedback is also provided by students through the course evaluation process at the end of each term. Course evaluations are reviewed by faculty and by the program director or dean as part of the annual faculty performance review process.</p> <p>Finally, quality assurance is addressed through rigorous programmatic accreditation standards and reflected in student performance data, employment data, and pass rates on national/state licensing exams, all of which are publicly available on the Chapman website for Crean College, the School of Pharmacy, and Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRADS).</p>	
---	--	--

APPENDIX 3 - DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW

Please complete Section B for institutions that offer online courses that do not rise to the level of a distance education program. A distance education program is defined as a program in which 50% or more of the courses for the degree are offered via a remote, distant modality, i.e., not in person.

Institution: Chapman University
Type of Visit: Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer: Regina Eisenbach
Date/s of review: March 15-17, 2023
Section Completed: B

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits 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.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
------------------	---------------------------	---

<p><i>Nature of Online Learning Courses.</i> How do faculty use distance learning options in face to face courses e.g., blended learning, hybrid learning, hybrid flexible (hyflex), flipped classroom, or other instructional strategies that allow student/instructor separation? How extensive is online learning in the curriculum? What training is offered to faculty who incorporate online learning in their courses? Can students request a distance learning option for onsite courses?</p>	<p>Chapman currently offers programs in the in-person modality. As necessitated by the pandemic, and in accordance with the Department of Education exemption, CU pivoted to distance education for course delivery. Over the last 3 years, significant investments in technological infrastructure, faculty training, and other support resources have been made available to support DE. This includes adoption of the Canvas LMS, Quality Matters (QM) membership offering resources such as pedagogical tools and workshops for faculty, \$2M+ in technology upgrades in classrooms to support DE instruction, tech support from IS&T, library resources and accessibility. Training programming provided by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) and Educational Technology Services (ETS) has been recently designed to ensure regular and substantive interaction (RSI) criteria are met and technological and pedagogical best practices for online teaching and learning are followed.</p> <p>Post-pandemic, all CU courses have returned to in-person instruction with the exception of a small number of courses offered by Attallah College of Educational Studies and two others available through Schmid College of Science and Technology to students who require remote access to the otherwise in-person courses. Campus-wide tools to support remote instruction remain in place. Some faculty may elect to provide supplemental instruction using DE tools or to allow students to join virtually in cases of illness or other hardship. These decisions are at the discretion of the instructor.</p> <p>CU is exploring options for DE in the future in response to trends in higher education, and in light of student interest, though there are currently no programs and very few intentionally designed or designated DE courses under the new Department of Education guidelines.</p> <p>Mindful that the current DE exemption may soon end, Chapman will be submitting in the coming weeks an application to WASC for institutional approval to offer distance education. Much work has been done to develop policies, infrastructure, training and support. Graduate programs in Education, Science, and Business have expressed interest in offering greater flexibility to students for a limited number of DE courses (constituting less than 50% of the respective degrees). Additionally, two graduate level master of science online degree programs in the School of Pharmacy were proposed to WASC for substantive change approval in July 2022. These were not initially approved, and Chapman continues to address the infrastructure issues institutionally and in Pharmacy that were identified by the substantive change committee.</p>	
---	---	--

	Chapman has until July 2023 to resubmit either or both of these degree program proposals, if the institution chooses.	
<p><i>Quality of the Distance Education Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>Chapman has made significant investments in technology to ensure the ability for faculty and students to engage in meaningful interaction in a DE modality. As this has been the primary mode of instruction since the emergence of the pandemic in 2020, it was essential to the community that CU continued to provide high quality instruction as the world, the country, and California implemented quarantines and work from home orders. CU invested in the Canvas LMS, which is the predominant LMS used across the postsecondary educational market and allows for the use of synchronous discussion boards, rubrics, grading & feedback, recorded lectures, announcements, assessment, etc. There is also a suite of instructional tools that integrate with Canvas such as Zoom, Turnitin, Poll Everywhere, Adobe Creative Cloud, etc. available. Library services are accessible virtually, and several “dens” to support faculty and students have been developed and are available on Canvas. \$2M+ in technology upgrades to classrooms have been made to support DE instruction. Support for technology and DE is largely provided by 3 units at CU. IS&T provides technical support, ETS provides educational tech support, and CETL provides pedagogical support, including for best practices for teaching in the DE modality. Each of these units provides specialized training and one-on-one consultations to the faculty community.</p>	

<p>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction. How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?</p>	<p>CU has developed a system to ensure RSI through a multi-step process that begins with faculty training in CETL to address QM standards, RSI requirements, and best practices for online learning. These policies are newly developed to support future DE courses and have recently received approval by faculty governance.</p> <p>As part of the new DE course approval procedure and policy, RSI begins with collaborative course design process involving the instructor, the program director, and pedagogical coaches, instructional designer, and the QM coordinator in the CETL. After a course has been approved and launched, RSI will be monitored through mid-semester feedback from students to allow for timely improvements. Students also submit a course evaluation at the end of the semester which includes questions about teaching, learning, and engagement. Finally, instructors will submit an RSI self-assessment rubric. Course evaluations and the faculty RSI self-assessment are reviewed as part of the annual review process with the instructor.</p> <p>The following are examples of RSI at Chapman: (1) weekly announcements in the LMS to review new information and major concepts, competencies and assessments for the week; (2) discussion boards with faculty presence and moderation; (3) constructive and actionable feedback on assignments; (4) synchronous and asynchronous interactions that require students to contact the instructor or participate in an instructor-moderated discussion board; (5) synchronous meetings and chats that explore course materials and answer student questions; (6) identification and outreach to students struggling to meet proficiency based on instructor observation and analytics; (7) small working groups moderated by the instructor.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Quality Assurance. What processes are in place to collect data from courses that use some type of remote learning? How are the findings used to improve instruction?</p>	<p>Course-Level</p> <p>Progress-monitoring is critical to ensuring that learning is taking place and that the identified course learning outcomes are being achieved. Within the Canvas LMS, instructors use course analytics to monitor student learning and make time-sensitive modifications to improve instruction. This is done by evaluating formative and summative assessment data results, student engagement time with instructional materials, periodic student feedback surveys, etc.</p> <p>Program- and Institutional-Level</p> <p>Data is collected through the course evaluation process, which provides instructors with student feedback about their courses, and is reviewed with instructors during annual reviews. Through the institutional assessment process, faculty also review data related to learning outcomes, including extracting data from courses, and submit an annual learning outcomes assessment report (ALOAR) that describes data collection and evidence, student performance, and a comparative analysis of learning across two years. These reports are reviewed by the Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC) and then reviewed and discussed with program leadership to identify opportunities for remediation, enhancement, etc. to ensure quality instruction in classes, whether in the DE or in-person modalities. Opportunities for collaboration with CETL and ETS are identified, faculty development is made available, and pedagogical tools and enhancements are made to ensure robust and meaningful engagement and learning in courses. There are several modes of data collection in place. Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRADS) collects, analyzes, and disseminates data that can be disaggregated to provide a sophisticated understanding of trends and areas of opportunity in addition to data collected by program faculty and administrators.</p>	
---	--	--