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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

On October 21 – 24, 2019 a WSCUC evaluation team of five members visited National University (NU) of La Jolla, California for the Reaffirmation of Accreditation review as scheduled. The visiting team acknowledges the gracious hospitality, openness, and responsive cooperation extended by the University community. Preparations and accommodations for the site visit were appropriate and served the team well.

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

NU was founded in 1971. With approximately 120 programs and a fall 2018 enrollment headcount of 16,930 undergraduate and graduate students representing all 50 states and 65 countries, NU is one of the largest private, nonprofit institutions of higher learning in California. Its mission is to deliver an exceptional student experience by providing superior programs and services that are relevant and result in meaningful learning. The university’s vision is to be a distinctive, leading-edge institution that produces graduates who make positive contributions to the transformation of society and its values include Quality, Innovation, Collaboration, Diversity and Access. Its seven Institutional Learning Outcomes reflect and extend the mission and values.

Academically, NU is organized into three colleges: the Sanford College of Education; the College of Letters and Sciences; and the College of Professional Studies. NU has five regional campuses and nine military learning centers throughout San Diego County. Additional regional campuses are in Oxnard, Costa Mesa, Sacramento (Rancho Cordova), Redding, San Jose, Fresno, Ontario, Riverside, Los Angeles, Woodland Hills, and Henderson, Nevada. (In addition to sites at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Spectrum Business Park, Kearny Mesa and South Bay, the WSCUC team visited campuses at Rancho Cordova, Costa Mesa, and Los Angeles.)
The university's administrative and academic headquarters are in La Jolla, California. A faculty of 2,278 (275 full-time, 36 associate and 1,967 adjunct) delivers the curriculum through an accelerated one-month course format, predominantly through online courses, with rolling admissions and registration on a monthly basis year-round.

NU is a member of the National University System which was created in 2001 with NU as the flagship institution. Other members include the John F. Kennedy University; City University of Seattle, Washington; Northcentral University; and the Division of Pre-College Programs, which includes National University Virtual High School and National University Academy. Entities related to the system include Sanford Harmony, Sanford Inspire, and the Sanford Institute of Philanthropy. The National University System board of trustees convenes as a separate board with an individual board chair for each NUS institution. The NU board of trustees oversees all tactical and strategic operations of NU and meets four times a year at the university’s headquarters to assess goals and progress toward achieving them.

Regarding significant changes since NU’s last reaffirmation, Dr. Michael Cunningham was appointed chancellor of the National University System in 2015 after serving as president of NU from 2012-2015. Dr. David W. Andrews was appointed the 6th president of NU in April 2016.

In fall of 2019, NU was awarded a significant unrestricted gift of $350 million from T. Denny Sanford, a long-term donor and supporter of the University. It is a significant consideration in the University’s planning and priorities for its future. NU will be renamed Sanford National University in summer 2020 in honor of this gift.

NU was first accredited by the Senior College and University Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WSCUC) in 1977. Since 1973, the university has had 14 accreditation-related visits. The most recent Capacity and Preparatory Review took place in
spring 2009. The most recent Educational Effectiveness Review took place in November 2010, following which the institution was reaffirmed for a nine-year term in the Commission action letter of March 2011. Areas for further attention and development were 1) Understanding and Improving Retention and Graduation, 2) Enhancing the Faculty and the Role of Faculty in Governance, and 3) Assessing General Education.

NU submitted its required Interim Report on March 1, 2015. The Commission action letter from that review was received in August 2015, directing the university to continue to address the recommendations from the 2011 action letter and to provide an update on further progress in these three areas.

Recommendations from the Mid-Cycle Review were received in December 2016 from Dr. Richard Osborn, NU’s WSCUC Accreditation Liaison Officer. Focused attention was requested on NU’s six-year graduation rate, the university’s decline in enrollment, and the difficulty in accessing student achievement and disaggregated retention and graduation information on the university’s website.

Since 2011, NU has submitted 42 Substantive Change applications. For new programs, significant recommendations include close monitoring of the student and faculty experience in a program’s first year, assessment of market potential for new programs, target market clarity, inclusion of required syllabi elements, a documented program approval process, and evidence of the new doctoral culture. Of particular importance to the reaffirmation visit were the university’s first programs at the doctoral level: an Ed.D. in Organizational Innovation and a Doctorate of Nurse Anesthesia Practice.

B. Description of the Team’s Review Process
The WSCUC team received NU’s 72-page Institutional Report organized by component with 82 appendices on March 13, 2019. With a preliminary analysis of this information, the team conducted its Off-Site Review (OSR) with NU leadership on May 22-23, 2019. Outcomes from this discussion included six commendations, 11 specific Lines of Inquiry (LOIs) as the focus for the Accreditation Visit (AV), and a request for 14 additional data sets or reports related to the LOIs. Commendations were expressed for NU’s resolve in addressing its changing environment, its fidelity to foundational mission and values, a strong and improving process for assessing student learning, responsiveness to WSCUC mid-cycle findings, financial stability, and the strength of its self-study process. The LOIs included NU’s doctoral culture, data and resources to support decision making, improvements in student learning, improvements in retention and graduation, continuing financial stability, the relationship with the National University System, the technology plan, sufficiency of faculty resources, comparability of the student experience across modalities and locations, and NU’s highest priorities at this time. Additional data requested related to self-study participation, retention and graduation, program review, assessment reports, faculty diversity, disaggregated enrollment, faculty and staff resources, student services assessment, financial statements and data, and access to online courses. Given the volume and complexity of the additional data request, NU was allowed additional time to respond.

Four site visits were conducted prior to the AV; Rancho Cordova, Los Angeles, San Jose, Costa Mesa, and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot. During the AV, Spectrum Business Park, Kearny Mesa, and South Bay visits were also completed. Reviews of these sites are included in Appendix C.
During the Accreditation Visit, team meetings included over 250 individuals (several in more than one meeting) in person or via video conference, including the President and the EVP and Provost, and over 100 core operational and academic administrators, 13 members of the WSCUC steering committee, five Faculty leaders and over 100 full-time and adjunct faculty members, eight members of the board, 34 students, 19 members of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee, six members of the National University System staff and one Education Service Officer from the Marine Corps.

In addition to the supporting appendices, documents evaluated included disaggregated reports on retention, graduation, and student satisfaction, alignment of resources with current enrollment, examples of full program reviews, new-hire diversity, and updated financial statements.

The five members of the team were accompanied by Dr. Laura Carrillo de Anda, a WSCUC observer specializing in international accreditation.

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

Led by a steering committee of 14 which included six administrators and deans, and eight members of the faculty, a total of 54 members of the NU community participated in the WSCUC self-study in preparation for the reaffirmation of accreditation review by WSCUC. The report is thorough and consistent with the WSCUC requirements for evaluating progress, providing evidence, and reporting. NU addressed each of the required components of the institutional report. The data and documentation to support the report was descriptive and substantial though the team found a need for clarification on specific outcomes. The team’s request for additional information following the identification of the LOIs at the OSR was needed primarily to clarify
results of several new processes in place related to previous WSCUC recommendations and to update information already provided. With the exception of several comprehensive program reviews which were provided at a later date but prior to the visit as agreed, the data requested was provided as requested and in a timely manner. The deeper analysis conducted by the team was useful in framing the university’s progress and clarifying status. The confidential email account was established and monitored by the WSCUC team.

NU’s institutional report was well-organized and clearly written. The addition of data tables, data trends, and results of the analysis in the report would have supported and clarified conclusions although additional documentation was available to the team. The NU community was responsive and collegial throughout the process.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component I: Response to Previous Commission Actions

Areas for further attention and development from NU’s last comprehensive review in 2009-2010, and which were reinforced by the 2015 Mid-Cycle review included 1) Understanding and Improving Retention and Graduation, 2) Enhancing the Faculty and the Role of Faculty in Governance, and 3) Assessing General Education.

Regarding retention and graduation, the Commission requested refinement of existing processes and initiatives to improve data collection as well as deeper understanding of retention and graduation rates for distinct student groups. Many new retention support programs have been implemented, including a ten-year retention and graduation improvement plan, the Exceptional Student Experience Initiative, strengthened student advising and support functions, implementation of predictive analytics, investment in Precision Education, establishment of the
data warehouse, use of the Tableau dashboard, university-wide catalog and policy review, development of more engaging course structure and content, and faculty mentoring of students. However, changing approaches to the calculation of retention and graduation complicate understanding whether improvements over time have been realized, particularly with regard to certain student groups. The team requested a “definitive graduation rates for each college and school disaggregated by groups that are meaningful to improvement efforts.” According to the institutional report’s 5-Year Retention and Completion Trend Data, associate, bachelor’s, and master’s student first year retention did increase from FY2013 to FY2017. For these same groups, graduation rates for FY2011 through FY2015 cohorts improved for associate and master’s students, but not bachelor’s students.

The graduation rate dashboard is more revealing for institutions such as NU with a preponderance of part-time students who may take longer to graduate. The “Unit Redemption Rate” (URR) illustrates the number of credits granted by the institution that are “redeemed” or completed in fulfillment of degree requirements, thus minimizing the expectation of full-time progress and traditional graduation rates. The URR for all students indicates improvements from FY2010 (52%) to FY2017 (89%) with a decline in FY2018 (79%). The “Absolute Graduation Rate” (AGR), an estimation of the proportion of entering students who eventually graduate regardless of how long it takes is based upon the unit redemption rate. NU’s AGR also shows significant improvement from FY2010 (19%) to FY2017 (68%), with, again, a noticeable decline in 2018 (52%). A factor contributing to these findings is enrollment. NU’s overall enrollment increased significantly from FY2010 (9,306) through FY2014 (14,776), however, as calculated for the GRD, FY2018 enrollment is at 11,515.
From the disaggregated retention trends data report requested by the team, the team found data that reveals more about NU’s more targeted successes and challenges in student retention and graduation. With a few exceptions, associates’ graduation rates are generally improved for FY2010 to FY2016 regardless of gender, age, ethnicity, or military status. Bachelor’s graduation rates are declining for both onsite and online students in the College of Letters & Sciences and the College of Professional Students. Onsite students’ graduation rates are increasing for the College of Education. Graduation rates for veterans and non-military students is higher than for active duty students. Masters students’ graduation rates are generally improved for this same time frame, regardless of college, gender, modality, age, or military status.

While NU’s comprehensive retention goal may not yet be met, its efforts to improve graduation rates are importantly broad in scope and purpose. Understanding the impact of these initiatives overall and on targeted groups, and therefore their potential value to NU will likely require additional time, more detailed tracking, deeper analysis, and broad community understanding of results for the desired impact to be realized. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.3)

Regarding Faculty and the Role of Faculty in Governance, NU described new processes and policies in place to define and reinforce faculty’s role in governance, including informational workshops; ongoing meetings between the president, provost and Faculty Senate officers; new policies which include a courses load reduction from eight to seven; and a streamlined review and promotion process. Faculty are working together to rebuild programs on an asynchronous model, and new and continuing program review. No comparative assessment on changes in the faculty’s perspective on governance over time was provided in the institutional report. Faculty perspectives provided during the visit acknowledge positive changes and express hope for continuing improvements in communication with the new administration and, in the words of
one faculty leader, “recognize that their own governance practices must be considered in order to keep pace with the changing needs of students and the University.” (CFRs 1.3, 3.10, 4.6)

Related to the Governance issue, the Commission action letter of 2011 added that “a related concern is the need for a more diverse faculty, especially given the diversity of the student population.” Again, NU describes many efforts to strengthen the diverse representation of faculty, notably the creating of the Office of Equity and Inclusion which reports to President Andrews; the new college-wide Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council; and new software for conducting faculty searches. Somewhat complicating the analysis of progress, however has been an increase in full time faculty whose ethnicity is unknown; from 14.5% in FY2014 to 18.7% in FY2019. Adjunct faculty whose ethnicity is unknown increased from 17.0% to 27.6% for that same period. At the team’s request, NU provided a report on the ethnicity of new full-faculty hires which indicates that persons identifying as white seem to still be the majority of new full-time faculty hires: 71 out of 117 identify as white. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1, 3.2)

To further strengthen an already “exemplary” assessment process with a focus on General Education, NU established the General Education Committee as a standing subcommittee of the Undergraduate Education Council. The university has developed rubrics aligned with the WSCUC Core Competencies, and has developed a new General Education Division within the College of Letters and Sciences. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

In addition, the recommendations from the Mid-Cycle Review, received in December 2016 from Dr. Richard Osborn, added a concern regarding the university’s decline in enrollment, and the difficulty in accessing student achievement and disaggregated retention and graduation information on the university’s website. According to NU’s response to the team’s data request for college headcount by location and modality, unduplicated headcount has decreased from
28,754 in fall of 2016 to 27,843 in fall of 2019. (CFR 3.4) Student achievement data may be accessed on the NU website. Information is in two sections. The first is Institutional Data which includes demographics, graduation, and retention data with a pivot table that would allow disaggregated analysis of degree level, ethnicity, gender, and military status. The second is Assessment of Student Learning which lists learning outcomes. (CFRs 1.2, 1.6)

Since 2011, National University has submitted 42 Substantive Change applications. For new programs, significant recommendations include close monitoring of the student and faculty experience in a program’s first year (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.13), assessment of market potential for new programs and target market clarity (CFRs 4.2), inclusion of required syllabi elements (CFRs 2.2, 2.3), a documented program approval process (3.7), and evidence of the new doctoral culture. Each recommendation has been addressed.

Of importance to the reaffirmation visit are the university’s first programs at the doctoral level: an Ed.D. in Organizational Innovation and a Doctorate of Nurse Anesthesia Practice. This recommendation requested that “At the time of the next reaccreditation visit by WSCUC, the Institution must be ready to describe and provide evidence of doctoral culture activities and support.” The team met with the Doctoral Subcommittee of the Graduate Council to learn more about the new policies and oversight, and the impact of the National Council of University Research Administrators recommendations and is satisfied with progress on this new degree level. The team was particularly impressed with the deliberate, well researched, and gradual development of doctoral policies and programs. The team encourages this work and advises that NU employ its processes of continuous improvement to ensure program rigor, student learning, and doctoral culture. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9).
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

1. Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Enduring Educational Objectives

*The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place on both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparence, and autonomy.*

NU has a clearly defined purpose that informs the university’s structure, curriculum, services, and operations with a focus on measuring and improving student learning. Its vision to “be a distinctive leading edge university” is evident in all aspects of University operations including delivery of curriculum, co-curricular support of student learning, the student portal, and the Center for Innovative in Learning, to name a few. NU’s culture embodies innovation, experimentation and benefits from enterprising faculty, staff, and administration. The stated values of quality, innovation, collaboration, diversity, and access are evident in the structures and process of the university through committees, offices, and initiatives. NU’s 2023 strategic plan furthers the university’s commitments. NU will need to communicate these goals to constituents in a timely manner as well as and support the human resources needs to achieve these goals. The team advises that NU leadership implement a process of change management that prepare staff, faculty, and students for the rapid pace of change as well as include staff and faculty feedback on appropriate timelines and resource allocation. (CFR 1.1)

The university has clear and publically communicated educational objectives as evidenced by the ILO’s on syllabi, PLO’s on the department websites, and the work of the General Education
Committee. The Office of Institutional Research regularly publish demographic, retention and graduation data. The university has a clear understanding of student barriers to success and actively works to address those barriers by improving internal processes or by providing targeted and individualized support services to ameliorate factors affecting student success outside the university’s control. (CFRs 1.2, 1.6)

The role of full-time faculty is clearly defined and during our meetings with faculty members, they conveyed satisfaction with their roles and responsibilities. Issues of academic freedom did not arise during our interviews and faculty seem satisfied with their rights both in policy and in action. However, the team had little interaction with part-time faculty. Given NU’s reliance on adjunct faculty, their understanding of their rights is important to NU ability to fully embody its academic freedom policy as defined in the Faculty Policies document dated June 2017. (CFR 1.3) The university has made financial and structural commitments to diversity through the establishment of new offices (Ombudsman Office and the Office of Equity and Inclusion) as well as a robust committee structure, overseen by a dedicated group of staff, faculty, and administers via the President’ Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council (DEIC). (CFR 1.4) This structure is new and should be monitored for effectiveness as the structure matures and evolves.

The university is a member of the National University System which is overseen by the board of trustees. Each institution in the system is overseen by the same board and it appears that decisions are made in a collegial manner. However, this is an unusual configuration and it may limit the autonomy of NU from external entities or the other institutions in the National University System. This board of trustees configuration should be regularly evaluated to ensure that it is able to continually serve the best interests of National University and that it is compliance with WSCUC’s Governing Board Policy. (CFR 1.5) The university operates with
integrity as evidence by their robust, systematic, and open processes that use data and analysis to guide institutional decision-making. The University’s ability to continually pilot, assess, retool, and invest in innovations in order to reach their goals, is laudable. Staff at NU feel empowered and supported to re-imagine their operations and a culture of continual improvement is evident. One small note of caution: the simultaneous implementation of so many initiatives may make it difficult to assess effectiveness of any one initiative. The team was impressed with the use of A/B testing of interventions and encourages this rigorous level of assessment and closing the loop. (CFR1.7) The University has been responsive to the team’s requests and has given timely notification of materials, schedules, as well as a very reflective Institutional Report. The team was particularly impressed with the posters in the team room depicting responses to our lines of inquiry. (CFR 1.8)

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

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The institution 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. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

NU’s programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded. NU has student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels that are clearly stated and ILOs are in alignment with WSCUC core competencies. The team was impressed in interviews with faculty, staff and students of their
awareness and understanding of learning outcomes as a way to value and assess educational effectiveness.

With over 80% of faculty at adjunct status, faculty are hired and qualified for the type and level of online/hybrid and in-class curricula offered at NU. As evidenced in curricular scaffolding and rigorous assessments, all degrees awarded by NU are clearly defined according to the levels of student achievement necessary for graduation and not simply an accumulation of courses/credits (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7). The team was impressed with NU’s coherent philosophy, expression of its mission across locations, and robust assessment documenting the meaning, quality and integrity of the NU degrees (CFR 2.1).

In 2016, the General Education Committee (GEC), a standing committee of the Undergraduate Council, redeveloped the General Education (GE) PLOs to ensure students were learning the WSCUC-determined core competencies as they interact with the GE curriculum. The redevelopment resulted in nine GE PLOs (appendix IV-F). Curriculum maps by GE Areas were created to show the alignment of GE PLOs to National University’s ILOs, WSCUC’s Core Competencies, AAC&U’s Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs), and the VALUE Rubric to be used as the assessment instrument. The GEC further identified where the GE PLOs are introduced and developed across the general education curriculum. From there, a multi-year plan was developed to show the GE PLOs to be assessed and the direct and indirect measures to be used for that purpose. (CFR 2.2a). While a fully integrated and robust assessment of these GE PLOs are still in development, the GEC is focused and passionate about the data acquired and curricular changes made thus far. While the GEC is committed to, “creating a more sophisticated approach to assessment GE and Core competencies,” (National Self-Assessment; pg. 16) the team found the GEC to be using the assessments to make informed and data-bound
curricular enhancements. The team was impressed with the committees’ commitment to using assessment to improve the general education curriculum.

The faculty-driven, transparent curriculum development process ensures graduate programs are reviewed for rigor, student learning outcomes, and standards of performance (CFR 2.2b). All programs, graduate included, undergo rigorous and systematic annual assessment that feeds directly into the five-year academic program review and permeates the culture of data-based educational effectiveness assessment (CFRs 2.6, 2.7). The team was consistently impressed with the level of faculty engagement associated with the assessment process and curriculum adjustments based on ongoing program review. Across programs and branch campus visits, faculty consistently expressed ownership and even excitement about their course and program assessments. The engagement and passion of NU faculty was noted throughout the visit. NU has recently gone through a voluntary the National Council of University and Research Administrators (NCURA) review of its research compliance and research infrastructure, and has organized teams to address the recommendations for building the research/teaching infrastructure and nexus (CFRs 2.8, 2.9)

NU continues efforts to systematically collect and analyze student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study (CFR 2.10). Staff and faculty are working toward benchmarking retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations and the rates of peer institutions (at the time of the visit this was still not in place; but in process). The nature of NU student demographics is a consistent struggle for NU, as their population is typically online non-traditional adult learners who come to the program with various life and school histories.
Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students’ personal and professional development (CFR 2.11). The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. In staff interviews, NU co-curricular/student affairs staff were passionate and connected to each other even though many staff and students connect virtually. NU’s newly refined “holistic advising model” hopes to show that students are supported based on their individual goals and needs. Co-curricular programs and student affairs activities assess learning outcomes annually.

NU serves a large transfer student population. As such, NU provides clear, accurate and timely information, ensures equitable treatment under its academic policies, provides access to student services, and ensures students are not disadvantaged by the transfer process. NU established articulation agreements with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits. NU recently signed the ADT agreement as well as numerous articulation agreements with community colleges to accept students into specific programs of study, grant credit for courses taken, and provide tuition discounting for students in those programs (CFR 2.14).

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission’s review, is that the institution has demonstrated evidence of compliance with Standard 2.

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

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. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.

NU’s institutional report, supplemental information and interviews with multiple students, employees, management and board has provided the team good insights as to how NU achieves its mission and priorities through the development and allocation of its resources, staffing and organizational structures. NU employs a significant amount of part-time/adjunct faculty (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). NU reports that they employ over 2,200 faculty with over 1,900 of them being adjunct. With over 85% of the instructional team being adjunct to support nearly 28,000 students as reported for fiscal year 2018, a consideration for the future is whether this student population could be completely supported with more full-time faculty members whose sole commitment is to the university (CFR 3.1). Staff levels at NU have fluctuated over the past years with 634 in 2015, growing to 796 in 2017 and by fiscal year end in 2019 the count was 643. The over 20% reduction in staffing levels in the past two years is somewhat concerning given the institution does not have any financial issues. It was reported at an interview of senior management that the fluctuations in staffing levels were tied to a realignment of admissions and student advisors. Interviews with numerous staff yielded consistent comments such as they really enjoyed serving adult students, appreciate the institution’s focus on affordability and student success. Other consistent staff feedback provided were concerns about the amount of communication from senior management, communications tend to be last minute for major initiatives and staff feel they are not competitively compensated compared to their peers in the industry. NU’s practices for hiring and evaluating both faculty and staff are somewhat vague and evidence provided was only to their human resources manual which includes an equal
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employment opportunity policy as well as references to employees having annual evaluations (CFR 3.2). The institutional report also indicates that full-time faculty are subject to an Annual Activity Report where students, deans, committees and senior university leadership weigh in on faculty performance. The development of faculty and staff is conducted at NU with a heavier emphasis on faculty to improve teaching (CFR 3.3). It was noted that each faculty are allocated $2,400 a year for professional development, conferences and that the Center for Innovation in Learning (CIL) was established to support faculty success in online teaching using their Blackboard LMS as well as support for course design.

It appears the institution has both the financial, physical and technological resources in place to be successful for the short and long-term (CFRs 3.4, 3.5). NU has demonstrated its financial strength for the past several years with stable operating revenues even in declining enrollment years. Revenue has grown by 2.6% or nearly $6 million between 2014 at $225 million and $231 million in 2019. Expenditures have proportionally adjusted with revenue changes between 2014 and 2019, except for 2017 in which a disproportionate increase in institutional support grew by over $11 million and continues to grow through 2019 by nearly $25 million since 2014. As a result of NU’s increases in institutional support, there has been a significant drop in operating net surplus compared to prior years. Nonetheless NU is generating well above break-even results on average. NU’s cash position is very strong and has grown by nearly 37% between 2014 and 2019 with an ending balance of $59 million. Investments have grown by 34%; from $200 million to a $781 million ending balance in 2019. NU’s liabilities have significantly increased between 2014 and 2019 by over 130% with a 2019 balance of $156 million. The primary increase in liabilities are $19 million due to affiliates and $87 million are funds held on behalf of others. It was stated in an interview that these liability increases are primarily a result of holding
investment funds for affiliate institutions. Overall NU’s balance sheet is exceedingly strong, with net asset growth of over 13.2% or $96 million since 2014, with an ending balance of $822 million in 2019. Over 95% of NU’s net assets are unrestricted which provides NU’s board and leadership with significant flexibility for investing and reserves. The institution provided the team annual financial statement audits for 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, all of which are unqualified (CFR 3.4). Sufficient information technology resources and support services appear to be in place for NU students and employees (CFR 3.5). NU indicates it provides students 24/7 online access to software through third party vendors, they have moved much of their physical equipment and technology support for programs to digital resources through external vendors. NU provides online students orientation and support services before their program begins. NU has moved toward more e-textbooks to drive down costs for students. A student concierge services function has been created to provide student another level of service to address multiple areas of support that a student could need via phone, chat, email, seven days a week, from 7:00 am to midnight PST. NU provides library resources to students through extensive collections of databases, print and e-books, journals, and other resources. Thirty staff members provide library support to the student body seven days a week. Faculty are provided technology resources and support particularly on NU’s learning management system; Blackboard. The National University System office provides central software and hardware support needs to faculty and staff at all locations.

The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes, defined roles and responsibilities, and governance seem to be in place (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10). After interviewing several members of the management team, the institution does value integrity, high performance and responsibility (CFR 3.6). Particularly on the academic side, there are multiple
levels of administrators and faculty governance structures to support the mission of the institution. It appears senior management is diligent about reviewing organization structures and efficiencies on a recurring basis. Evidence for this would be the recent reorganization and the hiring of two new vice provosts to support academic and faculty affairs as well as assessment and accreditation. (CFR 3.7). NU does indeed have a full-time CEO and a recently hired CFO. It also appears there are a sufficient number of top-level administrators, though it is not clear that the number of employees below the Dean or Assoc. Provost/VP level are also adequate. (CFR 3.8). NU does have a board of trustees that is sufficient in membership, governing documents and board committees to oversee major areas of the institution such as academic affairs, audit and governance among others. The board meets four times a year to review the activities of NU and evaluates senior leadership at least once year (CFR 3.9). Attention is needed to assure that the board design sufficiently meets the WSCUC Governing Board Policy, given that all board members are the same members on every National University system affiliate. The chair role rotates amongst them by election. The team also questions whether more diversity in the board composition might better serve the mission of NU (CFR 3.9). Few current members have experience in higher education or non-profit organizations. Most of the membership are current or retired executives from banking, legal or other professional industries. Given NU’s comprehensive academic focus, size, ambitious strategic plan and a lower need for fundraising, the need for more members who understand the intricacies of the higher education industry may be worth consideration.

The faculty at NU appear to have academic control over curricula through various mechanisms. A robust faculty senate and multiple committees are detailed in a 2012 document; the National University Faculty Bylaws. The document details governance, policies and
committee structures. Interviews with numerous faculty at both branch and headquarters visits verified that full time faculty perceive that they do play a critical role in this governance (CFR 3.10). It appears that some of the work of the Senate involves part-time and adjunct faculty, but only full-time faculty are allowed to vote on actions of the Senate.

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission’s review, is that the institution has demonstrated evidence of compliance with Standard 3.

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

*The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.*

NU is cognizant of the changing environment of higher education and deliberate in envisioning future changes. As such, it continues to actively reflect and plan with its multiple constituents to explore the role of on-site and online educational approaches and how those approaches can come together to meet the needs of students and enhance learning outcomes. (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)

NU has developed robust quality assurance processes capable of collecting, analyzing and interpreting data. Faculty, academic leaders and external stakeholders are committed to continuous improvement through on-going evaluation, self-assessment and student feedback intended to improve structures, services, processes, teaching, curricula, pedagogy, and student learning results. NU quality assurance processes include administrative functions to assure
quality and provide documentation to support the development and approval of any curricular changes. NU uses its Program Annual Review (PAR) for learning outcomes assessment, and it’s Five-Year Review (FYR) for program review to systematically review academic programs and degrees through a clear and transparent curriculum and development process that coincides, when necessary, with program assessments performed by other professional accrediting agencies. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

NU’s Institutional Research team provides significant support to academic decision-making, new program planning, and other aspects of academic improvement with the support of the Data Analytics Office and the NU Data Warehouse to collect and report data. The collection of data through these systems helps to streamline the development and dissemination of reports. However, the Data Warehouse is not yet fully implemented, and therefore currently limited. The Institution also utilizes CurriQunet, a centralized electronic curriculum management system to track, communicate, and review course and program development. It also provides a transparent approval process. Leading these efforts are the Office of Educational Effectiveness and Accreditation (EEA); an office of four staff that supports assessment efforts for all divisions, and the Office of Institutional Research (IR) with two staff. Both offices are valued across the university. Additional staffing may be needed to enhance the capacity to support assessment processes. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.5)

In 2015, NU started the creation of NU2020, the University Strategic Plan that incorporates its mission, vision and core values. The plan focuses on academic excellence, operational effectiveness, and enrollment management and growth. Since then, NU has updated its plan to a 2023 Strategic Plan which has an improved focus on student success and degree completion. As the institution moves forward, the team recommends that the institution seek to align the
strategic plan with the strategic direction of its colleges and schools with all current WSCUC requirements. (CFR 4.6)

There is a clear culture of collaboration and investment of all members of the NU community.

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission’s review, is that the institution has demonstrated evidence of compliance with Standard 4.

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

The meaning of a degree from National University is intertwined with the mission (exceptional student experiences, superior programs and services, relevant and meaningful learning) and their student population (independent, working, post-traditional adult learners). In the past few years NU has prioritized academic excellence, improvements in teaching, and student success outcomes. Another key priority has been organizational effectiveness through innovative operations, collaboration, facilities and technology. Central to NU’s meaning, quality and integrity (MQID) is the ability to initiate rapid change to stay relevant to the needs of students, changes in professional preparation, and advances in technology.

An important part of NU’s MQID are relationships to professional committees. Many programs have disciplinary accreditation and NU has been expanding the number of program-level advisory committees which help to inform degree meaning, quality and integrity. MQID at NU is based upon continually assessing curricular relevance by incorporating adjunct faculty into the curriculum design and delivery. Based on its reliance on adjunct faculty, the university will need to invest heavily in the onboarding and development of adjunct faculty as well as
ensuring formal structures in which the voices of adjunct and part-time faculty are included in decision-making. (CFRs 2.1, 3.1).

NU has established seven ILOs as well as PLOs for every program, and course learning outcomes (CLOs) for every course. Quality and integrity are assured by multiple methods. General Education (GE) assessment is further reviewed by a shared governance committee. The work of this committee should continue to document evidence of curricular change based upon the review of the GE outcomes as noted in the institutional report on page 16, “Creating a more sophisticated approach to assessing general education and core competencies”. (CFR 2.2a) CLOs are systematically assessed at the section level via signature assignments. The data are reviewed by the faculty course leads, and program directors. PLOs are reviewed annually as part of the PAR as well as every five years in FYR. It appears that most programs are up to date on their FYR. These processes are supported by the school assessment committees who meet regularly to review assessment data and close the loop. The University Academic Assessment Committee integrates the findings and discerns overall needs for improvement. Faculty governance engages with quality assurance through the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. The FYR’s timeline ensures that results are ready to inform the budget cycle.

A major component in assuring the quality of the degree relies on the mode of delivery and the course design. To better meet student needs, NU has been re-designing all courses to be delivered in an asynchronous manner. The Center for Innovative in Learning (CIL) has been responsible for working with the faculty content experts to design all courses so that they have consistent use of learning outcomes, embedded assessment, and appropriate rigor. NU uses many best practices in quality and integrity assurance such as a capstone experience for students in each program. Additionally, the growing use of student portfolios is also a best practice that
can be shared with potential employers and serve as an important mechanism of quality assurance.

The team was particularly impressed with the deliberate, well researched, and gradual development of doctoral policies and programs by passionate and engaged faculty. NU has intentionally offered programs that are in high demand and in which they already offer some measure of expertise. From the 90 applications received, 15 students were admitted to the first class of the EdD program. (Two deferred admission.) Discussions about developing doctoral programs and an appropriate doctoral culture have been long-term, inclusive, and open to learning, as well as adopting and ensuring a new level of rigor. The distinction of doctoral graduates being “leaders in their profession” is both in keeping with NU’s institutional purpose as well as introducing an appropriate distinction between master’s-level degrees and doctoral work. The team encourages this work and advises that NU employ its processes of continuous improvement to ensure program rigor, student learning, and doctoral culture. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9).

In addition to direct evidence of degree meaning, quality, and integrity, NU employs several indirect measures with systematic programs of survey data collection including the Noel Levitz Adult Students Priorities Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement. NU also deploys a three-year-out alumni survey to collect information on satisfaction with their education and employment. These survey results are routed to the department heads and used to improve programs.

National University employs multiple strategies to ensure the meaning, quality, and integrity of the degrees student earn. The result is a coherent, systematic, data-informed approach that
inCorpsorate many best practices and fits with the culture of innovation and continuous improvement at National University.

**Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation**

NU provides evidence of a comprehensive structure for designing, delivering and assessing all of its programs and for measuring student learning. This structure includes institutional and program outcomes that determine student learning suitable to each degree program. It also includes program reviews and approvals, and multiple indirect measures such as Student Satisfaction survey, Alumni Survey, and the National Survey of Student Engagement. (CFR 2.1).

To ensure educational quality, NU uses CurriQunet, a centralized electronic curriculum management system to track and review course and program development which allows for a transparent approval process by faculty, staff and education leadership. All approved program descriptions, CLOs and PLOs, and curriculum maps are housed in CurriQunet. In 2018, NU added a program viability study to its process of program development to ensure relevancy of the programs to potential learners (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.1, 4.3).

The seven ILOs at NU are included in appropriate academic documents and assessed in each program to assure the impact of the National University program.

Through evidence provided in appendices to the self-study, as well as interviews with faculty and program chairs during the visit, the team was pleased to see that the university has embedded SLOs into program requirements and courses; ensured that assessment of SLOs for 2016-2018
was done in a comprehensive manner; and mapped SLOs to WSCUC core competencies (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5).

The Faculty and Staff at NU work collaboratively to develop CLOs and PLOs that are measurable and appropriate for each degree level. Each school/college within the NU structure has a School Assessment Committee (SAC) that provides oversight of reviewing and mentoring faculty in learning outcomes assessment and PAR. Through the annual evaluation of the PARs in each school/college, SAC assesses evidences of student learning, program quality, and resource needs and make recommendations for improvement. The PARs also provide opportunities for faculty to provide feedback and additional comments. In addition, faculty teaching online receive support with course development by highly qualified instructional designers working in the Center for Innovation in Learning (CIL). (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 4.3)

In 2016, NU reviewed and assessed the core competencies within general education curriculum and the students are gaining meaningful competencies as they interact with the GE curriculum. This effort led to the creation of nine GE PLOs which included WSCUC’s five core competencies mapped to the ILOs. The team verified that the assessment of the student learning of the five core competencies, led by the General Education Committee, proved that students are meeting a basic level of expectations appropriate for the lower-level GE courses and improve as they move into higher level GE courses. With continuous review and assessment of the GE learning outcomes and core competencies, NU established ideas to further improve this assessment more systematically. As a result, a NU General Education Strategic Plan was created. Guided by the goals of the GE Strategic Plan, the GE Division established priorities for curricular development to enhance outcomes aligned with levels of achievement for graduation. (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, 2.6).
Each of NU’s undergraduate program has program learning outcomes that describe the knowledge, skills, and abilities students will be able to demonstrate upon graduation of the program. The PLOs are aligned with the ILOs but they only address four of the five core competencies; oral and written communication, critical thinking, and information literacy. To address this gap to include quantitative reasoning, NU’s General Education strategic plan calls for embedding secondary BlackBoard rubrics in each of the undergraduate program capstone courses. This, along with the core competency assessment results from GE coursework, the test results from ETS Academic Proficiency Profile, and other indirect measures from the National Survey of Student Engagement is expected to help the General Education Committee to ensure the development and mastery of the five Core Competencies in undergraduate education at National University. (CFR 2.2a)

NU’s graduate programs enforce a high-level of learning that is more demanding than expectations of undergraduate students. NU graduate programs have also completed curricular alignment with the ILOs. Within each graduate program, there is a clear evidence of learning outcomes articulated at the graduate level. Graduate students are involved in co-curricular activities such as seminars, experiential activities, field practice as appropriate, and other engaged processes for learning to further gain intellectual competencies which are reflected in course and program learning outcomes. Graduate program learning outcomes are assessed on an annual basis through the PAR. Most graduate programs are aligned with programmatic accreditors who have rigorous standards for scholarship and professional practice. Onsite examination and self-study documentation demonstrated that student learning assessments are collected and analyzed at key formative and summative levels; there are student support
mechanisms in place to ensure student progress. The results have been strong, reflecting well on
the institution. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3).

**Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation**

NU has a clear understanding of student learning, retention, and graduation and is committed
to improving student success with a number of innovative and ambitious projects. Furthermore,
NU regularly employs A/B testing as well as rigorous assessment of initiatives to ensure the
initiatives are having the desired effect. If they do not prove to be effective, NU is quick to
retool, reinvest, or discontinue the initiative. The university has invested in a 10-year retention
and graduation plan, improving and systematizing support services (such as the writing center,
advising, and library), Precision Education, faculty mentoring of students, as well as a data
infrastructure that gets relevant data and analytics into the hands of decision-makers. The
institutionalization of learning and retention data into many differ levels of decision-making
(PAR, FYR, assessment committees, course leads, program directors) is exemplary.

Given NU’s unique calendar of one course per month, regular benchmarks for student
retention using cohort tracking can be problematic and not truly reflective achievement or trends.
In addition to the evidence provided by NU, the team requested graduation rates for each college
and school disaggregated by groups that are meaningful for improvement efforts. The data show
that the one year- retention rates have improved for all degree levels and that graduation rates for
associates and masters had increased but the bachelors levels has decreased. Examination of the
graduation rate dashboard reveal a general increase in the Unit Redemption Rate, and an increase
in the Absolute Graduate Rate Both increase from 2010-17 and then decrease in 2018, although
this may be due to the drop in enrollment. Bachelor’s completion continues to be an issue with
active duty military having lower rates of completion as would be expected. While an open admissions institution catering to active military, veterans, and working adults would be expected to have lower rates of retention and graduation, NU’s graduation dashboard rates are below the WSCUC institutional average for the region. Again, the comparison institutions might not be a direct match to NU’s open admissions policy and adult student population. Nonetheless, improving student retention and completion should remain a major focus for the University. (CFRs 1.2, 4.1)

To address retention and graduation rates, NU has developed a comprehensive ten-year Student Success Improvement Plan 2019-2029. NU’s innovative efforts to increase retention and graduation are commendable. Technological efforts such as Precision Education, targeted student support, and daily updates to student degree audits are best practices that hold much promise and should be monitored for effectiveness. The Precision Education initiative is a significant priority for NU, intended to use sophisticated analytics with combined databases to create in-depth student profiles to predict students at risk and guide interventions throughout a student’s lifecycle. The goal is to personalize learning to facilitate learning, retention, and graduation. When boutique pilots are approved for scale, it is important that NU ensures that faculty and staff are well-informed and prepared for the type and pace of change required to achieve ambitious goals.

The data warehouse has already improved access and dissemination of data and analytics to decision-makers. NU is encouraged to continue to build out the data sources and make them available to the Educational Effectiveness and Accreditation and Institutional Research teams to analyze and disseminate. The Office of Analytics and the Office of Institutional Research are well-positioned and well-respected on campus. The two-person team in IR is responsible for a
large scope of activity including assessment, mandated reporting, training staff to use the annual, monthly, weekly, and daily dashboards, ad hoc requests, as well as more in-depth analytical work. The size of the team may be an issue as NU relies more and more on data and analytics. NU should ensure IR has the capacity to conduct the types of in-depth, university-specific research required to provide insight into the underlying causes of low retention and graduation rates. As NU ventures more and more into predictive analytics, IR will need to be staffed appropriately to conduct such research and to train data users on the ethical uses of such information. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, 4.1, 4.2)

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

In review of the previous WSCUC commission action letters and self-studies, NU has a well-regarded history of applying rigorous processes dedicated to understanding educational effectiveness in regards to teaching and learning. In 2011 WSCUC commended NU for utilizing best practices in the development of a rigorous and successful assessment system and the use of data and evidence to inform curriculum.

The team was impressed with the program improvement at NU. It was clear that understanding how and what students know is founded in use of data and evidence, and data is used to consistently inform curriculum and processes across programs. The documents provided by NU, as well as numerous interviews with faculty and staff on campus, indicate that quality assurance and assessment are seen as vital to the operation and teaching at NU. This use of data to inform is obvious in the well-defined and explicit assessment cycle that aligns with the mission of the institution. The PLO assessment process is a multi-year planning cycle that feeds
into a five-year review; the FYR. The process, as indicated in appendix III-N, is based on best practices in program review and includes a two person external reviewer component. With assessment feeding into the formal academic program review process, evidence of student learning and data is a vital part of the university’s accountability process where faculty members take a deep dive into academic program quality, rigor, and resources with a strong focus on student learning and success. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). Interviews with faculty involved in the FYR and assessment have confirmed curriculum and/or program changes are made from these processes.

The purpose of the FYR at NU is to, “identify strengths and seek out areas in which improvements that can be made to an academic program of study that will enhance the learning experience and academic success of its students” (Self Study, pg. 53). Faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administration all participate and give input into the process and the programs. Each review involves a comprehensive evaluation from NU constituents as well as external reviewers (2 max). University-wide planning, curricular decision making, and budgeting efforts, all use the FYR results and recommendation in considering institutional improvements. (CFRs 4.1, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7). The FYR summarizes the results of the program learning outcomes assessment that occurs during the five-year period, along with major program changes/improvements that were made during that period. The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils monitor the Program Review Process through policy guidelines. The team was encouraged by the review in 2018, where these two councils and the University Academic Assessment Committee, decided to assess their FYR process to ensure even further dedication to educational effectiveness. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).
During the 2018 academic year, 15 programs participated in academic program review, and 19 programs in 2019. Another 13 programs are scheduled to participate during the 2020 academic year (appendix VI-A). The NU process of review is tight but uniformly applied throughout the university – including course and program assessments. The seven components of the FYR process are founded in best assessment practices and provide an example to other universities and schools on how to operationalize and enculturate assessment as a way to dive deep into teaching learning and curricular improvements. Interviews of academic program directors who participated in recent self-studies inCorpsorate their learning outcomes assessments into FYR seamlessly. The administration and budget processes also utilize FYR reports and memos of understanding to make critical changes (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

The concept of “closing the loop” is an area of focus for NU – not merely implementing changes but evaluating the changes to assess the adequacy of impact. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3). The Data Analytics Office adds to the available institutional research capacity through the ongoing development of their data warehouse (CFR 4.2). The Office of Educational Effectiveness & Accreditation (OEEA) holds annual sessions on the PAR and FYR review processes in addition to other learning and assessment-related topical sessions. The OEEA also hosts learning communities for faculty undergoing a FYR. Furthermore, the team administers exit and alumni surveys and focus groups that are used as indirect measures for learning-outcomes assessment and program review. In addition, NU has three graduates of the WSCUC Assessment Leadership Academy, two of whom are OEEA employees. (CFR 3.3).

The team was inspired by the deep culture of assessment at NU and how it permeates how faculty teach and the impact it has on student success; as well as how data and evidence are used to make curricular and administrative decisions.
Component 7: Sustainability, Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Ed Environment

NU is certainly in a stable and ever-strengthening financial position despite enrollment declines. As reported in Component 2, Standard 3, the institution has over $800 million in net assets, primarily unrestricted which provides a significant reserve fund and multiple options for the board to pursue. In October of 2019 it was announced that T. Denny Sanford will gift $350M with an unrestricted donation to the institution further supporting National’s financial sustainability currently and in the future. In summer 2020, NU will be renamed Sanford National University in honor of this gift and others made in earlier years by Sanford. It was stated in interviews that the gift would be primarily used to assist with lowering tuition for students with the hope that affordability will provide more access to NU programs. Funds to invest in new ventures, technology and initiatives are available to management and the board to consider with such large reserves. Given such significant revenue, expenditures and funds in reserve, not to mention a large student population, there is a lack of and clear need for longer range, thoughtful and deep financial planning. Documentation provided and interviews have led the team to believe the institution’s focus is year to year planning. Not only financial but human capital planning also seems to be conducted in a haphazard fashion at NU based on the significant fluctuations in staffing levels. Capital planning was not evident or presented to the team for review. Longer range, comprehensive and integrated financial and business planning will assist all levels of the organization with a clearer picture of the future, demonstrating that operations will remain sustainable and where resources need to be invested to realize NU’s strategic vision (CFRs 1.1, 3.4, 4.6).
NU’s strategic plan called NU 2020 was developed in 2015 to run from 2016-2020 with a focus on academic excellence, operational effectiveness, and growth. The initial plan was well developed at a high and mid-level of detail. It appears to have included many employees in the process and the plan carefully looked at the internal and external landscapes with a SWOT analysis and a competitive scan (CFRs 1.1, 4.6). The plan was then updated in 2017 and then again in 2019 to run through 2023. It is unclear what remains from the original plan details in the 2020 version compared to 2023 since the 2023 version seems to only be at a very high level. It also seems as though NU will treat their strategic plan as more of a living document versus something that is made and set in stone for years to come. While there is certainly value in flexibility, it does become a challenge to continually change gears and devote more time and resources on the development of new plans. Related to this would be the need for change management expertise and a chief steward of the strategic plan on staff at NU to help organize, adapt and execute the vision and priorities effectively. Multiple interviews at NU have led to team concerns that there is need for an organized path forward and greater communications as to what is expected of individuals at all levels and how they are to contribute to the plan (CFRs 4.3, 4.6, 4.7). It is unclear at all levels based on interviews with the board, management, employees as well as in the documentation provided that there are no clear, measurable outcomes and minimal metrics for the new strategic plan. There are no statements such as “we want to grow XX% from X by 2023.” Lastly, there is no clear alignment of the strategic plan to resource needs or funding to needed human capital, equipment, construction, systems, consultants, and other resources. It is unclear from documentation provided whether there is a multiyear budget or planning documents to support such ambitious strategic priorities. All in all, NU does have a solid starting point for its strategic direction that does address the changing higher education
environment and the needs of students. With more focus, planning, change management and measures of success, the plan will come together more effectively.

Component 8: Optional Essay on Institution-Specific Themes (excluded)

Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Given the pace and impact of environmental changes in the higher education landscape, NU decided to approach the self-study in preparation for the WSCUC review as a “zero based” review; one that required a comprehensive evaluation which required a new view of compliance with the standards and criteria for review with both broad understanding of these changes and therefore broad participation in this process. The result of the self-study was an identification of 26 gaps in practice across eight major themes that would benefit from attention to increase alignment, quality, and efficiency with regard to WSCUC criteria and standards. Further analysis of the WSCUC gaps revealed that the current strategic plan was “on the right path” toward addressing the goals of the 2020 plan. Importantly, NU realized that it had the resources and commitment to continue to address them. Evidence of their successes include the new Exceptional Student Experience Initiative, the progress of the Precision Institute, a strong faculty-led process to assess and improve student learning, and the development of the Asynchronous Initiative by faculty to improve online learning. It was evident in the report and in conversations with staff, faculty, and administrators that the institution’s response to the gaps identified, and its track record of progress with new and innovative initiatives has and will continue to serve to strengthen NU’s future. As NU recognizes, the pace of change is considerable in higher education in general, and for NU in particular. Given its long-standing
commitment to innovation, confidence in its growing understanding of targeted student support and learning needs, and stronger support for data-based decision-making together with significant new resources from the Sanford gift, NU is well-positioned to continue its mission in the future.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Finding:
The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the WSCUC Standards. Final determination of compliance with each of the Standards rests with the Commission.

Commendations:
The team commends:

1. The university’s preparation for this reaffirmation visit; the organization of documents, responsiveness to team requests; posters addressing the lines of inquiry, and printed appendices in the team room.

2. The unrestricted gift of $350 million which reflects National University’s reputation for excellence in academic quality; leadership willing to embrace experimentation and innovation to support their commitment to student success through such projects as the Precision Institute; and constituency’s belief in National University’s mission and ability to provide access, affordability, and professional relevance for working adults and service members.
3. Faculty’s authentic use of assessment results to improve curricula (including General Education) at the course and program levels; to inform budget decisions; and to increase their shared sense of purpose. Faculty, administration, and staff work together to evaluate and improve both the annual and five-year review processes themselves to insure their meaningfulness to academic goals.

4. NU’s exemplary use of integrated technological tools and services to support student success and institutional innovation.

5. NU’s efforts to develop a data infrastructure and culture committed to the data-guided decision-making.

6. The university-wide commitment to students and student success, as articulated by faculty, staff, and administration and well-recognized by students. This commitment is consistent across locations, programs, policies, and institutional initiatives.

**Recommendations:**

The team recommends that NU:

1. Assure compliance with all current WSCUC requirements for the board structure and decision-making processes through a study of compliance with the WSCUC Governing Board Policy. (CFRs 1.8., 3.7, 3.9)

2. Articulate the financial and human resources, timelines, specific desired outcomes, and metrics needed to guide and monitor ongoing progress to achieve the 2023 strategic plan. (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

3. Continue to align adjunct and part-time faculty development and support with the significance of their contribution to NU’s instructional process and academic quality. Consider revitalization of the Adjunct Academy, a robust orientation to and training on
NU’s distinct pedagogy, and formal processes to insure their voice in critical academic
decision-making as appropriate. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.10, 4.5)

4. Implement a comprehensive change management process that successfully prepares
faculty, staff, and students to anticipate, understand, contribute to, and excel in the
rapidly changing ecosystem of National University. Employ effective communication
strategies that work (including face-to-face engagement where appropriate), particularly
related to changes in existing structures and processes, faculty governance, staff roles,
and responsibilities to enhance morale and trust throughout the institution. (CFRs 4.3,
4.6, 4.7)

5. Improve student retention through the identification and implementation of impactful
initiatives. Continue progress to measure and clearly articulate trends in student retention
and graduation on a university-wide and a disaggregated basis, and communication on
these trends to the community as a whole. (CFRs 1.2, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.6)

6. Continue progress to ensure a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusiveness through the
work of the President’s Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council, and its supporting
committee work on access and equity, curricula, climate, andragogy, and the NU
workplace. (CFRs 1.4, 3.1, 3.2)

7. Given the goal to produce graduates who are leaders in their fields, continue to develop
and implement policies, services, and scholarly practices that support the distinct needs of
doctoral faculty and students. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9)
## Appendix A: Federal Compliance Forms

### 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review

<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? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where is the policy located? General catalog page 20</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>periodic audits)? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO</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? X YES ☐ NO</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? 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters and Doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? English (BA), Org leadership (MS), Digital Cinema (MFA), Nursing (BS; Doc)</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? X 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? 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g.,</td>
<td>What kinds of courses? Independent study, practicum, prior learning (military)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internships, labs, clinical, independent study,</td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters, Doc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerated)</td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Certificate in Health Coaching, masters of science in nursing, Communications,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor of nursing practice</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? X YES ☐ NO</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? 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program materials)</td>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Undergrad, masters, doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Communications, MFA Digital Cinema, Doctor of nursing practice</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? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews Completed By: Amanda Brey
Date November 3
Appendix A: Federal Compliance Forms

2. MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal regulations</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on Recruit students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> ☐ <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>Comments: NU stated that it “does not provide incentive compensation to employees, including enrollment and academic advisors, or third-party entities for their success in securing student enrollments.” There was also no other documents or reports that were reviewed to suggest otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> ☐ <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>NU provided the following to show compliance: National University provides information about the cost per quarter unit and cost per 4.5 quarter unit course for both undergraduate and graduate programs Undergraduate: <a href="https://www.nu.edu/Admissions/Undergraduate/UndergraduateTuition/">https://www.nu.edu/Admissions/Undergraduate/UndergraduateTuition/</a> Graduate: <a href="https://www.nu.edu/Admissions/Graduate/GraduateTuition/">https://www.nu.edu/Admissions/Graduate/GraduateTuition/</a> The university also provides a net tuition calculator. <a href="https://npc.collegeboard.org/student/app/nu">https://npc.collegeboard.org/student/app/nu</a> After their initial interaction with an enrollment advisor, each student receives an email outlining the requirements of the program of interest along with the tuition per unit and per course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and employment</td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> ☐ <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>NU provided the following to show compliance: National University provides information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified on each program webpage as applicable. Example: <a href="https://www.nu.edu/healthsciences/">https://www.nu.edu/healthsciences/</a> Example: <a href="https://assets.nu.edu/assets/resources/degreeResources/CriminalJustice.pdf">https://assets.nu.edu/assets/resources/degreeResources/CriminalJustice.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <strong>YES</strong> ☐ <strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NU stated: “National University conducts 6-month out alumni surveys of its graduates. EMSI data are used to identify current employment of students by program of study. Short employment surveys are used for several programs where such information is required by a specialized accreditor, for example CEPH for the MPH program.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§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 Michael Jones. Date November 1, 2019*
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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.

<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 ☐ NO  
If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Easily searchable from their web site or search engine.  
Comments:  
Comprehensive web site that lists multiple internal and external options for student complaints such as Student Affairs, Ombudsman Office, Title IX, WSCUC, and each state. |
| Process(es)/procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
☑ YES ☐ NO  
If so, please describe briefly: In the catalog, complaint procedures are articulated for multiple types of complaints.  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
☑ YES ☐ NO  
Comments: It appears that the University adheres to these procedures. |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
☑ YES ☐ NO  
If so, where? Filed in their respective Offices Student Affairs, Ombudsman, Academic Affairs, and Compliance Office.  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  
☑ YES ☐ NO  
If so, please describe briefly:  
Comments: |

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)  
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.  
Review Completed By: Ann Marie Machamer  
Date: 10/24/19
## Appendix A: Federal Compliance Forms

### 4. TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s transfer credit policy and practices.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy publically available? X□ YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The policy could be found on the Institution’s Website at <a href="https://online.flippingbook.com/view/393415/">https://online.flippingbook.com/view/393415/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: The Institution’s policy regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher learning is included in the general catalog starting on page 87 (80) for Undergraduate programs and on page 98 (91) for graduate programs and could be found on the institution’s website. Policies are clearly stated and appropriate but could be made easier to access. Links to the direct location in the catalog would be helpful (I added the link below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://online.flippingbook.com/view/393415/87/#zoom=z">https://online.flippingbook.com/view/393415/87/#zoom=z</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§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: Edna Murugan

Date: 8/17/2019
Appendix B: Off-Campus Locations Reviews Team Reports

1. Los Angeles

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Michael Jones
Date/s of review: September 23, 2019

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

1. Site Name and Address
   Los Angeles Campus
   5245 Pacific Concourse Dr #100, Los Angeles, CA 90045

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)
   Branch Campus
   Students: 556 on-site students, many online students associated to the location
   Faculty: 159 part time, 29 full time.
   Programs: 24 on-site programs are associated to the site at the associates, bachelors, masters level

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
   • Approximately four hours spent at the site
   • Met with 12 students in person, 3 students online, 15 staff in person, 30 faculty in person,
   • Toured the facility, multiple classrooms, offices, labs and student areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>The campus fits well with the mission of NU to provide a location for onsite programs as well as a place for online students to be associated with.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</th>
<th>The connection to the institution is strong at the site, everyone interviewed had consistent and positive comments about NU, many of the comments were consistent with the institutional report, both the LA and Rancho sites had very similar comments, consistency across the campuses is impressive.</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</td>
<td>The site is well equipped for learning, classrooms with AV, wifi, computer labs, science labs, student lounge, student study area, faculty and staff offices that provide many services, room to grow at the site if needed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</td>
<td>The site offers admissions, student advising, financial aid, career services.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</td>
<td>There are 159 part time and 29 full time faculty teaching online and onsite courses. Oversight of faculty is provided by faculty program directors who could be located at any NU location. Faculty at all sites are welcome to participate in course development.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</td>
<td>Curriculum development is typically overseen by a faculty program director with heavy input from all faculty associate to the program.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</td>
<td>Was not able to assess retention and graduation at the site level, data provided was at the institutional level and by program.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</td>
<td>Was not able to assess student learning specifically at the site however this is done at the program and course level throughout institution.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</td>
<td>Was not able to assess quality specifically at the site however this is done at the program and course level throughout institution by faculty and leads on a recurring basis.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Off-Campus Locations Reviews Team Reports

2. Rancho Cordova

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Michael Jones
Date/s of review: October 15, 2019

1. Site Name and Address
Rancho Cordova Campus
10901 Gold Center Dr, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

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 byWSCUC)
   - Branch Campus
   - Students: Onsite 165, multiple online students associated to the site as well
   - Faculty: 109 Part time, 17 Full Time
   - Programs: 13 programs are associated to the site, at the associate, bachelors and masters levels

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
   - Approximately four hours spent at the site
   - Met with 3 students online, 12 staff in person, 8 faculty in person, 3 faculty online,
   - Toured the facility; multiple classrooms, labs, offices and student areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>The campus fits well with the mission of NU to provide a location for onsite programs as well as a place for online students to be associated with. Location is probably oversized for the amount of onsite student population.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Connection to the Institution.** How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)

The connection to the institution is strong at the site, everyone interviewed had consistent and positive comments about NU, many of the comments were consistent with the institutional report, both the LA and Rancho sites had very similar comments, consistency across the campuses is impressive. None

**Quality of the Learning Site.** How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)

The site is well equipped for learning, classrooms with AV, wifi, computer labs, science labs, student lounge, student study area, faculty and staff offices that provide many services, plenty of room for growth if needed. None

**Student Support Services.** What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

The site offers admissions, student advising, financial aid, credential advisors, career services. None

**Faculty.** Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)

There are 109 part time and 17 full time faculty teaching online and onsite courses. Oversight of faculty is provided by faculty program directors who could be located at any NU location. Faculty at all sites are welcome to participate in course development. None

**Curriculum and Delivery.** Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)

Curriculum development is typically overseen by a faculty program director with heavy input from all faculty associate to the program. None

**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

Was not able to assess retention and graduation at the site level however data provided was at the institutional level by program. None

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

Was not able to assess student learning specifically at the site however this is done at the program and course level throughout institution. None

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

Was not able to assess quality specifically at the site however this is done at the program and course level throughout institution by faculty and leads on a recurring basis. None
Appendix B: Off-Campus Locations Reviews Team Reports

3. San Jose

Institution: National University-San Jose Branch Campus
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Amber Machamer
Date/s of review: 10-17-2019

1. Site Name and Address
   3031 Tish Way San Jose, CA

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

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
   a. Tour of site, panels with staff, faculty, and students as well as regional director and site director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For a recently approved site.</em> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fit with Mission.</em> 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)</td>
<td>Site is well aligned with overall University.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Connection to the Institution.</em> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>Given the nature of the on-line programs, students, culture, the site and University are well aligned.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quality of the Learning Site.</em> 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)</td>
<td>The site has a few classrooms, office, and conference rooms as well as space for students. On site and regional management ensure an effective learning environment.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>On site and central support services are well integrated and sufficient.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>There is no differences between site and central faculty resources.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>There is no difference between site curriculum and delivery and the central curriculum and delivery.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>There is no difference between site retention and graduation and University retention and graduation.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>There is no difference between site student learning and University student learning.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance Processes:</strong> 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)</td>
<td>There is no difference between site quality assurance and University quality assurance.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Off-Campus Locations Reviews Team Reports

4. Costa Mesa Branch Campus

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Amanda Brey
Date/s of review: October 21, 2019

1. Site Name and Address
   Costa Mesa
   3390 Harbor Blvd, Costa Mesa, CA 92626

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)
   Branch Campus
   Faculty: 31 fulltime, 127 adjuncts
   Programs: 16 programs are offered at this campus:

   • Approximately three hours spent at the site
   • Met with approximately 25 fulltime faculty, 4 students on campus (none online), 4 staff members
   • Toured the facility, multiple classrooms, offices, labs and student areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For a recently approved site.</em> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fit with Mission.</em> 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)</td>
<td>Campus students, faculty and staff are engaged with the NU brand. The campus is in keeping with the mission of NU by offering an exceptional student experience for its onsite adult learners. The campus also provides an environment where its online students could still be associated with other students, faculty, and staff.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Connection to the Institution
How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)

| Students, full-time faculty and staff reported that there are meaningful and intentional efforts to make everyone feel connected to the university. They also expressed that they feel strongly connected to and supported by the administration of the institution. |

## Quality of the Learning Site
How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)

| Classrooms are well equipped for learning with computers, Wifi and Audio/visual equipment, and hands on practical devise (nursing). Faculty and staff offices and student areas are well-maintained. The physical structure appears to be well-managed and students, faculty and staff conveyed a general sense of safety on campus. |

## Student Support Services
What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

| The site provides enrollment, advising, academic counseling, financial aid and computing services. Expressed satisfaction with the support they receive from the faculty, especially availability and timeliness in responding to their needs. And flexibility |

## Faculty
Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)

| Courses at the campus are taught by full-time & adjuncts many of whom have been employed at the location for a significant number of years (most attended during the visit). The more than 25 full-time faculty and Program Chairs interviewed, all expressed loyalty to the institution. They also expressed appreciation to be able to participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning in Program Annual Reviews and Five Year Reviews. |

## Curriculum and Delivery
Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)

| Faculty are directly responsible for course development and are involved with programmatic review and assessment. Expressed academic freedom and ownership of curriculum. Faculty collaborate with senate to ensure curriculum development linked to institutional learning outcomes. |

| None |
**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

Graduation and retention data received is not disaggregated by campus neither was this data available at the campus.

None

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

Information on student learning is not disaggregated by campus; it is done by program. Full-time faculty are directly involved in assessment while adjunct faculty are less involved.

None

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

NU’s quality assurance processes are designed to deliver education across multiple campuses and off-site locations and all processes are designed and monitored to apply equally to all locations.

None
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5. Spectrum Branch Campus

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Amanda Brey and Edna Murugan
Date/s of review: October 22, 2019

1. Site Name and Address
   Spectrum Business Park Campus
   9388 Lightwave Ave, San Diego, CA 92123

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)
   Branch Campus
   Students: 3123 on-site students, many online students associated to the location
   Faculty: 44 fulltime, 246 adjuncts, 1 associate
   Programs: 37 programs are offered at this campus:

   - Approximately two hours spent at the site
   - Met with approximately 15 fulltime faculty, no students, 15 staff members
   - Toured classrooms and faculty areas/offices and military/veteran center and library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>Campus students and faculty appeared to be engaged with the mission and values of NU. The campus is in keeping with the mission of NU by offering an exceptional student experience for its onsite adult learners (very active campus with students and faculty). The campus also provides an environment where its online students could still be associated with other students, faculty, and staff (either online or in person). The library provides a wonderful learning and resources area to further connect with the mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Connection to the Institution

How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)

While not meeting directly with students, it was clear meaningful and intentional efforts are made to ensure a connection to the university. Full time faculty and staff expressed a strong connection to and supported by the administration of the institution.

### Quality of the Learning Site

How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)

Classrooms are well equipped for learning with computers, Wifi and Audio/visual equipment. Facilities manager was friendly and aware. Faculty and staff offices and student areas well-maintained/felt new. The physical structure appears to be well-managed and faculty and staff conveyed a general sense of safety on campus.

### Student Support Services

What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

The site provides enrollment, advising, financial aid and academic counseling. As well as international student advising, military, registrar services and assessment of these services.

Student support staff expressed desire to ensure their students were satisfied and served (remote or in person). Staff felt connected to each other in ways that allowed them to help students even more directly by knowing where to send them for assistance across support services.

Assessment data shows that students generally feel supported by these services whether needing them remotely or directly.

### Faculty

Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)

Courses at the campus are taught by full-time & adjuncts many of whom have been employed at the location for a significant number of years (most attended during the visit). Many of whom are part time.

Many part time faculty conveyed a fierce loyalty to their program chair but not to the institution in light of the recent “clocking in” rule to track adjunct hours (and limited to 100 hours per month). Several faculty referenced “email bombs” that felt like they were dropped in their inbox from administration and the part time faculty were left to figure it out (while chairs tried to minimize the damage and chaos the emails would cause in the department).

All faculty were very happy and encouraged by students and referenced their love of teaching multiple times.

### Curriculum and Delivery

Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs Faculty are directly responsible for course development and are involved with programmatic review and assessment.

Communication from administration to departments (specifically for adjunct faculty)
and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)

Expressed academic freedom and ownership of curriculum.

Faculty collaborate with senate to ensure curriculum development linked to institutional learning outcomes.

**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

Graduation and retention data received is not disaggregated by campus neither was this data available at the campus.

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

Information on student learning is not disaggregated by campus; it is done by program. Full-time faculty are directly involved in assessment while adjunct faculty are less involved.

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

NU’s quality assurance processes are designed to deliver education across multiple campuses and off-site locations and all processes are designed and monitored to apply equally to all locations.
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6. Kearny Mesa Campus

Institution: National University  
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation  
Name of reviewer/s: Edna Murugan and Amanda Brey  
Date/s of review: October 22, 2019

Site Name and Address
1. San Diego – Kearny Mesa Branch Campus  
   3678 Aero Court  
   San Diego, CA 92123

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 byWSCUC)
   - Branch Campus
     - Students: 357 on-site students, many online students associated to the location
     - Faculty: 25 fulltime, 93 adjuncts, 3 associates
     - Programs: The following 17 programs are offered at this campus:

   - Approximately two hours spent at the site
   - Met with approximately 40 fulltime faculty, 6 students on campus and online, 3 staff members
   - Toured the facility, multiple classrooms, offices, labs and student areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For a recently approved site.</strong> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Campus students, faculty and staff are engaged with the NU brand. The campus is in keeping with the mission of NU by offering an exceptional student experience for its onsite adult learners. The campus also provides an environment where its online students could still be associated with other students, faculty, and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>Students, full-time faculty and staff reported that there are meaningful and intentional efforts to make everyone feel connected to the university. They also expressed that they feel strongly connected to and supported by the administration of the institution.</td>
<td>There could be improvement on the connection with adjunct faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Learning Site.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>NU’s brand is noticeable throughout the campus from exterior signage to interior hallways and classrooms. Classrooms are well equipped for learning with computers, Wifi and Audio/visual equipment. Faculty and staff offices and student areas are well-maintained. The physical structure appears to be well-managed and those we spoke with expressed a general sense of safety on campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>The site provides advising, counseling, library and computing services and other appropriate student services. The students we spoke with expressed satisfaction with the support they receive from the faculty, especially availability and timeliness in responding to their needs. Students generally like the fast-paced curriculum but reported a challenge with not enough time to get to know the writing style of Instructors with the 4-week model. Students reported general satisfaction with the staff but expressed some dissatisfaction with the financial-aid staff and would like to see them more organized.</td>
<td>Review the FA support students receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Courses at the campus are taught by full-time, adjuncts and associate faculty, many of whom have been employed at the location for a significant number of years. The more than 40 full-time faculty and Program Chairs interviewed, all expressed loyalty to the institution. They also expressed appreciation to be able to participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning in Program Annual Reviews and Five Year Reviews.</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for adjunct faculty teaching at NU to be a voice in the Program Annual Reviews and the Five Year Reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Faculty are directly responsible for course development and are involved with programmatic review. Faculty collaborate with academic leadership in ensuring that curriculum development is linked to institutional learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Evidence/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention and Graduation</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Graduation and retention data received is not disaggregated by campus neither was this data available at the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>Information on student learning is not disaggregated by campus. Full-time faculty are directly involved in student learning assessment while adjunct faculty are aware of the program review but do not participate in the review process. With the large percentage of adjunct faculty teaching at NU, they should be a voice in student learning assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Processes</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>NU’s quality assurance processes are designed to deliver education across multiple campuses and off-site locations and all processes are designed and monitored to apply equally to all locations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7. Marine Corps Recruit Depot

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Patricia Breen
Date/s of review: October 21, 2019

1. Site Name and Address
   Marine Corps Recruit Depot
   4025 Tripoli Avenue, Building 111
   San Diego, CA 92140

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 byWSCUC)

   Designated as an “additional location,” National University is one of three colleges offering programs at the Education Services Center of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego. It is a relatively small center. Only two programs are regularly offered at this location; the MA in Organizational Leadership, and General Education. Management programs may also be offered with sufficient enrollment. Faculty who teach at the center, both full time and adjunct also teach at other sites and branch campuses in the San Diego area. No full-time faculty are permanently assigned.

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

   Ten Staff Members
   The reviewer met with the Associate Director for Military Center Operations at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and her enrollment advisor, center assistant, and staff from other sites who support the military centers, including
      Executive Director for Military and VA Programs from Quantico, VA
      Associate Director Military Center Operations from the San Diego Naval Base
      Academic Counselor from the Marine Corps Air Station in Miramar
      Academic Counselor from the San Diego Naval Base
      Academic Counselor from the 29 Palms branch campus
      Enrollment Advisor from Marine Corps Air Station in Miramar
      Military and Veteran Resource Specialist from the Spectrum branch campus

   Three faculty
      Two full time National University faculty who teach at several locations
      One adjunct faculty who also teaches at several locations

Four students  
Three in the MA Organizational Leadership program  
Two working on their second NU degree  
All three service veterans  
One taking General Education courses in preparation for a degree in psychology  
On active duty

One External Partner  
The Education Services Officer for the Marine Corps Recruit Depot  
An NU graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>The site was first approved in 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>Providing educational opportunities to service members is the essence of NUs founding mission. The site is planned and operationalized in partnership with the Marine Corps which provides facilities and access to service members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>NU is one of three colleges at this campus. All are well presented with dedicated offices and classrooms. The support of the NU community for service members is extremely high – as voiced by faculty, students, and staff alike from this location. Students are very focused on their education and feel they are well served by NU, particularly with VA support and tutoring services. They wish more staff outside of the military centers understood as much as local staff and faculty do about their fast-changing jobs and great need for flexibility.</td>
<td>Note that despite the recognized convenience of online courses, military veterans benefit financially by having some on site courses to qualify for living cost benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</td>
<td>The physical environment is a standard, “industrial” military base building, operated by the military. Students have large, schoolroom style classrooms, vending machines, access to NU staff in the office and opportunities to meet with faculty on site. Students had very positive remarks about the availability of faculty. Note: the purchase of new classroom chairs for NU</td>
<td>As an older military center, upgraded IT support beyond what the military can currently provide is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classrooms procured by the Education Service Officer delivered was announced during the visit. Good news for all.

| **Student Support Services.** What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7) | Military students are not identified on the Noel-Levitz Adult Priorities Survey. Although the students interviewed were fairly consistent with overall results. No particular concerns were surfaced by students at this site related to services other than a lack of awareness of some of them. Their concerns related to affordability and a desire for more programs at this site to keep it viable.
Positive comments related to the quality and flexibility of their professors were made. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Both full time and adjunct faculty teach at this site. Courses remain current and relevant through their own contributions and those of alumni. The faculty interviewed appreciate the opportunity to add current and relevant components to their instruction in addition to the required syllabus components. They know that their knowledge could be added to the permanent course structure by working with their course leads. Their direct connection to the assessment of student learning is through the signature assignments embedded in the course master syllabi. They are knowledgeable about the event and purpose of the PAR and the FYR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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? (CFRs 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</td>
<td>Faculty course leads and program administrators. They are approved by NU’s graduate and undergraduate councils. Faculty who teach at this site also teach at other campuses and sites as well as online and they do feel courses are comparable due to the required elements of syllabi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>NU provided graduation rates for military vs. non-military students by degree and college although not by site. Overall, and for each of the three colleges, both active duty and veteran services members graduate at a lower rate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service members are an important part of NU’s enrollment (as well as its legacy) and represent approximately 25% of enrollments. It is a population to study carefully if their contribution to the NU community and messaging are to remain strong.
than non-military. For masters’ degree recipients, the negative difference in graduation rates vs. non-military ranges from 22.7% to 11.89% for active duty, and 9.9% to 5.98% for veterans service members

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

Student learning results for this site were not available

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

Faculty teaching at this site are part of the College and Department of NU and are governed by the instructional quality requirements for each school. On-going course evaluations are required and provide real-time input from students. An area for improve is consistent and rigorous on-boarding as well as continuing development for adjunct faculty.

As NU re-invigorates their Adjunct Academy, embed particular focus on the needs of military students who may require additional flexibility.
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8. South Bay Branch Campus

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Patricia Breen
Date/s of review: October 22, 2019

1. Site Name and Address
San Diego – South Bay
Branch Campus
660 Bay Boulevard Ste 110
Chula Vista, CA 91910

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)

Four programs are offered at this site:, BA Criminal Justice Administration, BA Business Administration, BA Management, BA Psychology, MBA, General Education and the Emergency Medical Technician certificate. Degree approval was first received in 1981. It is one of four branch campuses in San Diego. NU reports “San Diego” headcount as 4,025. Staff at the branch campus estimate current enrollment as between 260 and 300. Approximately 50% of students are active duty or veteran service members and most students attend in the evening.


Team visitors were given a tour of the facility and met with three groups; two adjunct faculty, four students, and five staff and administrators, including:

South Bay Center Director
Spectrum Campus Center Director
Financial Aid Advisor
Center Assistant
Enrollment Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>For a recently approved site.</strong> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>NU’s mission statement does not focus on access but its value statement includes “access to education is a fundamental right... We aspire to remove barriers to access as a means of creating social justice and a path toward a more productive life for our students.” In addition, NU was founded by a military vet for the specific purpose of supporting their educational needs through access that responds to their service demands. Approximately 50% of NUs South Bay students are military.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>Students reported an unexpected and positive connection not only to their faculty but also to their fellow students. One student has a facebook group of students in her program. Assure that all students have knowledge about and easy access to all resources available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Learning Site.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>South Bay campus includes 13 classrooms, a computer lab, and a teaching lab. It is located in a modern classroom facility. Three enrollment counselors, two retention counselors, a financial aid coordinator, a credential analyst, and center assistant are on site. No faculty are permanently located at the campus. Class size ranges from 18 to 40. The EMT lab is dated. Update lab equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Staff report that students receive all of the services they need at the campus. Librarians and VA counselors from other campuses support South Bay students on site as needed. Students like Blackboard, SOAR, tutoring services and having only one advisor. Students reported satisfaction with their support services and, especially, the availability of Assure that all students have knowledge about and easy access to all resources available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct?</td>
<td>Faculty which is needed in the fast-paced curriculum. Students would like to know more about the resources available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Faculty use the syllabi developed by their academic departments. They believe the required components are standard regardless of location or modality and they understand how and why to request revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Graduation and retention data were not provided by campus. Administrators were not aware of their retention or graduation percentages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Student learning data does not appear to be disaggregated by campus. Adjunct faculty understand program review, but do not participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance Processes:</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Faculty teaching at this site are part of the College and Department of NU and are governed by the instructional quality requirements for each school. On-going course evaluations are required and provide real-time input from students. An area for improvement is the consistent and rigorous on-boarding as well as continuing development for adjunct faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Distance Education Review

Institution: National University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Edna Murugan
Date/s of review: October 22 through October 24, 2019

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Distance Education Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Fine Arts in Digital Cinema Production</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Administration</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Public Administration</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Fully Online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 26 courses were carefully reviewed for a wide variety of online programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Blackboard Course Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.S. in General Education</td>
<td>BIO100</td>
<td>Survey of Bioscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Educational Counseling</td>
<td>CED605</td>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Criminal Justice Administration</td>
<td>CJA464</td>
<td>Constitutional Law for Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Criminal Justice Administration</td>
<td>CJA467</td>
<td>International and Domestic Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Health</td>
<td>COH609</td>
<td>Public Health Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Cybersecurity</td>
<td>CYB499C</td>
<td>Cyber Security Project III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>ECE330</td>
<td>Early Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Management</td>
<td>ECO203</td>
<td>Principles of Microeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Educational Administration</td>
<td>EDA654</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Educational Administration</td>
<td>EDA656</td>
<td>Professional Growth Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.S. in General Education</td>
<td>ENG100</td>
<td>Effective College English I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>FIN609A</td>
<td>Seminar in Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education in Inspired Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>ITI674</td>
<td>Research in SEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education in Inspired Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>ITL510</td>
<td>Language Literacy: Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Information Technology Management</td>
<td>ITM438</td>
<td>Role of Programming IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>LED602</td>
<td>Developing and Implementing Groups and Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Marketing</td>
<td>MKT620</td>
<td>Consumer Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Marketing</td>
<td>MKT620</td>
<td>Consumer Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Nursing - RN Completion</td>
<td>NSG303</td>
<td>Professional Issues for RNs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method).

National University focuses on serving diverse, post-traditional adult learners who are pursuing their educational goals. To accommodate the needs of this group of learners, NU adopted the online learning modality and currently offers 145 distance education programs. There are ten distance education Associate’s programs, 47 Bachelor’s programs, 52 Master’s programs, and 40 non-degree programs. Currently, about 80 percent of NU students take at least one course online.

Blackboard is used for National University’s learning management system (LMS).

**Distance Education enrollment summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FTE</td>
<td>8309</td>
<td>8062</td>
<td>3996</td>
<td>4382</td>
<td>3658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate FTE</td>
<td>7874</td>
<td>7873</td>
<td>6168</td>
<td>6793</td>
<td>6903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Distance Education unduplicated headcount</td>
<td>24275</td>
<td>23901</td>
<td>28754</td>
<td>33578</td>
<td>28043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

National University’s Online Programs” webpage [https://www.nu.edu/program-finder/?sort[class-format]=online](https://www.nu.edu/program-finder/?sort[class-format]=online) was reviewed extensively. Numerous appendices submitted by NU as part of its Institutional Report, and live and archived courses were also reviewed.

The team met with members of National University Technology Department and other key stakeholders to include Jonathan Chillas (CDO), Chris Krug (VC, IT), Jen Keys (NU CFO), Michelle Bello (NUS CFO) and Shannon McCarty, (VP, Teaching and Learning). Dr. McCarty provided an in-depth demonstration of an online course structure and its Blackboard LMS site to team members Edna Murugan and Michael Jones on October 23, 2019. Numerous questions were asked and answered satisfactorily. Courses offered online follows the same curriculum and have the same learning outcomes as courses offered on site. There is a strong focus on the exceptional student experience and support for student/course analytics for student retention efforts.
# Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</td>
<td>Distance learning plays a significant role at National University and aligns with its mission, operations, and administrative structure. NU’s distance learning supports its goals of providing “more engaging course structure and content, as well as more frequent scheduling of courses in large graduate and undergraduate programs” with expectation that it will result in “increased student engagement, course completion, persistence and graduation”. Distance education offerings are developed and planned similar to other curriculum program. Distance learning program viability study is completed and recommendations are made as part of the approval process. Final approval is made by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Academic Program Directors and Program Faculty determine the appropriate course elements required for a program’s online courses and make recommendations for additional instructional elements, features or learning tools to be included in developing of new or existing online courses. The Subject Matter Expert and the Faculty Course Reviewer sign off on the completed course then it is copied to the Master term. The distance learning offerings are funded the same way as other new programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</td>
<td>NU Campus-based students are encouraged to take a combination of ground and online courses. Distance education students take part in online orientations, invited to attend on-campus events and are included in student support services, including career services. They are also invited to participate in student clubs and organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</strong> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</td>
<td>NU uses Blackboard as its learning management system (LMS) which allows for interaction between faculty and students and among students in both synchronous and asynchronous online courses. Tools such as Collaborate Ultra in Blackboard is used to enhance video-conference capabilities. The LMS is continuously’ meeting educational expectations on backed up on an hourly, daily, weekly cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services: What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</strong></td>
<td>The institution expanded its online student support services to 10 offices. Services provided to students include sign-on/login support, admissions, financial aid, student accounts, registrar, and graduation. Library services are provided by a staff of 25 full-time and five part-time employees. The library collections include 190 databases, 667,663 print and e-book volumes, 123,768 journals, and 40,813 DVD and streaming video titles. Students have access to the institution’s Library Help Desk for one-on-one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University Accreditation Reaffirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assistance through phone, email, or Internet 24/7. Distance education students may also request free 24-hour electronic delivery of library resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty.** Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?

| Faculty. | Fulltime and adjunct faculty teach a combination of on-ground and online courses. Local faculty teach a combination of on-ground and online classes, and out-of-state faculty teach only online classes. Online faculty are provided extensive training and support by the institution’s Center for Innovation in Learning (CIL) who also support them with course development. Faculty must complete an eight-hour Faculty Foundation course in the Blackboard Learning Management System before they are assigned to teach. This foundation course mirrors an actual course in Blackboard and confirms faculty preparedness in key areas, policies, and pedagogies. Additionally, NU online faculty have access to course shells where they can experiment and apply what they learned in the onboarding foundation course. Online faculty are part of the curriculum development and evaluation process including the development of course learning outcomes (CLOs) and program learning outcomes (PLOs). |

**Curriculum and Delivery.** Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)

| Curriculum and Delivery. | Distance education programs are designed by Academic Program Directors and program faculty who determine what is appropriate for a course. Academic Program Directors and faculty collaborate with instructional designers, NU Library Liaison, and course developers in mapping course activities to learning outcomes, and ensure that the course adheres to the quality standards for delivery of an online course. Content and expectations for student learning outcomes are equivalent for classroom and online learners. Programs and courses go through a stringent review and approval process beginning with the department chair and ending with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Credit hour expectations are included in each course syllabus. |

**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online

| Retention and Graduation. | Retention and graduation data are collected for students taking online courses. With a few exceptions, from the disaggregated retention trends data report the team reviewed, the online retention rates for the Associates’ and Bachelor’s degrees for the College of Letters & |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National University Accreditation Reaffirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning.</strong> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</td>
<td>Standard assessment processes are used across NU’s ground and online programs and courses (e.g. student evaluations, program annual reviews). 84% of students who took courses offered as part of the institution’s 2018 asynchronous initiative, reported positive experiences (Appendix IV-E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts with Vendors.</strong> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?</td>
<td>Technology vendors include: Blackboard, Civitas Learning, RightNow. All courses are fully developed by NU faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance Processes:</strong> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</td>
<td>The Center for Innovation in Learning (CIL) supports and coordinates online faculty professional development related to distance education, including the use of Blackboard and other online teaching technologies. NU Program Course Development Worksheets (Appendix IV-C) and the Asynchronous Course Quality Design Guidelines (Appendix IV-D) are used to ensure that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>