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SECTION I - OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Section A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Incorporated in 2002, Providence Christian College (Providence, ProvCC) is a private, non-profit, four-year liberal arts college reflecting the Reformed tradition. The college’s mission is to equip students to be firmly grounded in biblical truth, thoroughly educated in the liberal arts, and fully engaged in their church, their community, and the world for the glory of God and for service to humanity (Catalog 2017-2018). Providence currently offers a Liberal Studies Major, which, according to the college catalog (2017-2018), is aimed at “producing critical creative citizens—young men and women who confidently engage the word in order to work toward a society in harmony with God’s good creational order.” In addition to the Liberal Studies Major, Providence offers academic concentrations in 13 areas: Biblical and Theological Studies; Biblical Languages; Business, Economics, and Society; Communication Arts; Education; English; Fine Art; History; Humanities; Music; Psychology; Social Science; and Visual and Performing Arts. As of fall 2017, the college had three full-time faculty, two interim faculty, one teaching administrator, 20 adjunct teaching faculty members, and one visiting teaching faculty (Catalog 2017-2018).

Originally located on a leased 5.5-acre site in Ontario, California, Providence in 2004 was given permission by the Bureau for Private Post-Secondary and Vocational Education to serve as a degree-granting institution in California. The college began offering classes in fall semester 2005, with fall enrollment of 26 students (092-2 PCC Research Report 12 12 2016). By 2010, fall enrollment had grown to 68 students (092-2 PCC Research Report 12 12 2016). In 2010, Providence’s board of trustees moved the college to its current location in Pasadena,
California, located about ten miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles. The college leases space at William Carey International University, which affects the long-term planning of facilities. The college is currently discussing extending the lease with William Carey to allow for Providence’s growth beyond the next decade (ProvCC Institutional Report 2017 3).

In 2012, Providence started merger discussions with Covenant College, an affiliated college in the Association of Reformed Institutions of Higher Education. The talks were instigated because Providence’s previous president, Dr. J. Derek Halvorson, was identified as the president-elect of Covenant. However, Providence’s board of trustees decided against the merger, viewing it as disadvantageous to the college. During this time, Providence streamlined its academic program, offering just the Liberal Studies Major that includes multiple concentrations instead of offering several majors. The new degree allowed ProvCC to focus its resources and curriculum on the liberal arts, viewed by the college as a hallmark of a Providence education. In addition, in 2014, the college hired Dr. Jim Belcher to fill the president position.

One consequence of uncertainties related to the merger discussions and the revised curriculum was a decline in fall enrollments, which went from 78 in 2012 to 71 in 2013. The college responded by initiating athletic programs in 2014 in an effort to boost enrollment. As a result, fall enrollments increased to 115 in 2014 and 164 in 2015 (092-2 PCC Research Report 12 12 2016). More recently, the college has purposefully slowed down its recruitment of athletes, with the fall enrollments at 164 in 2016 and 167 in 2017 (10 Day Report 2016-4 FINAL; 10 Day Report 2017-4 FINAL).¹ However, Providence has struggled to retain students in these much larger classes and has since had difficulty maintaining this level of student

¹ Variances in enrollment statistics were noted between the PCC Research Report 12 12 2016 and the Institutional Summary Report 9/21/2017, particularly fall 2014 and fall 2015. The team was told by Providence’s vice president of finance and operations that the recent 10 Day Reports were more reliable because of additional “cleanup of the database,” so those statistics are used above for 2016 and 2017.
recruitment, as is evident in the most recent statistics. This situation is evident when reviewing graduation data. For example, the first graduating class in 2008-2009 included 13 students. Graduating class numbers fell to a low of 9 students in both 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (092-2 PCC Research Report 12 12 2016). The student-withdrawal rate between fall 2010 and fall 2012 was between 62 and 63 percent (092-3 PCC Research Report [Continued] 3-27-2017).

Graduation numbers increased to their highest level of 17 students in 2012-2013 but declined to 11 in 2015-2016, the latest date for which data appears to be available. As is evident from this brief review, enrollment growth through recruiting and retaining students has been a major challenge for the college.

Given difficulties retaining students and the need to provide additional educational support for its evolving student body, Providence suffered a significant loss of revenue in 2015-2016 and larger-than-anticipated expenditures in 2016-2017. In response, Providence completed a financial restructure, resulting in layoffs of both faculty and staff. In 2016 the college also restructured its committee system from two to four committees to better support Providence’s growth and “the complexities of issues facing faculty in the past few years” (ProvCC Institutional Report 2017 5). The new structure “provides delineation of responsibility and accountability of the work of the faculty within the expanded structure” (5). Senate leaders that were interviewed spoke positively about the reorganization and the clarity in accountability provided by the new structure.

The college’s Long-Range Planning Committee of the board of trustees also has developed a strategic plan, which was supposed to sunset in 2017 but has been extended to 2018, “in order to allow time to undertake a methodical approach to planning” (ProvCC Institutional Report 2017 6). In addition, the college has continued to generate strong financial support from
local churches and individuals, which has allowed the college to enhance its liberal arts program (7).

This review focuses solely on Providence’s Pasadena campus, since the college has no off-campus locations or distance-education programs. No special follow-up related to substantive change was conducted in connection with this visit.

Section B. Description of Team’s Review Process

Although the Offsite Review (OSR) was scheduled April 3-4, 2017, the team review process began in advance of the OSR. In January 2017, the institutional report and related documents were uploaded on the cloud content management system, Box.com, for the team to review. Prior to the OSR, the team completed the WSCUC worksheets, which encouraged reflection on the WSCUC standards and components. Based on reviewing the institutional report, the team developed lines of inquiry and identified commendations and recommendations. Ultimately, the team decided to suggest delaying the Accreditation Visit, planned for fall 2017, to spring 2018 to allow Providence time to collect and analyze data related to the questions that emerged in the lines of inquiry. The OSR concluded with a brief video-conference call, in which the team shared the lines of inquiry with Providence administrators. Following the video-conference call, the WSCUC Vice President discussed delaying the Accreditation Visit with the then Providence Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Ann Hamilton, who supported this plan.

The team followed a similar review process for the Accreditation Visit (AV). Prior to the visit, the team reviewed the additional documents requested through the lines of inquiry, which were available on Box.com. The team also completed the WSCUC worksheets, focusing particularly on the documents Providence provided in response to the lines of inquiry. The team reviewed a draft visit schedule completed by the Providence ALO, detailing individuals the team
would like to meet. After minor revisions, the ALO finalized the schedule and emailed it to the team prior to the visit.

The AV started with a planning session the afternoon of March 6. The team reviewed the visit process, the available decision options, and the proposed schedule. The team also identified which team members would lead each meeting and drafted potential questions. In addition, the assistant chair reviewed messages on the confidential email account established for the review. Messages on this account were subsequently reviewed each day of the visit.

The actual AV campus visit began March 7 with a meeting with the president, which was followed by a session with the director of institutional research. Both meetings were highly informative in learning about both the strengths and challenges facing Providence. The team also met with senior staff; the vice president of finance and the interim ALO; the director of enrollment management; the vice president of advancement; the Academic Success Team; the Joint Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Cultural Competence, Title IX, and the Research (IRB) Committee; the director of athletics; the dean of students; the Student Life staff; the athletic coaches; and the faculty senate chair and the faculty senate recorder. During the second day, team members met with the Advancement, Development, Evaluation Committee; the Teaching/Learning Committee; the Retention Committee; the Program Review Committee, the board of trustees; the Faculty Senate; and the Long-Range Planning Committee. All of the different individuals, some of whom were members of multiple committees and groups, seemed engaged and helpful in addressing questions and providing needed information for the visit.
Section C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

According to the institutional report, “the review involved all areas of the college. The dialog about student learning and student success has framed the college conversation over the last several years” (10). Although the team appreciated the substantial investment of time and effort that went into the institutional report, it found that the document was “primarily descriptive” and thus opted to give the college “additional time to collect and analyze relevant data in order to address the questions presented in the lines of inquiry and to respond to the request for additional documents.” The time seemed to benefit the college, which provided an abundance of documents in response to the lines of inquiry, some of which helped to address the questions that had been raised. The team was also pleased that the college provided initial institutional research data as well as the results of initial efforts using direct assessment to measure student learning. These steps will help to create a culture of objective assessment of student learning and evidence-based decision-making.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In 2013, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Senior College University Commission (WSCUC) granted Providence Initial Accreditation. The Commission also removed a Formal Notice of Concern, which had been issued during its Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR). The Formal Notice of Concern, according to the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation, “provides notice to an institution that, while it currently meets WSCUC Standards, it is in danger of being found out of compliance with one or more Standards if current
trends continue” (37). According to the 2012 WSCUC team report, quoted in full below, the Notice of Concern instructed Providence to “include evidence of” the following in its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) report for Initial Accreditation:

- Financial Viability – adequate enrollment, stable financial resources, positive net assets and a line of credit; update on notes payable and results of fundraising
- Financial planning and management – effective, aligned, and evidence-based plans and the appointment of a CFO
- Enrollment management – plans including capacity, staffing, and process in recruiting and retaining a critical mass of qualified students
- Institutional research – accurate, current, and useful data on important data used in support of planning and decision-making
- Program reviews, assessment of student learning – evidence of completed program reviews, results showing student achievement of intended outcomes and faculty use of assessment to improve teaching and learning. (5-6)

In 2013, the Commission also requested an Interim Report in spring 2015, “demonstrating progress on enrollment growth, hiring of a new president, and establishment of new executive leadership, and continued development of strategic, departmental, and related financial plans” (WSCUC Accreditation History Report Providence Christian College, 10/12/2017). Providence submitted an Interim Report in 2015, which addressed all of these areas. In 2015, WSCUC asked that a progress report be submitted in November 2016, which included the college’s 2015 and 2016 financial audits and a revised strategic plan, which the college provided (WSCUC Accreditation History Report Providence Christian College, 10/12/2017). An Offsite Review occurred in spring 2017; however, after completing the review,
the WASC team recommended that the Accreditation Visit be moved from fall 2017 to spring 2018 to allow Providence time to collect and analyze data related to the questions that emerged in the lines of inquiry.

Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

Institutions under review for reaffirmation are evaluated for compliance with the WSCUC Standards and are required to have in place policies and procedures considered essential for sound academic operations. The team found that Providence has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission. The sections below describe the results of the team’s review of each Standard.

The IEEI indicates that formal learning outcomes have been developed and are published and accessible to the public. A variety of indirect-assessment methods are regularly utilized to evaluate student outcomes in academic and co-curricular programs, direct methods were employed in fall 2017 to evaluate student papers in the senior capstone course, and plans are in place to expand these recent efforts and regularly to utilize standardized tests where appropriate. Structures are in place that allow faculty and staff to reflect and discuss assessment results and to make indicated changes to academic and co-curricular programming. Overall, ProvCC’s practices of effective assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness are emerging.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives:

In previous reports, WSCUC reviewers have praised Providence for its commitment to its mission and focus on providing a liberal arts education in the Reformed tradition. This
commitment was evident to the team during interviews with constituents from across the campus community during its recent visit.

**Institutional Purposes (CFR 1.1-1.2)**

The published mission of Providence Christian College is “to equip students to be firmly grounded in biblical truth; thoroughly educated in the liberal arts; and fully engaged in their church, their community, and the world for the glory of God and for service to humanity.” Providence enacts this mission from the educational perspective of the Reformed Christian confessions for its students and for the public good.

Institutional learning objectives take the form of “Student learning Outcomes” and “Core Abilities/The Providence Promise” and are published on the institutional website [http://outcomes.providencecc.edu/](http://outcomes.providencecc.edu/); [http://www.providencecc.edu/about-providence/at-a-glance/](http://www.providencecc.edu/about-providence/at-a-glance/). The learning objectives are consistent with the institutional mission. Providence also publishes student achievements, including graduation and retention rates, on its website [http://outcomes.providencecc.edu/](http://outcomes.providencecc.edu/). This information is also published in collateral materials utilized for admissions and information purposes. Four-year graduation rates of 68% and employment rates of 88% suggest the learning objectives are being adequately met (CFR 2.1). According to the IPEDS data on first-time, full-time students completing in 150% of the time to complete, in 2016 the rate was 56% (Fall 2011 cohort); and in 2017 the rate was similar at 57% (Fall 2012 cohort).

**Integrity and Transparency (CFR 1.3-1.8)**

The institution publishes its definition of academic freedom in its Catalog (2017-18 37), which states, “Students and faculty are free to explore, investigate, and engage all of creation in pursuit of truth. Academic freedom at Providence, however, is shaped by its confessional
commitment.” This is consistent with the mission of the institution and its application of the Reformed Christian perspective of higher education. It was clear in discussions with faculty members that they are free to teach and investigate any area of inquiry. However, teaching or publishing ideas that were counter to the Reformed confessions was problematic. When concerns about consistency with Reformed teaching arose from students, for example, informal feedback was requested from faculty in Biblical and Theological Studies regarding the consistency of instruction with tenets of the Reformed tradition (CFR 1.3). There are no specified policies about how the institution addresses faculty challenges to Reformed tradition beliefs in their instruction or scholarship.

The institution aspires to enhance diversity in all aspects of academic and non-academic life. However, at this time, there is minimal evidence of its attainment. In part, this is due to the demographics of the Reformed confessions, which are largely Anglo in identity. The institution seeks to fill its staff and academic ranks with members of these confessions and therein self-selects its demographic representation. Otherwise, the team could not identify in the institutional strategic imperatives or Master Plan any intentional tactics to enhance hiring or retention of diverse and representative faculty or staff (CFR 1.4).

However, enhanced diversity is noted in the student body, which includes a broad mix of demographics (http://www.providencecc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/10-Day-Report-2017-Fall.pdf). The institution is a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution and Hispanic students are the second largest (27%) ethnic group on campus. Again, Providence recognizes and seeks to enhance campus diversity by recruiting a broad array of students from throughout the region and nation according to its enrollment management plan (CFR 1.4).
The Academic Affairs Master Plan 2018–2020 charges the Vice President of Academic Affairs to develop a cultural competency matrix to assess the teaching of cultural topics in the curriculum (CFR 1.4).

The board of trustees includes members from a variety of Reformed denominations. However, there is no official denominational representation on the board, and the institution does not receive funding from any Reformed body. Otherwise, the institution operates as an independent educational organization (CFR 1.5).

Grievance procedures are clearly outlined in the Course Catalog (Catalog (2017-18 45). Appropriate records appear to be maintained, including disposition of the grievance. Academic policies and procedures are clearly delineated in the Course Catalog (Catalog (2017-18 36) and on the institutional website (CFR 1.6). The team is not aware of complaints or grievances submitted to WSCUC or BPPE.

The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, including provision of timely audited financial statements. This practice is evidenced in the Course Catalog and website. The President functions with appropriate professional latitude and board oversight. Communication between the President, CFO, and board appears open and regular (CFR 1.7).

The institution holds WSCUC accreditation in high regard and maintains an active engagement with the agency. Open communication exists between its ALO and WSCUC VP Mark Goor (CFR 1.8).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Providence highlights its liberal arts emphasis through its Liberal Studies Major, with concentrations in 13 areas. The Core Liberal Studies Curriculum is made up of 57 to 63 credit
hours, which includes 11 credits of Foundations; 12 credits of Kingdom of God: Bible and Theology; 6 credits of Serving God and Neighbor: Christian Perspective and Calling; 25-28 credits of Exploring Creation and Culture; and 3 units in the capstone course. In recent years, the institution has established the systems needed to ensure that core functions are effectively performed. In the future, the college will need to demonstrate on a regular basis that educational objectives are being met through formal assessment of student work and systematic external program review.

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7)

The undergraduate program at ProvCC is appropriate in content, standards, and degree level, as evidenced by the breadth and depth of the curriculum and by the standards to which students are held in each course. Concentration programs require students to engage in rigorous, focused, and sustained study. Full-time and adjunct faculty are qualified, and most hold the terminal degree in their field, though the institution struggles to find diverse, qualified, and confessionally committed (as required by their mission) faculty (CFR 2.1).

Admission criteria and degree requirements are clearly articulated; learning outcomes for courses, programs, and the institution have been developed by the faculty and are in place; and faculty committees (Faculty Senate, Teaching and Learning Committee, Program Review Committee, and others) are structured so that the meaning, quality, and integrity of the undergraduate degree is maintained. Faculty advisors work closely with students to ensure progress towards the degree, and a student information system is in place to track student completion of core, concentration, and graduation requirements (CFR 2.2-2.3).

Faculty have, since ProvCC was established, regularly and collectively reviewed and discussed student work products to assess student achievement of learning outcomes; however,
nearly all of this work has been informal and has not been documented or tracked in a way that allows aggregate analysis of results annually or longitudinally. In fall 2017, seemingly for the first time, faculty formally assessed student work products in the capstone course to measure achievement of program learning outcomes. Results of this assessment suggest that students in Liberal Studies 400 achieved targeted performance levels in the areas of written and oral communication, but not in the area of critical thinking. There is a 5-year plan in place to expand this formal assessment effort to examine student achievement of learning outcomes across multiple courses and programs (CFR 2.4).

The overwhelming majority of students who attended the student meeting during the team’s accreditation visit describe ProvCC as an active and engaged learning environment and report they are challenged in their courses. The 1:14 faculty to student ratio (http://www.providencecc.edu/about-providence/at-a-glance/) allows for small-class sizes and a community of learning that actively involves all students. Individual feedback on learning is provided to each student; however, results of assessment of aggregate achievement of program and institutional learning outcomes are not yet available (CFR 2.5).

Faculty members include student learning outcomes on their course syllabi and efforts have been made to map those learning outcomes to program learning and institutional learning outcomes. Faculty review and discuss student achievement of learning outcomes; however, much of this review is informal and anecdotal or uses indirect assessment methods (e.g., focus groups and surveys). ProvCC has only very recently begun formal assessment of student learning using direct methods (application of faculty-developed rubrics to student work products in capstone course) and has therefore not yet demonstrated that graduates achieve outcomes (CFR 2.6).
Procedures for program review and a multi-year cycle of scheduled program reviews are in place. ProvCC faculty have conducted internal reviews of their programs, though these have not been regular and consistent, and have not included a review of direct assessment results nor of graduation and retention rates, as these objective data have not been collected until very recently. External program review has occurred occasionally over the last several years; however, the way in which ProvCC responds to the recommendations from such reviews, some of which are quite critical of the programs, is not clear (CFR 2.7). For example, the experiential-learning program, “Avodah,” was recently externally reviewed and the reviewer’s report was fairly critical of the program. Sample comments include:

While many course evaluations of the Avodah excursions, in general, are positive, what is glaring is the consistent, constant, and unusual “neutral to strongly disagree” response to the inquiry: “The Avodah challenge my Christian perspective.”;

and,

It is no coincidence that the majority of those with whom I had conversations regarding the Avodah program indicated that the program’s structure of 12 excursions within a 4-year time frame is excessive, tedious, and counterproductive to a student’s overall experience; and based on low persistence rates, the program is not practical for all students’ success and may be experienced as a burden rather than a learning opportunity.

ProvCC administrators and staff indicate that they are carefully reviewing the report’s recommendations and planning for changes in the Avodah program, but it’s not clear that they are making moves to specifically address some of the problems identified by the reviewer.
Scholarship and Creative Activities (CFR 2.8-2.9)

ProvCC offers professional development workshops for faculty on a variety of topics related to the mission, teaching pedagogy, institutional research results. ProvCC provides funding for full-time faculty to attend regional conferences. The capstone course provides opportunity for student research and creativity, and collaborative research partnerships between students and faculty have begun in this context (CFR 2.8).

Processes and procedures for evaluation of faculty are in place and include review of teaching, scholarship, and service. Student learning is not yet included in evaluations of faculty as direct evidence is not yet being collected and aggregated sufficiently for this purpose (CFR 2.9).

Student Learning and Success (CFR 2.10-2.14)

ProvCC has an Academic Resource Center, which identifies and supports the needs of students; peer counselors and professional staff regularly track student progress throughout the semester and, collaboratively with faculty, reach out to students who are struggling to provide services and support. Very recently, ProvCC has begun to track aggregated and disaggregated retention and graduation rates. Tracking of aggregated and disaggregated student achievement using direct assessment methods is not yet in place; however, indirect assessment (e.g., student reflections and surveys) of student experience occurs regularly and those results inform programmatic change (CFR 2.10).

Co-curricular programs at ProvCC are aligned with the mission and the academic goals of the university. There is regular and productive formal and informal dialog and collaboration between faculty and staff in curricular and co-curricular areas. Assessment of co-curricular programs is limited by the absence of direct methods: surveys, student interviews, focus groups,
staff observations, and informal student feedback is conducted; the results of these indirect methods are reviewed and applied to changes in programming (CFR 2.11).

ProvCC provides clear information about its programs, admission criteria, and graduation requirements on its websites and in published materials. Students receive regular academic advising from faculty, and the Academic Resource Center closely monitors each student’s progress throughout the semester (CFR 2.12).

ProvCC is thoughtful about student-support services and implements a variety of programming throughout the campus and academic programs to enrich the student experience, to identify and support students in need, and, in partnership with academic programs, to help students achieve institutional learning outcomes. Evaluation of these support services has included a variety of indirect assessment approaches and the results of those assessments is reviewed and used to make change. Direct assessment methods are lacking (CFR 2.13).

Policies for transfer students are developed and clearly articulated and appropriate support for these students is provided through academic and co-curricular programs (CFR 2.14).

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

As is stated in the WASC 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*, “The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures” (18). As a developing institution, Providence’s growth will require significant investment in these areas.
Faculty and Staff (CFR 3.1-3.3)

Providence employs professionally competent and confessionally committed faculty and staff to fulfill the mission of the college. The hiring targets requested by departments during the program review process and annual planning efforts recognize this need for growth in line with available resources. Providence appears to have an adequate number of administrators focused on specific duties as reflected in the institution’s organizational chart (CFR 3.1).

Providence responds to its changing needs with adjustments to its administrative staffing. For example, in response to the introduction of scholar-athlete programs in 2014, Providence developed and reorganized Student Affairs. The addition of these sports programs for men and women not only increased enrollment but also highlighted a need for a greater level of collaboration between Student and Academic Affairs for the establishment and monitoring of student learning objectives (CFR 3.1).

All faculty and staff policies and practices are laid out in the Providence’s Staff Handbook, with any needed guidance for faculty laid out in its Faculty Handbook (CFR 3.2).

All faculty members participate in faculty orientation each fall. Professional development activities—such as special speakers, an annual spring academic conference on various topics, sessions on teaching strategies and retention strategies—are arranged at least twice each year. New faculty receive an initial orientation, and starting in fall 2016, a pilot program was developed for ongoing faculty mentorship throughout the first semester (CFR 3.3).

Professional development funds are set aside annually for full-time faculty members attending professional conferences and developing professional libraries. Faculty and staff are encouraged to use webinars and other online resources to enhance their professional development (CFR 3.3).
Staff are encouraged to participate in professional development activities designed to help with their roles at Providence. For example, the registrar takes courses offered by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), and two administrators participated in WASC conferences regarding quality of education issues. Professional development remains an important component of the annual college budget, and funds for academics are distributed through an application process that is reviewed and allocated by the Faculty Advancement, Development, and Evaluation Committee (CFR 3.3).

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFR 3.4-3.5)

Maintaining long-term viability is a central challenge and priority for the college. Providence has enjoyed tremendous financial support from donors since its inception. While this is a great position to be in as an institution, the college is aware of its need to increase its net tuition revenue (per student) (CFR 3.4).

Providence has greatly increased its size since fall 2014 (115 FTE fall 2014 to 167 in fall 2017) (092-2 PCC Research Report 12 12 2016 for fall 2014; 10 Day Report 2017-4 FINAL for fall 2017). With this growth, there have “been growing pains” in maintaining fiscal stability. The college sustained operating losses of 383K in FYE 2016 and 269K in FYE 2017. As of the FYE 2017, Providence has fully drawn its 500K line of credit and has a 269K deficit in unrestricted assets (although there is a net positive in combined unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted net assets). Even with these fiscal difficulties, Providence continues to receive unqualified opinions from its independent auditors, or financial statements that meet generally accepted accounting principles with no exceptions.

Providence has attributed the losses to unforeseen issues relating to its growth plans, which included building enrollment around a mix that included scholar athletes and traditional
students. Changes in projected retention rates of students due to the new student mix along with Providence recognizing the need to increase admissions staff and to provide additional support for this new blend of students resulted in a significant loss of revenue in 2015-2016 and a greater-than-anticipated increase in expenditures in 2016-2017. In 2015-2016, Providence was forced to embrace a financial restructure, which resulted in a number of layoffs of staff and faculty (CFR 3.4).

Providence has responded to its recent deficits by increasing strategic planning efforts, including the creation of a three-year strategic plan along with a budget designed to support that plan. The college has reviewed its methodology related to how it projects enrollment numbers for that plan and does have a greater understanding of retention and persistence rates now that Providence has hired an institutional research consultant.

The college’s supporters and the board are aware of the fiscal difficulties of Providence and appear to be willing to provide additional financial support to assist Providence in difficult years. Historically, Providence has enjoyed consistent financial assistance from its supporters, beginning with 50 donors in 2003 contributing $366,212 to 400+ donors in FYE 2017 giving a total of $2,897,737 ($1,609,015 unrestricted) (CFR 3.4).

Providence has created reports to monitor both adherence to its strategic plan and budget along with monitoring its advancement activity to ensure that the college is able to end future years with positive operating results (CFR 3.4).

Currently, Providence has facilities and services that are adequate to serve the college. The institution’s long-range planning and budgeting is designed to ensure that the college makes investments as Providence grows (CFR 3.5). Information Technology is outsourced and reports to the CFO, who is responsible for the coordination with departments to ensure the
administrative and academic computing needs of the campus are met (CFR 3.5). Growth of data resources available to students are being improved through access to electronic libraries, library cooperation agreements, and the sharing agreement of the Providence physical library with WCIU (CFR 3.5).

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFR 3.6-3.10)

The third president inducted at Providence Christian College, Dr. James Belcher, began his tenure as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) in July 2014. He has worked closely with the cabinet to assure continued quality in the educational program. He has also showed leadership in maintaining high-quality academic and student support programs, while having a lean and efficient administrative staff. The vice president of finance and operations/chief financial officer is full time and has responsibility over budget and finance, information technology, human resources, facilities, admissions, and financial aid. The college has a sufficient number of qualified administrators in the cabinet to provide effective educational leadership and management (CFR 3.6 and 3.8).

Although there are voting limitations at the Senate level, the college appears committed to a shared governance model, in which relevant stakeholders are involved. While decision-making appears collegial, clear lines of authority are established. The president’s administrative cabinet, composed of senior administrative staff, includes the president, the vice president of academic affairs, the vice president of finance and operations, the vice president of advancement, the dean of students, and the director of enrollment management. The cabinet convenes for weekly update meetings, as well as twice per month for longer ad-hoc meetings, to make administrative decisions and to provide leadership to the college.
The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision-making, and place priority on sustaining effective academic programs. Providence updates its organizational chart on a timely basis to ensure that there are clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority for the board of directors, the faculty, and the administrative staff. Faculty carry the dominant role in program and curriculum development and review, development of academic policies, and interviewing prospective faculty (CFR 3.7).

The board of trustees is an independent governing board committed to the mission, the vision, the purpose, and the future sustainability of the college. The board exercises oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations. An important role of the board of trustees has been the annual evaluation of the full-time CEO. The board has carefully reviewed the work of the president and made efforts to help him fulfill his many responsibilities (CFR 3.9).

Academic leadership is provided by the faculty, under the leadership of the vice president of academic affairs. After a three-year national search for a permanent hire, the college recently filled this position, and the new VPAA will start in June 2018. During team interviews, both faculty and administrators were pleased that the position had been filled. The faculty appears to exercise effective academic leadership to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution’s educational purposes and character (CFR 3.10).

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

ProvCC’s focus on processes for quality assurance, institutional planning, and improvement has developed as the college has grown. This standard is described as follows:
“The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposed and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future” (2013 Handbook of Accreditation 20).

Quality Assurance Processes (CFR 4.1-4.2)

Historically, administration and faculty at ProvCC have regularly engaged in discussion about the quality of the college’s programming and the success of their students; however, these discussions have largely been based on anecdotal observations and, more recently, on results of indirect assessments (e.g., student feedback). In the last two years, ProvCC has begun to engage in collection, analysis, and interpretation of direct data, including tracking of retention and graduation rates and, very recently, analysis of student work products in an advanced course. Administration, staff, and faculty have collectively and collaboratively reviewed and discussed results of these initial efforts and thoughtfully engaged in planning for curricular and co-curricular improvements based on these data (CFR 4.1).

To date, institutional research efforts have been implemented by a consultant hired for this purpose. ProvCC administrators, faculty, and staff have reviewed the results reported by the consulting team and have incorporated those data into planning and decision-making. Moving forward, ProvCC will need to institutionalize and expand these efforts, including assessment of the effectiveness of this work (CFR 4.2).

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFR 4.3-4.7)

ProvCC faculty and staff are committed to improvement based on data and evidence and have begun to expand and improve efforts to assess teaching, learning, and the campus environment. Whereas decision-making about curricular and programmatic changes were
historically based on anecdotal evidence and indirect assessment methods, more recent efforts
use objective data and direct assessment methods. Results from these recent efforts have been
carefully examined and utilized in decision-making (CFR 4.3).

Faculty are interested in understanding the impact of their teaching and curriculum and
are committed to using assessment results to improve programming in order to maximize student
learning and development. Since ProvCC was established, faculty have regularly reviewed and
discussed student work and have thoughtfully made changes to curriculum and programming as
a result of those discussions. Recently, the review of student work has included direct
assessment methods and plans are in place to expand these more rigorous and objective efforts to
evaluate student learning (CFR 4.4).

Students have many opportunities to provide feedback about the effectiveness of
curriculum and programming through surveys, focus groups, and reflections. Efforts to include
alumni and employers in assessment and alignment of educational programs are not yet in place
(CFR 4.5).

Thoughtful reflection and discussion around planning occurs regularly at ProvCC and
includes faculty and staff from academic and co-curricular divisions. Recently, these discussions
have increasingly focused on results of institutional research efforts and on direct assessment of
student learning. Strategic plans, which are regularly discussed and revised, align with
institutional purposes and address mission-consistent priorities; however, they are relatively
short-term and focused on operational directives designed to provide increased fiscal stability
(CFR 4.6).
Administrators, faculty, and staff are in touch with changes in higher education and evaluate these innovations and developments in light of the mission of the institution, making changes when appropriate and relevant (CFR 4.7).

Summary of Component 2

The team’s findings suggest that Providence has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standards and federal requirements. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

Under this component, institutions “are expected to define the meaning of the undergraduate and graduate degree they confer and to ensure their quality and integrity” (2013 Handbook of Accreditation 29). Providence’s mission is to equip students to be firmly grounded in biblical truth, thoroughly educated in the liberal arts and fully engaged in their church, their community, and the world for the glory of God and for service to humanity (Catalog 2017-2018). An emphasis on the liberal arts is something stressed by Providence’s mission, its publication, and by its president. For example, in his “Letter from the President” in a spring 2017 college publication, Dr. Belcher underscores that several recent developments “lay the foundation” for the college’s expansion: the promotion of entrepreneurship and innovation, the addition of the Health Science Concentration, the membership in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the hiring of a new athletic director, and “our continued push in the academic rigor of the liberal arts degree with which each student is training to be a critical thinker, effective communicatory, and lifelong learner” (2). As the college grows, it will be important for Providence to articulate/rearticulate the distinct value of a liberal arts education and its meaning to students and the institution.
The college appears to have a strong sense that its liberal arts emphasis is central to a Providence education. It also seems aware of the need to enhance the quality and integrity of this degree. Assessments of oral communication and writing in LBS 400/Capstone completed in December 2017 demonstrated that students were communicating (score of 3.7) and writing (score of 3.28) at levels that matched the college’s target range, a score of between 3-4 on rubrics. However, in its assessment of critical thinking in 17 capstone projects from December 2017, the college found that average scores on these capstones (2.07) were below the target range of 3-4. These capstone projects were selected from various concentrations, including Biblical and Theological Studies, Education, Business, Social Science, English, History and Humanities. Furthermore, when team members met with a room full of Providence students, they voiced discontent concerning variances in the quality, particularly rigor, of their courses. Although students praised Providence’s faculty members for their care and interest in student success, many said the Biblical and Theological Studies Concentration (taught by two full-time faculty) was more rigorous and engaging than other concentrations. While this information is anecdotal, it suggests the need for further data on the overall quality of the degree and the integrity of the different concentrations. Furthermore, the negative external review of the Avodah program suggests the need to rethink the experiential aspect of the degree. Both the capstone course assessment and the external review demonstrate the importance of direct assessment and external program review in upholding the quality and integrity of Providence’s liberal arts degree. In team interviews with administration and faculty, it was apparent that they were aware of these issues and were implementing ways to address them.
Component 4. Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

ProvCC has clearly articulated its mission and the institutional learning outcomes that derive from this mission (core competencies) and includes those in every course syllabus with a description of how the course interacts with those competencies. Co-curricular programming also derives from the mission and these core competencies. The mission and core competencies are displayed on the website and are provided to and discussed with students at orientation and throughout their time at ProvCC.

Standards of performance at graduation are clearly communicated to students and initial attempts at measuring student learning and achievement with direct assessment methods have occurred (standardized tests at entry and exit, analysis of student work products in the integrative senior capstone course) and are clearly articulated. Plans are in place to expand direct assessment methods and to better incorporate institutional research into decision-making and program and curricular improvements.

In fall 2017, faculty applied rubrics to the written paper portion of the Senior Capstone course to evaluate research skills (research and source usage, bibliography/works cited/references); writing skills (purpose/thesis statement/arguments, structure/organization, vocabulary/word choice, mechanics/presentation/grammar); and content (argument/originality, support/development analysis, rhetoric). Results for an unspecified number of student work products indicate an average total score of 3.28, which is within the target range of 3-4 identified by faculty. Faculty have identified next steps to improve assessment methodology and expand evaluative efforts to include other aspects of student work within the capstone course and to include additional courses.
The Educational Testing Service Proficiency Profile for the 9 of 13 students who matriculated in fall 2013 and graduated in 2017 shows an overall decrease in scores. These concerning results have been reviewed and discussed among faculty and administration and plans are in place to implement indicated curricular and programmatic changes and to expand standardized testing.

5. Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Administrators, faculty, and staff are committed to understanding the student experience and to maximizing student success and have, from the start, engaged in regular discussion and reflection about student learning, including reviews of student work. However, until recently, ProvCC’s efforts to assess student learning, retention, and graduation were limited to indirect data (e.g., student self-reports through surveys and focus groups), anecdotal observations by faculty and staff, and program review that was primarily conducted internally.

In the last two to three years, ProvCC has taken substantive steps to move toward evidence-based decision-making regarding programming and curriculum, including utilization of institutional research data about retention and graduation rates, external program review, and assessment of student learning with direct methods (e.g., application of faculty-created rubrics to samples of student work in the capstone course). According to the IPEDS data on first-time, full-time students completing in 150% of the time to complete, in 2016 the rate was 56% (Fall 2011 cohort); and in 2017 the rate was similar at 57% (Fall 2012 cohort). Initial data indicate no substantive differences in persistence and graduation rates by ethnicity.

Faculty define student success as an 80% or better pass rate in their courses. Results from 2009 to 2012 indicate that pass rates across all courses range from 38% to 79% with most
courses having pass rates between 60% and 80%. The 4-year graduation rates for ProvCC students who matriculated in 2010, 2011 and 2012 range from 37% to 38%.

Administrators, faculty, and staff have reviewed and analyzed results of these improved tracking and assessment efforts and are carefully implementing changes to programming and curriculum. Plans are in place to continue and expand all of these efforts over the next five years.

6. Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence

ProvCC has conducted internal program reviews since it was founded and has conducted external program reviews of some programs, with a plan to have external reviews for all programs conducted regularly on a rotating cycle. Program reviews to date, however, have been limited by the absence of direct assessment of student learning and institutional research measures. Given ProvCC’s plans for expanding its recent efforts in these areas, future program reviews will likely be more accurate and more helpful to the college. Over the last 2 to 3 years—as ProvCC has employed consultants to assist the college in putting institutional research into place and starting to use direct assessment methods—administrators, faculty, and staff have worked to digest the data and incorporate the results into plans for programmatic and curricular change. As noted by ProvCC in its institutional report:

As the college strengthened its ability to conduct research and validate the findings of that research, it has learned a great deal. The college has had to develop a culture of assessment through improving on assessment protocols, choosing new assessment instruments with national benchmarking capabilities…

In particular, the college has had to enhance its capacity to conduct and
communicate disaggregate research results that are meaningful and would serve as a basis for assurance of learning . . . What began as critical inquiry into evidence of student success has resulted in large scale system changes for the college and all departments, in data collection methods, and in the research staff, resources, and program impacts . . . The capacity for institutional research has been greatly expanded, and with that capacity comes both the responsibility to steward that knowledge toward improvement, and to attain a new dimension of quality in education . . .

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability; Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

As President Belcher has directed the institution, Providence will strive to build on the infrastructural processes for Learning that Lasts. Strategic allocation of resources has been undertaken by the college. Providence has invested resources in bringing capacity to evaluating and developing benchmarks and triggers to plan ahead for times of increased revenues, as well as constricted income. A full study of the class scheduling will inform future scheduling of classes and the development of student educational plans will provide a specific road map to course scheduling and planning for institutional needs (CFRs 3.4 and 4.6).

The newly developed strategic planning process and template shows direct alignment of resources with institutional priorities that ensures a focus on quality programs, improving student success, and assuring accountability and program improvement. The college will be fiscally sustainable by making strategic plans tied to budgets (CFRs 3.4, 4.3).

A strengthened program review process has guided the college toward both a deeper need and greater demand for capacity in obtaining valid data and aggregated statistics that will address
the needs of targeted populations and needs of our student. The college will have an understanding of what information it was missing, as well as what was present and important.

As the college looks to the future, Providence must be responsive to the needs of both the students and the employers in the marketplace. This ability to peer over the horizon, while holding onto the richness of its Reformed Christian heritage will be of paramount importance in the college’s continued success.

These years of prudent budget planning and program alignment will continue to maintain the college’s financial health for years to come, in order to meet future changes that will occur in higher education. The future phases of growth and development at Providence will be upheld by four pillars to assure Learning That Lasts.

**Component 8: Institution-specific Theme(s) (optional)**

**Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement**

As previously described, Providence possesses the strengths and weaknesses of young, resource-constrained institutions. Students, faculty, and staff appear to be generally satisfied with the institution. Enrollment and graduation rates appear to be increasing year-over-year, although enrollment growth has slowed in the two most recent academic years. Despite a discount percentage of 58% for 2017, but bolstered by extremely generous donor support, the institution continues to meet its financial obligations.

Given the expressed challenges of enrollment, substantial operating costs, and the perpetual threat of donor fatigue, it is vital that Providence addresses its higher-than-average financial aid discount rate in a timely manner. The college anticipates that enrollment increases might be realized with the new Health Sciences Concentration. Other new programs that do not compromise the integrity of a liberal arts mission might be beneficial in increasing enrollment;
this includes certificate programs and on-line offerings. Additionally, other sources of revenue must remain under active discovery and consideration. For example, boosters and other athletics-related fundraising might diminish the substantial burden of athletic programs on the operating budget.

While the institutional strategic planning process required significant investment by major stakeholders, it was not generally informed by institutional data. Only recently has the institution invested in consulting an institutional research analyst. While commendable, it is clear that analytic data emerging from the institution are few and generally descriptive. Given thatWSCUC is a data- and assessment-driven accreditor, it remains surprising that a 16-year-old institution only recently engaged in rudimentary, quantitative, program assessment and related activities. The AV team underscores its recommendation to enhance data-driven decision-making across a wide spectrum of institutional activities.

Providence now appears equipped to enter its forthcoming third decade from a position of enhanced awareness of the expectations of offering a high-quality education, particularly in data-driven decision-making. The college also continues to put in place the necessary components to ensure its financial viability. Altogether, the future of this institution can be very strong and representative of the liberal arts tradition.

Section III: Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

Commendations: The team commends Providence for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. For your continued demonstration of a clear vision of PCC’s mission, philosophy, and priorities.
2. For your continued building of needed infrastructure. In particular, the team applauds Providence’s hiring of a new president and a vice president of academic affairs and its reorganizing of the faculty committee structure to improve accountability and clarity of responsibility.

3. For your willingness to respond to existing institutional limitations by seeking paid and unpaid advisers across various domains.

4. For your holistic and integrated approach to student services. This emphasis includes, but is not limited to, establishing the Academic Resource Center (ARC) and hiring a full-time director, developing a part-time position for a Student Success and Career Counselor, and hiring a Writing Center Director.

5. For beginning to employ data-based decision-making, including examination of persistence and retention rates and direct assessment of student learning in your capstone course.

**Recommendations:** The team has identified the following recommendations:

1. Ensure fiscal stability by executing Providence’s three-year budgetary plan (CFR 3.4).

2. Develop and implement strategies to increase net tuition revenue (e.g., reducing the tuition-discount rate) (CFR 3.4).

3. Continue to expand institutional research capacity and develop and implement an integrated data collection and analysis plan (CFR 1.2; CFR 2.7; CFR 2.10; CFR 4.1; CFR 4.2).

4. Substantially enhance direct assessment of student learning and achievement across courses, curricular and co-curricular programs, and institutional learning outcomes (CFR 1.2; CFR 2.11; CFR 2.4; CFR 2.10; CFR 4.1; CFR 4.3).
APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms

Providence met federal requirements in the following areas:

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
3. Student Complaints Review
4. Transfer Credit Review
FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW
There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
3 – Student Complaints Form
4 – Transfer Credit Policy Form

During the visit, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)
The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution’s assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
   (i) It reviews the institution's-
      (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
      (B) The application of the institution’s policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
   (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution’s assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:
A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

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

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)
Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor’s degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master’s degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.
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## 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where is the policy located? Credit hour policy is located on college’s web-site in registrar’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>audits)? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree</td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level.</td>
<td>What degree level(s)? □ AA/AS □ BA/BS □ MA □ Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded? □ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g.,</td>
<td>What kinds of courses? Liberal Arts Bible Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internships, labs, clinical, independent study,</td>
<td>What degree level(s)? □ BA/BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerated)</td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Liberal Arts Bible Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other</td>
<td>How many programs were reviewed? 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program materials)</td>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? □ BA/BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Bible Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>length? □ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Completed By:  
Date:
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal regulations** | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  
☑ YES  
Comments: |
| **Degree completion and cost** | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  
☑ YES  
Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  
☑ YES  
Comments: Students may use a net price calculator available through the College web-page |
| **Careers and employment** | Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?  
☑ YES  
Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?  
☑ YES  
Comments: |

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on student complaints | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☐ YES  
If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? On the college’s website  
Comments: |
| Process(es)/ procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☐ YES  
If so, please describe briefly: Students are asked to try and handle the complaint through non-formal means and then elevate them through formalized college procedures  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☐ YES  
Comments: |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☐ YES  
If so, where? Student records  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☐ YES  
If so, please describe briefly: Student Life and academic records monitors student complaints  
Comments: |

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?  
☑ YES  
If so, is the policy publically available?  
☑ YES  
If so, where?  
Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education?  
☑ YES  
Comments: |

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

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

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

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

Review Completed By:  
Date: