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SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and its Accreditation History

Since 1952, Columbia College Hollywood (CCH) has served the thriving Los Angeles entertainment industry with entry-level professionals to serve in careers in television and film. Over the past decade the college has gone through a number of dramatic changes, one of which was to seek WSCUC accreditation. Eligibility was granted in 2011, followed by Candidacy granted in 2013, and Initial Accreditation granted in 2014. The current team is conducting the first visit for reaffirmation of accreditation, although the college also had a Special Visit in fall 2017 and a Substantive Change Visit in fall 2018.

In the Institutional Report, CCH described its intentional change from a vocational institution as a result of changes in both the entertainment industry and in higher education. The resultant mission of the college is as follows:

*Columbia College Hollywood educates students in the art and science of communications and the diverse media of contemporary storytelling within an exploration of the liberal arts. Our rigorous course of study and practice prepares graduates to be analytical thinkers and effective communicators who are creative, knowledgeable, and responsible contributors to advancing a curious, thoughtful, and compassionate global community.*

The emphasis is on storytelling as a key goal; this ensures a liberal arts foundation, with the thinking skills of analysis, communication, and creativity, to reflect a broader conception of the educational process than the formerly vocational focus.

This conception has led to dramatic changes in curriculum over the past several years as well, including the addition of General Education requirements and additional degree programs
which CCH describes as “logically-adjacent,” such as graphic design and recording arts. They have also discontinued some degrees. The table below summarizes their current degree offerings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Los Angeles Campus</th>
<th>Chicago Campus</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s Degree Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and Cinema</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design and Interactive Media</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Effects</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate’s Degree Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and Cinema</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Visual Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Effects and Animation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accompanying the changes in identity and curriculum has been the addition of a branch campus in Chicago, now called Flashpoint Chicago (FC), via the Substantive Change process, approved in spring 2017. Flashpoint Chicago was previously known as Tribeca Flashpoint College; because it was previously a for-profit institution, the acquisition by CCH required approval not only byWSCUC but also by the US Department of Education (USDE), which failed to take place in the time expected.

Integration of the two campuses, with different cultures, calendars, faculty, and programs, has been a daunting undertaking, partly because of the geographic distance between the two campuses. There has been substantial progress in the integration process. Both campuses are now on the quarter system; there is substantial progress in aligning faculty responsibilities and compensation; both campuses are gradually utilizing similar processes and software. One of the drivers of CCH interest in acquiring Tribeca Flashpoint was their already well-established online education modality; this expertise is being shared with the Los Angeles (LA) campus and faculty. For example, right now Chicago is offering courses in a format they call Multiple
Program Delivery (MPD); both on-ground and online sections are being served by one course. This format is planned to be extended to the LA campus in the next term.

Another important aspect of the CCH approach is its long-term operating partnership with Edcura. Edcura is a higher education services company that partners with colleges and universities to provide marketing, enrollment management, strategic, and administrative services. CCH has embarked on an innovative partnership to increasingly focus its efforts on its core strengths in academic programming and seeking external assistance with marketing, recruitment, and other operating processes. The team explored the Edcura partnership exhaustively to ensure that CCH has maintained full control of governance and particularly the academic enterprise. Three CCH board members have what could be perceived as a potential conflict of interest with Sterling Partners, the private equity firm that funded Edcura; they were not trustees when the original partnership was established and have since recused themselves from any decisions involving Edcura. Edcura markets to and recruits potential students, and faculty make up the membership of the admissions committee that makes admissions decisions. Edcura has assisted the chief financial officer (CFO) in designing some of the budgeting and operating processes but leaves the decision-making in the hands of the institution.

With the assistance of Edcura enrollments at CCH, including FC, have grown noticeably over the past several years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, this growth has not matched their robust projections. They have explained the lack of alignment between projections and outcomes as resulting from a variety of factors, including the delayed approval of the FC acquisition by USDE; a letter by Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois, which called out Tribeca Flashpoint to prospective students as a risky institution in which to enroll; enrollment restrictions (i.e. headcount cap) on the Chicago campus; and faulty modeling of enrollment projections based on historic rates rather than more nuanced projecting based on factors known about students, such as graduation rates. This failure to meet projections has created financial difficulties for the college, which are described further in Section II, Component 7.

CCH appears to have a dynamic and effective strategic planning culture. The four key initiatives of the 2016 Strategic Plan were achieved: program expansion, local recruitment, geographic expansion, and modality enhancement. The current 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan is a timely response to the critical nature of the current financial challenges. It articulates the following three objectives:

1. Get the college to a balanced budget by the end of fiscal year (FY) 2020 (March 31, 2021)
2. Begin generating non-tuition revenue for the college
3. Position the college to generate a cash surplus by the end of FY 2021 (March 31, 2022)

The initiatives and outcomes to date of the plan are further described in Section II, Component 7.
B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The team reviewed the institutional report and supporting documents during the Offsite Review and developed a number of lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit. The team was interested in understanding:

- The impact of the strategies employed to boost enrollment, retention and student outcomes.
- The process and outcomes of the current strategic planning effort. Specifically the details of the new strategic plan and how it envisions the institution thriving in the next few years.
- The operating partnership with Edcura; in particular, how the cultures of these two entities interact with each other; how CCH ensures control over the decision-making process; and what aspects of the partnership have been beneficial, and which have caused unexpected issues.
- How CCH cultivates a vital faculty culture.
- The college’s strategic and logistical approaches to maintaining and operating degree programs at two distinct levels--associate’s and bachelor’s.
- How assessment is evolving and how it will be sustained.
- The role of general education as a foundation for liberal and practical education.
- How the co-curricular programs and policies are experienced by students.

During the team conference call in January 2020, team members divided the responsibilities for the writing and inquiry that would be conducted, enabling the members to explore questions, pursue lines of inquiry and draft preliminary documents to guide the visit. The team discussed the preliminary schedule which included plans for a visit to the Flashpoint
Chicago campus February 6-7, 2020 for the Distance Education and Off-Campus Location reviews. The team agreed that during the Accreditation Visit it would remain together for some meetings, although separate meetings requiring follow-up, or a more focused conversation would be scheduled as needed.

By virtue of its small size, the college was able to engage the majority of faculty and staff in the various activities around the Accreditation Visit. The team had ample time to meet with a broad cross-section of community members that included senior administrators, deans, full and adjunct faculty, students and alumni. Meetings with key units included senior staff, Edcura, chief financial officer, admissions and financial aid, student success and retention committees, student affairs, department chairs, and alumni. The team also met with the Board of Trustees. More focused sessions included exploring the implications of the relationship with Edcura, finances, the use of data to guide enrollment management, and the use of evidence to guide decision-making. The team chair presented six commendations and nine recommendations to the president prior to presenting those statements to an assembled group of CCH community members at the exit meeting.

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

CCH’s institutional report was clearly written and organized around the nine components delineated by WSCUC. While the report provided foundation for the Accreditation Visit, the onsite interviews and discussion provided the necessary information to answer questions and shape the team’s findings.
The team found in supporting documents sufficient evidence to support claims made in the report. CCH addressed the issues and concerns raised by the Commission through an institutional culture that grasped and demonstrated the importance of reaffirmation. The team found that CCH’s description of the report development process was accurate and included broad participation from campus stakeholders under the leadership of the president and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). These administrators devoted time, expertise and experience to assure the process was thorough and reflective, led by the president in his role as the college’s chief executive officer, the interim dean as leader of the academic program, and the ALO as the one responsible for mapping the college’s own procedures and policies to the accreditation process.
SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In response to the 2014 Special Visit, it was recommended that CCH focus on five key recommendations; this section is organized according to those recommendations. CCH responses to additional recommendations from the 2017 Special Visit are included in the five sections.

Clarity of mission: As mentioned above, the intentional change that CCH made from its former vocational focus to being an academically-oriented institution in a liberal arts tradition led to a fundamental change in mission, which was articulated in 2016. CCH decided to re-form the institutional mission statement committee with the intention to adopt a new mission statement by 2021. The president explained that soon, following the dramatic changes of the past couple years, including the acquisition of the FC campus and the addition of several academic programs, it will be time to stop and reflect on the changes and what they mean for the ongoing mission. This is an indicator of the active approach CCH takes to strategy and planning.

Structure and leadership: CCH has made dramatic changes in the areas of structure and leadership. The new president has been in place since 2016 and continues to build a new leadership team. The most recent recognition has been the need to strengthen financial leadership; currently an interim CFO is in place while stronger processes to budgeting and cash management are developed, and a full time CFO hired. The board has been enlarged and strengthened; the chair is the former president of Dickinson College and has deep understanding of the challenges facing higher education. The comprehensive 2016 Strategic Plan was developed and implemented. A short-term 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan has been developed to address the current fiscal challenges and set the stage for a new round of strategic planning. CCH has worked to integrate and streamline functions across the two campuses.
Institutional research (IR) has been integrated with institutional effectiveness and located at the vice presidential level to better inform institutional decision-making. Responsibilities of key committees have been clarified; committees appear to function effectively. A long-term faculty and staffing plan was developed; however, full implementation has been delayed because of the failure to meet enrollment projections.

**Student success and risk:** Student debt was named a concern by the Special Visit team. The average debt vs billed tuition and fees for CCH winter 2019 departing students was 40.08% at the LA campus and 49.25% at the Chicago campus. These marks met CCH’s target goal of having less than 60% of departed students’ tuition and fees secured via loans in the student’s name. The college is committed to advising students to borrow responsibly and only take out what is needed to cover the cost of attending CCH. Efforts to strengthen the co-curricular program and retention include a student success committee on each campus and a retention committee that monitors progress at the individual student level, a peer mentor program, improved orientation and first year seminar, financial aid counseling, an academic success plan for conditional admits, and ongoing improvements to the career development program. Despite these efforts, retention rates continue to fluctuate. The team recommends that CCH develop an integrated strategic enrollment management function to lead efforts to understand and coordinate response to this fluctuation.

**Assessment and program review:** Action letters from both the 2014 Special Visit for Initial Accreditation and the 2017 Special Visit included commendation for the significant progress made on assessment. While the team was initially concerned that the assessment system might be too onerous, the team found an institution excited about what they continue to learn about student learning and about their processes across the institution. In addition to the
assessment processes in academic departments, CCH has one of the most thorough approaches to assessment and continuous improvement for the administrative side of the operations that the team has witnessed. Each year each administrative area completes an Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER), with identified goals and metrics, outcomes, and improvements. In addition to programmatic IERs, IERs are also generated by admissions, the registrar, campus safety and security, career development, facilities, financial aid. Plans are also in place to expand IER reporting to other units. For the most part the IER process and plans are manageable, reliable, and actionable; owners of plans across the institution expressed interest and support for what they were learning and how it was helping them improve their effectiveness and their efficiency. The quarterly and annual IERs serve as guidelines for recording quantitative and qualitative data as well as discussion of objectives, goals, and proposed improvement plans. Faculty committees have finalized BFA program emphasis learning outcomes (ELO).

General education and core competencies: CCH designated a faculty member to have responsibility for the general education (GE) program. The process for designation of courses as GE courses has been clarified. Further work on the general education program is reported below in Component 4.

Finally, the Substantive Change Review team report from fall 2018 also included five recommendations, each of which is discussed briefly here, and more in depth in Component 2:

Align strategic enrollment management with mission and the strategic plan: The institution has focused heavily on the recruitment of students. The team endorses the expansion of this recommendation to ensure that CCH develops a robust, strategic approach to all the elements of enrollment management, including not just marketing and recruitment, but retention of continuing students, and the leveraging of financial support.
Review the faculty staffing plan: The institution made some good initial progress on the plan. However, given the current financial challenges, CCH has put the plan on hold for the time being, which the institution has accepted as a necessary cost control measure. The team recommends that reinstatement of the faculty staffing plan begin when finances return to positive.

Develop optimal online services: There was apparent satisfaction with the ongoing improvements to online services and the team considers this recommendation met.

Monitor the ongoing integration of Flashpoint Chicago: As mentioned above, there has been strong progress on this recommendation and the work should continue until complete.

Review the retention plan: Discussion of this recommendation is included as part of recommendation one above.

In conclusion, CCH has been responsive to the concerns outlined in prior Commission actions. Furthermore, they recognize that enrollment growth and predictability is critical to their future growth and success.
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

The compliance review has two sections. In the first section, CCH documented its compliance with federal requirements. More complete treatment of these can be found in the appendices for this report.

The team found that CCH’s Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) which was submitted along with the institutional report, provides a comprehensive picture of CCH’s quality assurance in both academic and non-academic areas. It aligns with the narrative in the institutional report and clearly articulates strengths and areas for improvement. The team would note that CCH has multiple degree programs across two campuses, have done a good job of clearly and concisely explaining what happens on each campus, and how the two campuses and the assessment of their degree programs are aligned.

The second section of the compliance review is a self-review organized around the 39 Criteria for Review (CFR) distributed across WSCUC’s four Standards of Accreditation. The team found that CCH engaged in the process in such a way as to foster institutional self-reflection. The compliance review process identified several areas that warrant further attention: 1) strategies for enrollment management; 2) strategic planning efforts; 3) the implementation of the 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan; 4) the coordination of data gathering and 5) the role of general education as a foundation for a liberal education.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institutional purposes of CCH are clearly articulated and publicly available, as is current information on student learning and retention and graduation rates (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.6). Faculty expressed satisfaction with the more diverse nature of the student body as a result of recent recruitment and at the same time indicated that the student body was stronger than it has
ever been. Students expressed a feeling of inclusion and support (CFR 1.4). As indicated above, the team investigated the relationship with the external partner Edcura and is satisfied that CCH is governing itself, free from external interference (CFR 1.5).

College leadership showed integrity in its handling of a transfer credit issue discovered in fall 2017. Policies were being applied inconsistently; in response, the institution conducted a thorough internal audit of the issues of 709 individual student records. Project File Forward, as the audit and resolution process was named, resulted in a new transfer credit policy and tuition refunds to students for courses taken in error. According to the institutional report, no student degrees were affected, and all enrolled students were able to complete their programs. The team was impressed with the honest and careful individual treatment and the clear communication with WSCUC regarding the issue (CFRs 1.7, 1.8).

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning: Faculty have worked hard to revise the major and GE curriculums that are well thought out and carefully codified in the comprehensive “system model books” that are distinct for each program. Though more could be done to distinguish between the degree levels (associate’s/bachelor’s), these guiding documents were created by faculty utilizing Lumina’s Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) and the Association of American Colleges & Universities’ (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics to calibrate expectations and articulate outcomes (CFRs 2.1-2.4). The general education curriculum and assessment has been constructed around WSCUC’s Core Competencies and incorporates these as learning outcomes effectively (CFR 2.2a). Degrees and student learning outcomes (SLOs) are reflected in curricula, programs, policies, and advising (CFR 2.3).
full-time and adjunct faculty exercise collective responsibility for setting and assessing SLOs and standards (CFR 2.4).

Students reported a high degree of faculty engagement in their learning and feedback on the projects and progress, with capstone assessment in both the majors and the general education curriculums providing key assessment opportunities and focusing student learning (CFRs 2.5, 2.6). CCH has recently instituted systematic program reviews, piloted in exemplary fashion by the Cinema Department’s review in 2019, which was rigorous and carried out with a high degree of frank self-analysis (CFR 2.7).

**Scholarship and Creative Activity:** CCH is focused on preparing students to contribute to the film and television industry, with scholarship and creative activity in this area highly valued and recognized by students as integral to their educational experience (CFR 2.8). Assessment is carefully integrated into the teaching at the college, with faculty articulating that they saw clear links to their assessment work and the improvement of student learning and curriculum (CFR 2.9).

**Student Learning and Success:** CCH is using data effectively as it works to improve its retention and graduation rates, which are currently respectable but lower than their goals, with the student success committee articulating an 85% retention rate as an ambitious goal in the near term (currently 71%). Both the student success committee and retention committees are joint faculty and staff committees that are committed to examining data, which is ably supplied by the faculty, student affairs staff, the registrar, and an IR consultant. Data is appropriately disaggregated by demographics, though more could be done to benchmark goals and disaggregate data between the associate and bachelor’s degree levels for analysis (CFR 2.10).
The college has recently and effectively committed significant resources and leadership to revitalizing its student services, such as developing a new first year experience that provides an extended orientation and dramatically improving its career development efforts. The student affairs department is developing a program review process that will be initiated in the coming year (CFR 2.11). Academic advising is staffed by a dedicated advisor and full-time faculty assigned by major; students expressed satisfaction with the advising they are receiving, which is noteworthy given recent turnover in the primary advisor position and the implementation of fully revamped program curriculums and teach outs of the previous versions of the programs (CFR 2.12).

Tutoring services are lean but effective and utilized by students, with math and writing tutoring being utilized by students on both campuses. The learning resources center (LRC) on the LA campus is surrounded by full-time faculty and program chair offices in an effort to create a hub of academic support and engagement; students in Chicago were observed to be accessing the tutoring labs during the team visit there (CFR 2.13). Transfer students appear to be effectively served and communicated with, though rolling admissions has proved challenging for the smaller programs and should be re-examined by the college (CFR 2.14).

Diversity and Inclusion: Overall there is satisfaction with both the diversity and the preparedness of the students. At the same time, the curriculum needs to keep pace with the diversity of faculty and students. As such CCH has adopted the WSCUC Equity and Inclusion Policy statement and recently established a curricular diversity and equity committee. The program curricula appear not to codify expectations that all students will be exposed to non-Western and culturally diverse materials (CFR 1.4), and this committee is well-positioned to address issues like this.
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

The team has significant concerns about the institution’s current cash position and forecast over the next year and questions the ongoing financial viability of the institution (CFR 3.4). The March 31, 2019 financial statements included a note about CCH meeting its financial obligations. Currently, CCH has a qualified and diverse faculty and staff. Without the proper financial resources, the institution will find it difficult to attract and retain sufficient, qualified, and diverse faculty and staff to support its programs and operations (CFR 3.1). Additionally, funding for professional development of faculty and staff has been reduced due to CCH’s financial distress (CFR 3.3). The institution’s facilities and technology have seen recent investments; however, the financial situation may impact future needs (CFR 3.5).

The institution provided evidence that well developed and applied policies, practices, and evaluations are being utilized (CFR 3.2). The team recognized the forthright communication from the institution’s leadership concerning its financial condition; however, it noted the need for a full-time, permanent CFO and chief academic officer (CAO) (CFRs 3.6-3.8, 3.10). The team met with the Board of Trustees and was impressed with the membership and the passion each member had for the success of the institution (CFR 3.9). The board understands that their role is changing and that they need to be asking different and better questions. The membership of the board has been strengthened to include leaders from academics, finance, and the film industry. Board policies and processes, such as term limits, conflict of interest, and presidential evaluation, have been developed and are being implemented. They see the potential of the Edcura partnership and are mindful that it is their responsibility to ensure that Edcura does not control governance and that the quality of the educational process and student learning is still
the central concern. Finally, they understand that their board development is nascent and must continue on the trajectory it is currently on.

On the faculty side, CCH has implemented a new system of standardized faculty performance reviews (CFR 2.9). By the time of the visit, the majority of instructors had undergone reviews covering performance in four areas: planning and preparation, establishing an effective classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. The criteria and rubrics utilized in the reviews were adapted from Charlotte Danielson’s *The Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument*. Full-time (FT) faculty are further evaluated on their performance in additional areas of responsibility, such as administrative duties, faculty governance, and advising. The faculty review processes and materials appear to be well designed and functioning as intended, but again may be challenging to complete and continue without additional full-time faculty to alleviate some of the demands placed on department chairs.

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

The team saw ample evidence in the institutional report that CCH has established quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement practices and shows promise of continual improvement. The processes are quantitatively and qualitatively evidence-based and include wide stakeholder participation and reflection.

**Quality Assurance Processes:** In response to the 2017 Special Visit recommendation 6, the college integrated data from three sources: the registrar, the IR consultant, and the CampusNexus Analytics Dashboard. Faculty and staff committees such as the student success committee regularly use disaggregated data to track student success factors (CFR 4.1). If the college is to continue its good progress in this area as well as expand its IER reporting, the
institutional research function will need to be better integrated into the college’s structure (CFR 4.2).

**Institutional Learning and Improvement**: The institution has made significant progress in its commitment to improvement based on evidence and ongoing, continuous improvement. Both full-time and adjunct faculty reported participating in and feeling included in assessment and curricular decision-making (CFR 4.4). Quarterly faculty development takes place through workshops with topics identified through the assessment process, course evaluations, and faculty requests. The IER process is a particularly strong component of that process (CFRs 4.4-4.6). Through discussions with senior leadership, faculty, and the board, and actions such as the stabilization plan, CCH appears to be aware of changes and challenges of higher education’s ecology (CFR 4.7).

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

CCH sees the meaning of the degree as encompassing the “classroom, campus culture, co-curricular pursuits, opportunities for civic engagement and service to the community, and the value of the degree after graduation” (IR, page 17). Indicators that the college is succeeding under its terms are mostly positive, with successful efforts on the academic side to forge learning outcomes and assess learning (CFR 2.2-4, 2.6) offset by some concerning data on alumni outcomes.

CCH has spent the last three years reviewing, reflecting on, and revising its learning outcomes for all programs, creating clear curricular documents and expectations for each degree program and general education. In addition, with the acquisition of the Chicago campus, the programs there have undertaken a switch to the quarter system to align with the LA campus, a
process that entailed intensive curricular revisions and resulted in new program documents that clearly delineate each of the degree programs (CFR 1.2).

In revising the general education curriculum to better articulate learning outcomes, CCH has utilized WSCUC’s five Core Competencies alongside disciplinary learning outcomes developed by faculty teams (CFR 2.2a). The college also consulted Lumina’s Degree Qualifications Profile to guide the alignment of these outcomes and differentiate between the associate’s and bachelor’s degree levels. CCH’s undergraduate degrees all delineate clear, program-specific learning outcomes reflecting their distinction and degree level appropriately. While still rolling out, thanks to the system model books (described below), the capstone seminars in the general education curriculum, and the regular assessment regimen, faculty are well positioned to ensure that students are achieving the stated learning goals (CFR 2.4, 2.6).

Despite this good work, degree levels are not appropriately distinguishable in courses and general education, and assessment at the associate level does not appear to ensure this distinction is happening on an ongoing basis. For example, associate-seeking students take the same courses alongside their bachelor’s degree counterparts but merely stop out earlier (upon completing 96 as opposed to 192 units) (CFR 2.2). In addition, the general education learning outcomes (GELOs) are identical across all degrees, though associate’s complete significantly less general education units. While WSCUC’s 2013 Handbook of Accreditation only addresses the Core Competencies in relation to baccalaureate degrees and above; the institution may also find it useful to calibrate the GELOs to correspond to its different degree levels (CFR 2.2, 2.4).

CCH has a sound process in place to ensure curricular changes are informed by the program review process and implemented by program-specific curriculum development committees led by department chairs and comprised of any additional FT faculty in the program
and selected adjuncts from both campuses (CFR 2.4). In addition to program reviews by outside experts, there is a plan to implement program advisor committees (PACs) to ground the curriculum in current industry practices. On the LA campus the Cinema PAC had met once, but it did not appear PACs had met for any other programs.

CCH programs have developed sophisticated “system model books” for each degree program that vary by degree level and provide a curriculum matrix, course descriptions, learning outcomes, and both PLO and general education LO rubrics for each program (CFRs 1.2, 2.3). These documents were developed by faculty curriculum committees which integrated their classroom experience with appropriate external resources (CFR 2.4).

In response to the 2017 Special Visit recommendations and in order to assure the integrity and quality of the degrees, CCH has implemented an impressive regimen of assessment processes and tools to track student learning. The planning and implementation of assessment processes is ambitious; it is still very new and only beginning to yield actionable findings. The team was concerned about institutional capacity reflected by the volume of assessment work in relation to the FT faculty responsible for carrying it out (CFR 2.4); assessment is more fully reviewed in Component 6.

For instance, the assessment plan calls for all full-time faculty and the department chair to conduct in depth assessments—including classroom observations—of capstone courses every quarter in order to assess all senior students on every PLO. Given the very low numbers of FT faculty, it may be worth considering whether the institution’s quality control efforts will be best served in the long run by a more staggered or periodic approach that responds to faculty capacity to maintain the degrees (CFR 3.1).
This capacity issue may be exacerbated by the financial challenges currently facing the institution, as the implementation of the 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan has—until further notice—halted implementation of the faculty hiring plan, which would have provided additional FT faculty in needed areas. Furthermore, the financial stabilization plan calls for the elimination of the general education chair on the Chicago campus, and eliminating “redundant full-time faculty positions with the goal of retaining one full-time faculty member per degree program” (2020 Stabilization Plan, page 7). These reductions may negatively impact the institution's capacity to carry out some of the quality control and assessment as planned (CFR 3.1).

In the co-curricular area, indicators that the college is succeeding are mixed, though the impact of new leadership in student affairs was evident during the visit and confirmed by students, alumni and faculty, which impressed the team. While students expressed satisfaction with the campus culture and climate, data presented by the college shows very low job placement numbers (CFR 2.13). Indeed, the college identifies a 70% placement rate as its goal for alumni one year after graduation (IR, page 43), but the most current numbers the college provided to the visiting team for its bachelor-level alumni on the LA campus show a 22% placement rate in FY19. The validity of data on career placement was itself also concerning (CFR 4.1) as the “n” for determining placement fluctuated widely year to year (the Los Angeles campus BA placement in FY18 was 6; in FY19 it was 85). During the visit, the team was impressed by the revitalized career development programming and capable staff, which have made recent strides in the areas of internships and career development support (CFR 2.13).

Faculty development efforts at CCH are coordinated through a faculty development committee that meets periodically and plans quarterly faculty development days, which provide programming that responds to both instructor interests/needs and institutional priorities. Part-
time faculty are compensated for attending development days and faculty interviewed by the team expressed appreciation for these opportunities during the visit. The team was also impressed that all faculty are required to develop an annual, individualized faculty development plan covering their development activities in the areas of 1) instructional development and 2) professional development. FT faculty must complete 12 hours in each area (24 hours total annually); PT faculty must complete 6 hours in each area (12 hours annually) (CFR 3.3).

Of final--but critical--note in terms of assuring the integrity of the CCH degree is the turnover in the role of chief academic officer and perpetual reliance on interims in this position. Since 2016 CCH has had eight dean of academic affairs transitions, including the president himself covering the role at times, most of them interim positions. At the time of the visit the position continued without a permanent hire. While capable interim leadership was in place, the lack of a permanent and appropriately empowered CAO presents challenges in key areas such as consolidating budget priorities from the academic programs, assuring academic representation when navigating the Edcura relationship, engaging in faculty governance, bolstering faculty morale in the face of financial challenges, and generally ensuring faculty are adequately represented in decision-making and strategic planning (CFRs 3.1, 3.10).

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

In response to WSCUC recommendations, the general education curriculum has been comprehensively redesigned, aligning itself with the WSCUC Core Competencies (CFR 2.2a) as the framework for providing a liberal arts-oriented education. The new GE curriculum is codified in the general education system model book, which delineates its requirements and learning outcomes effectively (CFR 2.2). It includes course descriptions, learning outcomes, rubrics, and
other elements key to conducting this programming. The GE curriculum covers three areas of study: Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Courses are sequenced as appropriate with GE capstone seminars. GE faculty committees specific to each of these areas assess the GELOs (CFR 2.4) through the capstones, with these learning outcomes appearing to be embedded in the methods the faculty use to assess student work (CFR 2.6).

The five general education learning outcomes (GELOs) are

1. GELO1. Compose written communications in English with precise command of usage, organization, and expressive form.

2. GELO2. Discuss ideas with clarity and composure in oral communication settings.

3. GELO3. Execute research plans, from the initial identification of information needs through to the evaluation and utilization of findings.

4. GELO4. Utilize quantitative information with understanding of its applicability in real-world settings.

5. GELO5. Formulate conclusions/solutions as the result of a creative, critical thinking process.

Each GELO is assessed via two performance indicators.

Essentially then, CCH has adopted the Core Competencies as their institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), since they are common across all degree types and levels at the institution. This ensures that CCH is addressing the Core Competencies systematically. As discussed in Component 3, CCH has effectively determined distinct requirements for each degree program and program learning outcomes reflect this distinction appropriately. However, the GELOs remain identical between degrees levels--though bachelor’s degree students complete roughly twice as many GE courses as their associate degree counterparts. While the 2013 WSCUC
Handbook states that undergraduate programs must ensure the development of core competencies, the institution may find it useful to calibrate the GELOs to correspond to the different degree levels and account for the additional units taken in the baccalaureate programs (CFR 2.2, 2.4).

Additionally, while adopting the five Core Competencies as its ILOs prioritizes them effectively, it does not yield an articulation of any distinct, college-wide learning goals that might be expected from CCH’s new mission statement. The institution may want to develop further its articulation of learning goals around mission-critical concepts such as storytelling and the global community.

While the general education system model book is exemplary in its organization and clear articulation of the purposes and content of the curriculum, there may be some minor confusion regarding the relationship between the GELOs and the course learning outcomes, which don’t always appear to align and suggest additional care should be taken to ensure the integrity of the general education matrix. For instance, CMST110 History of Motion Pictures I is listed on the GE curricular matrix as contributing to the quantitative reasoning GELO for students, but neither the course learning outcomes (CLOs) nor the course description provide any indication that quantitative reasoning would be an aspect of the course.

Assessment of the five core competencies based on the GELOs began in spring 2017 and continues; the processes are nascent but systematic and are guided by the learning outcomes along with thoughtful assessment planning and materials (CFR 2.2a). Core competency assessment has led to incremental improvement efforts, such as the creation of the faculty-led math coaching lab in 2019 to address unsatisfactory quantitative reasoning findings (CFR 2.10);
and the institution is attentive to adjusting assessment methods to improve its effectiveness (CFR 4.3, 4.4).

The assessment of core competencies and GELOs through capstone course assessment and senior level assessment of program learning outcomes in the major programs appears to function well to ensure performance standards are being met at graduation (CFR 2.7). Assessment findings via these reviews are oriented towards improvement, such as the decision to require that all Cinema BFA students take the program’s business practices course in response to findings that students in some areas of emphasis were leaving without an adequate understanding of industry.

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

CCH serves a diverse student body across two campuses and at two degree levels. With respect to student success, there exists an ethos of individual and personal attention to students. Retention committees on both campuses conduct weekly meetings to identify at-risk students and to develop retention protocols and student-focused solutions. The retention committees each have access to a Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)-compliant retention spreadsheet, where all members can make notes in real time regarding specific students. It is important to note that the students discussed in the retention committees, in keeping with CCH’s broader definition of student success, might not be struggling academically. Student learning and success at CCH might be impacted by factors outside the classroom, including physical and emotional health issues or external factors that may make it difficult to give their full attention to coursework. The retention committee discusses a student’s situation and creates a plan of action which involves highly individualized and personal attention and requires the student to take
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active responsibility for their success with assistance from CCH. This is a high-touch “web of support” for students that provides a clear picture of the steps students need to take to achieve academic success and appropriate scaffolding to do so. While this allows faculty and staff to gain a clear picture of student needs at an individual level, it also provides faculty with insight they can use to implement curricular changes and improvements at the course and degree levels. The resulting aggregate data is also used by the student success committee to develop programming to support student success (CFR’s 4.1, 4.3, 4.4).

Before discussing retention and degree completion, several important caveats should be acknowledged. First, CCH has multiple start dates per year. It also has both full and part-time students, first-time freshman and transfer students, and online and on ground students. This flexibility, while important for ensuring access to a CCH education, creates complexity in calculating and reporting retention and graduation rates. Second, cohort sizes are often small, so sample size is an important consideration. The loss of a few students can cause great fluctuation in both retention and graduation rates.

CCH maintains retention, persistence and graduation rates, time to completion and on-time completion rates (among others) in its Annual Institutional Report (AIR). The AIR presents the data for the last five years, which allows for the analysis of trends over time. The AIR also provides some context for the data presented, which is in keeping with the role of institutional research in educating data consumers. The AIR report provides training and coaching related to the use of the data as well as some interpretation and information to inform decision-making on campus.

For CCH, retention is defined as the percentage of students who re-enroll one year later (i.e., fall 2017 to fall 2018), after accounting for graduates. Given the institution’s schedule, this
method of calculating retention rates makes sense. Historical data show positive trends—retention rates overall increased from 71% in 2014 to 77% in 2017. In 2018, however, retention slipped to 74% (IR, page 35). To better understand this, CCH disaggregated their retention rates in several ways. In looking at retention rates by degree type, CCH found that retention for students enrolled in bachelor’s degree programs was higher (74%) than those enrolled in associate’s degree programs (58%). When retention data for bachelor’s degrees was disaggregated by emphasis, they saw emphases with smaller populations were within expected ranges, but Screenwriting had a 21% decline between fall 2017 and fall 2018. Additional disaggregation by student type showed that first-time freshman and transfer students retention increased from fall 2017 to fall 2018 (first to second year) but retention on continuing students fell from 78% to 74%. Part-time students have a much lower retention rate (38%) than full-time students (76%).

CCH has been able to identify some trends that help them understand student success. For example, data suggest that persistence declines from spring to fall quarter when students take summer quarter off. As a result new student orientation now educates students and parents on the advantages of staying enrolled year-round. The institutional research function is effective; however, there appears to be a tendency to generalize some data distinguishing between degree levels, such as aggregating associate and bachelor’s data. This may obscure findings about the success of these distinct degrees, so formulating disaggregated data for each degree level is recommended (CFR 2.10).

As a result of the high degree of variation seen in retention rates, graduation rates are also highly variable (IR, AIR Appendix, page 29) and lower than the national average for schools of its type. The four-year graduation rate for full-time students has increased for the last 2 years from 41% (fall 2012 cohort) to 46% (fall 2014 cohort). The five year graduation rate for full-
time students has also increased, from 55% to 57% for the same time period. Further
disaggregation shows that increase is due to an increase in graduation from transfer students. The
current six-year graduation rate for full-time students is 56%. Looking closer at six-year
graduation rates, CCH found gender differences such that women graduate at a higher rate (59%)
than men (54%). Overall, retention and graduation rates, while increasing, are still not in line
with national averages (the retention rate for first-time full-time freshman at private institutions
is 82%; the 4 year graduation rate is 51%) or CCH’s own internal goals.

CCH has completed WSCUC’s Graduation Rate Dashboard since 2015, which estimates
the institution’s absolute graduation rate over time using six data points which accounts for all
graduates, regardless of when students matriculate or how they enroll. While the WSCUC
method of calculating graduation rates allows for comparison with other institutions, it is also a
more inclusive measure than traditional measures that only use first-time, full-time students.
CCH is likely to benefit from this more inclusive measure, as it enrolls full- and part-time
students both online and on the ground. CCH points out two factors which impact its Graduation
Rate Dashboard (IR, page 42). First, because of its multiple start dates in a year, fluctuations in
first-time freshman and transfer as well as full- and part-time students are not considered in the
dashboard. Second, in 2018, the semester-based credits from the FC were added to the
dashboard, resulting in fewer average credits. In response, CCH collects and records the data for
the dashboard to create campus-specific graduation rate dashboards that are used for institutional
decision-making.

Even with those caveats, there is important information to be learned from the
information contained within WSCUC’s Graduation Rate Dashboard. The eight-year average of
absolute graduation rates at CCH is 53%, meaning on average, 53% of degree-seeking students
who enroll at CCH eventually graduate from CCH. It should be noted that the Graduation Rate Dashboard indicates graduation rates have been on a precipitous decline since the high of 78% in 2013-14, to its current low of 27% in 2017-18. This could be authentic, i.e. reflecting the trend towards the college’s current enrollment issue and/or it may be because the Graduation Rate Dashboard privileges an institution’s steady state; when an institution grows rapidly, it suppresses the Graduation Rate Dashboard.

The college has taken to heart the need to support student success, most notably, the college’s support for online students, which includes multiple emails to contact new students and connect them to the campus community. The associate director of admissions works as a liaison between admissions and academics to monitor new online students and assist them as they enter the online environment. Other programs that support student success (both online and on the ground) include: student success plans, which ask students who do not meet requirements to meet with the director of student success and to create an academic success plan; financial aid counseling which provides students not only with loan information, but also financial literacy modules; academic advising, which nurtures relationships between students and faculty and provides program and emphasis specific guides that help students navigate the curriculum; and, student counseling, which along with student services identifies students in need of services and plans workshops on mental and emotional health issues. A licensed mental health counselor holds both individual and group sessions and is available in emergency situations. Taken together, these initiatives will serve to provide decision-makers with concrete information about the nature of issues related to enrollment management. CCH has been able to accomplish this in a way that remains true to their culture and mission and retains the partnership between the
faculty and academic staff in setting and maintaining academic standards of success (CFR’s 2.4, 2.5, 2.10).

CCH is not satisfied with their current retention and graduation results. While CCH clearly takes providing support to heart, the alignment between those efforts and how they improve retention and graduation is not yet clear. CCH’s serious financial issues, discussed in Component 7, caused by dramatic declines in enrollment, mean it is imperative that CCH move quickly toward a comprehensive enrollment management strategy. This would include integrating information from marketing and recruitment with retention, student success and financial aid. Undertaking an enrollment management strategy requires a robust institutional research capacity. Institutional research is vital in helping make the connections between student support efforts and student outcomes and success. Enrollment management functions require the institutional research function be robust enough to handle not only the demand for data, but the critical role of facilitating discussion and making sure data are incorporated into decision-making at all levels of the college (CFR 4.2).

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

CCH has undertaken substantial assessment and institutional reporting initiatives—system model books, quarterly and annual learning outcomes improvement plans, revised program review with effectiveness evidenced by a strong Cinema department review, comprehensive faculty performance reviews, dashboards, widely used IERs, faculty handbook revision, curriculum development manual and use of data in decision-making. The many assessment initiatives demonstrate the institution’s strong commitment to making assessment a critical part of the institution’s infrastructure. The institution has also made considerable progress
on assessment planning and program review and has been responsive to previousWSCUC recommendations.

The assessment committee provides multiple perspectives for collective decision-making and reviewing PLOs and has made a significant difference to the overall assessment efforts and student success. The committee expressed a desire to better include and communicate assessment results to the students. Assessment committees for each program have been established at both campuses to:

- Provide guidance related to assessment of student learning outcomes including policy, procedures, methods and development
- Develop and maintain guidelines for assessment, recommend improvements and changes
- Provide guidance related to student learning outcomes for classes, programs, general education and institutional levels
- Oversee gathering of data, prepare and review academic program assessment reports and make recommendations to improve student learning
- Provide counsel to academic administration and faculty regarding assessment and improvement plans
- Promote the use of assessment for planning activities

Enthusiastic use was widely reported for CCH’s annual IERs which aggregate assessment data, survey data, student success data, career placement statistics, and program advisory committee (PAC) feedback. PACs are comprised of both internal and external disciplinary experts. PACs review syllabi, CLOs and other resources. From discussion with several external PAC participants, though there have not been many so far, the ones that have occurred were
productive and offered the opportunity for robust discussions, especially regarding current trends in the film industry where changes occur frequently, particularly in hardware and software. The reviewers reported that they focused mainly on two areas: quality, depth, and breadth of the curriculum; and the preparation for work in industry. The external reviewers felt that CCH’s students produced above average work and were highly employable. The external reviewers felt that the college would benefit from expanding external voices and a larger industry network would benefit the programs. The PAC process at CCH sounds very much like the external critique process in many art and design programs, and the institution may wish to consider that process for its external resonance in assessing the currency of practices in the disciplines.

The departmental IERs include summaries of internal assessment results, standard institutional data, for example, the number of faculty, number of students enrolled, and student:faculty ratios, student success data, and other accountability measures. CCH outlines its assessment infrastructure in its Academic Assessment Guide, which is grounded in assessment literature and was created in response to the 2014 Special Visit recommendation 3. The assessment process is clearly outlined and explained in the guide which results in quarterly and annual assessment-recommended improvements. Quarterly improvements are ones achievable within current budgets, and annual are tied to future budget planning. PLOs and GELOs are measured at three points: upon entry into the program in a first year course, a second year course, and at (or near) graduation in a fourth year course. Plans for improvement flow into the quarterly incremental improvements which are reviewed in the annual reviews and strategic planning (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 4.1). Adjunct, full-time faculty, chairs, and deans report that the results of these assessments provide the occasion for robust curricular discussions, result in improvements, are valued by the faculty, and though somewhat demanding, are sustainable. However, since they
depend on full-time faculty and chairs for organizing and documenting, the resumption of the faculty hiring plan will be important to long-term sustainability (CFR 3.1). CCH may also want to consider administrative support for documentation. CCH also collects data through various internal surveys such as a faculty assessment survey, pending graduate survey, instructor and course evaluation survey, as well as external surveys like the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Beginning in spring 2019, FC implemented the same survey structure as the LA campus.

The institution has done an exemplary job of including adjunct faculty in assessment and curricular discussion through both the review of student work and faculty development days (CFR 3.3). Adjunct faculty reported feeling included, and that these stipended meetings (stipends at two levels—meeting and administrative) supported pedagogical development, assessed programs, and built community. Both FT and adjunct faculty also expressed a keen desire to see more guest speakers related to faculty development areas. Though the adjunct faculty have remained relatively consistent, they voiced concern about the impact of administrative turnover on continuing and consistent assessment and curricular direction.

As the institution expands its use of online and hybrid offerings shared between LA and FC, the institution would benefit from continued assessment collaboration between the two locations.

**Assessment of the Co-Curricular:** Both campuses have introduced new co-curricular programs to support student success. The college and the vice president of student affairs are discussing approaches to a program review of the co-curricular understanding that the program review guide will need to be revised to accommodate the different structure of student affairs, and are in initial discussions about outcomes to be assessed and performance standards, which like the academic departments, will be tracked through IERs. Student affairs meets regularly to
look at IER reports, and weekly data to understand and anticipate changes and needs of the student body, such as the need for additional counselors. Currently the assessments are more reactive, and improvements should include mechanisms for more proactive change (CFR 2.11). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) could be a useful resource in developing a more proactive assessment framework.

**Program Review:** The Program Review Guide follows WSCUC best practices for program review (CFR 2.7). In response to a 2017 WSCUC Special Visit recommendation, the program review cycle was revised to six years. The online version of the BFA degree is evaluated separately, but within the same program review, because of the different co-curricular and instructional needs. The program review cycle begins in year five using quarterly and annual assessment reports along with additional student success metrics and industry reports. The program review is completed in year six with changes made in year seven. The program review schedule includes the review of one emphasis per year. In 2018 the BFA and the AFA in Cinema Television were reviewed. This program review provided a quality report that was very useful for the Cinema program, and in addition to providing significant insight to the Cinema Department, could serve as a template for how other departments could approach program review. The reviewers noted the advantages of CCH’s location, ties to industry, openness to change, and diversity efforts. Areas for improvement included faculty support and staffing, scaffolding of skill levels, the potential of adding general education courses that address both program learning outcomes and general education learning outcomes, and the necessity of internships. This program review also resulted in a five-year strategic plan to implement a new curriculum for BFA and AFA Cinema incorporating many of the program review recommendations. General education is not planning an independent program review but plans to
be a part of each of the studio program reviews. This would provide a fuller review of each program, but care needs to be taken to include reviewers appropriate to the general education areas, as well as mindful of the possibility that such an approach could result in recommendations for more major discipline tied courses that would increase the overall number of courses and potentially decrease general education’s effort to broaden its curriculum.

**Data Collection and Analysis:** Institutional research, now located at the vice presidential level, was restructured in 2017 with the collection and analysis of data coming from the campus registrar, with support from an institutional research consultant and the CampusNexus Analytics Dashboard.

The registrar issues weekly enrollment reports and ad hoc reports; admissions uses Hubspot to track enrollment metrics. These metrics, along with the AIR, are the bulk of the data produced by the team. This information is disseminated through meetings with the vice president of institutional effectiveness and presentations to various campus committees and to the Board of Trustees. The faculty diversity report is presented to the curricular diversity and equity committee and academic committees. The campus dashboards were upgraded to CampusNexus and dashboards for academic and student affairs are in progress. A quality assurance program has been created to assess WSCUC educational effectiveness at FC. (CFR 2.10, 4.6)

The AIR compiles five-year student enrollment trend data including persistence rates, retention rates, graduation rates, time to completion, and job placement rates along with brief narratives. As the institution continues its rolling enrollment practice with increased articulation agreements with local community colleges (CFR 2.14), it could benefit from its Graduation Rate Dashboard to report both first-time full-time and transfer students, though small and uneven graduating cohorts need to be taken into account.
As CCH moves forward it needs to consider 1) educating relevant data users on data use and interpretation; 2) the sustainability of its very thorough assessment structure, especially in light of its stabilization plan. The assessment plan calls for the work being done by full-time faculty and the department chair in conducting in-depth assessments and writing multiple reports (CFR 2.4). Reducing the number of outcomes reviewed and reports generated might add more value and better serve the institution as its assessment program matures; 3) beginning the process of articulating the results of assessment efforts and student achievement data to external stakeholders (2.7). CCH would benefit greatly from additional resources in the institutional research and registrar capacity to systematize the gathering, dissemination and incorporation of data in decision-making (CFR 4.2).

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

CCH derives 100% of its revenue from student tuition and fees. These revenues rely upon recruitment strategies, retention rates, and graduation rates. The institution has grown the campus and implemented multiple strategies to improve its financial viability and improve the student experience. These strategies include the following:

- Investment in infrastructure modernization and upgrades to student learning spaces and technology at the LA campus resulting in growth from 307 students in fall 2014 to 540 students in fall 2018, an increase of 76% (CFR 3.4).
- Implementation of the 2016 Strategic Plan with four strategic initiatives: 1) program expansion, 2) local recruitment, 3) geographic expansion, and 4) modality enhancement.
- Acquisition of Tribeca Flashpoint College in 2018.
• Entering into a long-term operating partnership with Edcura, a higher education services provider.

• Development of the 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan to provide a clear path for CCH to achieve financial stability and sustainability in a relatively short period of time.

CCH has encountered many challenges over the past four years, which have negatively impacted the institution:

• Expected growth from the acquisition of the Tribeca Flashpoint College did not materialize as expected due to a 14-month delay in approval by the US Department of Education, which also set an enrollment cap of 335 students at the Chicago campus.

• Negative bias toward for-profit institutions in Illinois, due in part to a letter by Senator Richard Durbin of Illinois.

• Inadequate financial methodology and processes to accurately forecast and correctly plan for revenue, expense, and cash management (CFR 3.4).

• Increased pressure at the Chicago campus due to high fixed costs.

The 2019 year was an especially difficult year financially for CCH. Factors contributing to the significant losses include (CFR 3.4):

• Low summer 2019 enrollment due to faulty enrollment projection assumptions which forecasted a higher summer 2019 enrollment than was actually realized ($992K decrease in revenue), both in terms of new and returning students, most notably at the Chicago campus where the summer 2019 population was 124 students below the forecast.
• Low High School Summer Program (HSSP) enrollment due to changes in programming that decreased the demand from 73 students in 2018 to 18 in 2019 ($400K decrease in revenue).

• Unexpected fall 2019 enrollment “melt” at both campuses reduced revenue by $842K.

• Losses from lower than expected retention and higher than expected attrition reduced revenues by $212K.

• Challenging recruiting in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), which allows graduates of LAUSD and its authorized charter schools to attend the city’s community colleges at no cost.

In response to the financial challenges, CCH acted in summer 2019 to reduce expenses, which included placing all college employees on a one-week unpaid furlough, eliminating 14 positions, eliminating unnecessary expenses, reducing non-academic operational expenses, and negotiating the sale and leaseback of a parking lot to generate $3M in working capital.

In addition, the institution developed “The 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan: Project 2020”. The plan included the creation of the Office of Strategy and Sustainability, a team consisting of the president, CFO and senior vice president of customer success. The team has implemented a structured management system comprised of metrics, analysis, and progress-reporting that is reviewed in weekly meetings with department chairs across the college. To monitor milestones, deliverables, and incremental progress, the team uses a smartsheet-based management system of tracking.

As part of Project 2020, financial operations have been reorganized to include best practices in financial operating procedures (CFR 3.4). Steps underway include revising and modernizing financial processes to provide accurate and timely financial reporting and
forecasting across all revenue, expense, and cash management functions; implementing structured and disciplined accounting and monthly close processes; replacing and/or re-training department employees who demonstrate substandard performance; fully aligning financial data and systems across the two campuses; and recruiting a long-term, committed CFO as the strategic leader for the finance department.

Project 2020 is focused on putting the institution on a stronger financial foundation by implementing a number of expense management initiatives. These initiatives include the following:

- Increasing tuition in LA by 7% to generate $700K in 2020.
- Reducing rent by 50% ($1.2M) in Chicago by negotiating the utilization of 50% less space. This negotiation was underway but not finalized during the team visit.
- Targeting reductions in all departmental expenses (excluding personnel) by 20%.
- Suspending the faculty hiring plan (CFR 3.1).
- Creating scheduling efficiency by utilizing blended courses; ensuring department chairs and faculty are carrying the appropriate teaching assignments; offering low-enrolled classes online and suspending new enrollment in two Chicago programs that produce the least revenue.
- Restructuring the student housing program in LA to eliminate losses.
- Reorganizing marketing and strategic enrollment management budgets to support the most efficacious endeavors, resulting in a 24% reduction in the marketing budget.
- Reducing three positions in admissions to align with more conservative enrollment goals.
Restructuring the Chicago campus by reducing operations to support a smaller student population; eliminating the general education program chair and redundant full-time faculty positions; and aligning pay across LA and Chicago.

- Integrating teaching, financial, customer relationship management and other software platforms across the campuses (CFR 3.5).
- Reviewing third party support services such as financial aid processing, security, human resources, and information technology (IT) for efficiency and effectiveness.
- Reducing commencement and Board of Trustee meeting expenses.
- Considering sale and lease back of the LA campus property.

In addition to expense management endeavors, CCH is looking to engage its alumni in fundraising. Plans to initiate fundraising is planned over the winter quarter, headed by the Board of Trustees chairman. Additionally, the institution is negotiating with a grant writing consultant which is anticipated to be completed in winter 2020. Unfortunately, the team is unable to understand the outcomes of this engagement due to its infancy. CCH indicated that “the Board of Trustees is currently discussing a fundraising development strategy to reduce the college’s 100% reliance on tuition and fees.” (IR, page 69) The team obtained little information that fundraising was moving forward at pace that would benefit the institution in the near term.

The team appreciates CCH’s transparency regarding the financial challenges it has and is currently facing. CCH has acted quickly to address challenges as they have arisen. As detailed above, the financial situations the institution has found itself in do not come from one, but multiple sources. The team is concerned about the ability for CCH to meet its financial obligations. The independent auditor report for the period ending March 31 included in its notes about the management plan that the financial statements “have been prepared on a going concern
basis which contemplates the continued operations of the institution through 2020 and the realization of assets and the settlement of liabilities and commitments in the normal course of business.” Furthermore, the note goes on to explain that “Management is committed to aggressively pursuing these strategies in the year ending March 31, 2020, and beyond . . . However, there can be no assurance on the effects on the institution as a result of the outcome of these planned courses of action or the institution’s return to profitability.”

With all the changes and continual moving parts of the CCH landscape it is difficult for the team to determine whether the 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan: Project 2020 will be effective in returning the institution back to profitability. As part of Project 2020, CCH has created a rolling 52-week cash flow forecast, which has and will assist in projecting cash needs. CCH was frank in sharing cash concerns over the next year and the need to utilize its assets quickly to be financially viable.

Unintended consequences of Project 2020 reductions in marketing and admissions, freezing faculty hiring (CFR 3.1), increasing tuition, reducing plant operation services, and increasing fixed costs by entering into additional financing arrangements have not been fully accounted for. Additionally, due to the short time Project 2020 has been in place and that it is multifaceted, it is difficult for the team to ascertain how effective the outcomes of the plan will be for campus or if all the details of the plan are achievable in the timeframe required for the institution to meet its financial obligations.

H. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

As with prior site visits, the team has been impressed with the intention of CCH to fully engage accreditation and WSCUC Standards and the campus’s responsiveness to prior recommendations. The Board of Trustees and the administration have led dramatic change for
more than five years, including program expansion, geographic expansion, and enrollment growth; and if they make it through the current crisis, CCH has potential for helping reshape private higher education in the future. They understand much about the changes in the higher education environment and are taking innovative approaches to the challenges, including the partnership with Edcura.

The current financial crisis, which CCH seems to have fully evaluated, primarily grew out of two different issues, the failure of their financial processes to keep up with enrollment growth (including not anticipating larger numbers of graduates related to larger incoming classes) and the external challenges to student enrollment and persistence that most small private institutions are facing. The partnership with Edcura is providing them some tools to address their financial processes; however, it is imperative that Edcura work to understand the landscape of private higher education more completely before they can be of assistance with the issues of enrollment and persistence. In order to address the crisis in the short run, CCH must either achieve bridge financing by approximately May 15 and/or sell and lease back the LA campus property by approximately August 15 in order that they not run completely out of operating cash. The crisis is imminent, and they have confidence that either or both solutions can be achieved. If so, they have good potential. If not, they will immediately be in closure mode.

Assuming they get through the crisis, their plans for future improvement include growing online programs, stabilizing their on-ground enrollments at 900 in LA and 500 at FC, improving morale by continued reinvestment, reconsidering the emphasis on their current mission and identity as a film school, strengthening branding to support their new mission and identity, continuing to develop new adjacent programs, evaluate current emphases, continuing to integrate the two campuses, and developing an alumni engagement and fundraising program.
The board, the administration, and the campus seem to value the feedback from WSCUC and are interested to receive recommendations for improvement.

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

The team commends CCH for the following:

1. A broad and robust assessment infrastructure that is informed by many current best practices, clearly aligned with an ethos of continuous improvement and institutional accountability for student success, and unambiguously part of the culture among faculty and administrative staff across both campuses.

2. Frank and forthcoming reflections on its issues, challenges, and opportunities in the self-study and materials supplied throughout the reaffirmation of accreditation review; its responsiveness to previous WSCUC recommendations.

3. An approach to strategic planning that is focused, active and actionable.

4. The mutual commitment between CCH and its adjunct faculty in supporting student success and fostering campus community.

5. The value CCH faculty, staff, and trustees have for the opportunity to prepare students for a lifetime of contributions in the entertainment industry. Students recognize and value that this commitment matches their passion and inspires their learning.

6. The investment in strong and effective leadership in student affairs, resulting in a campus with newfound confidence that its student affairs personnel are capable and effectual, its career development function is proactive and effective, and its co-curricular
programming, such as the new First Year Experience extended orientation requirement, is strategic and useful.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the WSCUC Criteria for Review (CFR) and the intersection of the CFRs with the team’s lines of inquiry shared with CCH after the WSCUC Offsite Review, the team recommends that CCH:

1. Fully implement the 2020 Stabilization and Growth Plan to ensure sufficient cash is available to sustain the campus while enrollment objectives are attained. The institution should explore utilizing its assets to increase cash in support of campus programming and activities (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 3.5).

2. Improve capacity for enrollment and revenue projections. To be successful in the long-term the institution needs a full-time, permanent CFO (CFRs 3.4, 3.8).

3. Implement the new campus budgeting process including the education and engagement of all departments (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, 3.7).

4. Prioritize the reinstatement of the faculty hiring plan, faculty and staff professional development, and equipment/infrastructure needs once financial stabilization has been achieved (CFRs 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 3.7).

5. Develop and implement plans to increase diversified revenue sources to support the needs of the campus and students (CFR 3.4).
6. Develop a comprehensive strategic enrollment management function that integrates marketing, recruitment, student retention and success and student financial support (CFRs 2.10, 4.1, 4.6, 4.7).

7. Hire and appropriately empower a qualified and experienced chief academic officer as an academic affairs advocate and leader. Part of this role should be to act as the administrative liaison to faculty for both campuses and to lead academic affairs in creating an academic strategic plan to inform the institution’s strategic planning efforts (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.10).

8. Continue the good progress integrating the FC and LA campuses. As the campuses continue to evolve, they should intentionally prioritize synergies that improve services, structures, policies, and culture (CFRs 4.3, 4.4).

9. Uphold the commitment of the Board of Trustees to the educational mission of the college and to continuing its efforts to improving board governance, monitor the Edcera relationship, ensure financial stability, and evaluate the president on a regular cycle (CFRs 1.6, 3.4, 3.6, 3.9).
APPENDICES

1. Federal Compliance Forms
   a. Credit Hour Review
   b. Marketing and Recruitment Review
   c. Student Complaints Review
   d. Transfer Policy Review
2. Off-Campus Location
3. Distance Education
### CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on credit hour | Is this policy easily accessible?  X YES  NO  
Where is the policy located? On the Student Consumer Information page of the college website:  
https://columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/  
https://columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/  
Comments: Credit hour policy is available for both campuses on both websites. The webpage contains all the student consumer information. |
| Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour | Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?  X YES  NO  
Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES  NO  
Comments: There is an annual syllabi verification wherein faculty create course syllabi and an LMS shell for each course, following approved templates. A credentialed academic administrator on the designated campus, such as the Dean of Academic Affairs, an Associate Dean, Department Chair, or Full-time Lead Faculty member, must review all syllabi in their department or area of study. The academic reviewer responsible for verifying a course syllabus uses the Learning Outcome Review and Credit Hour Verification Checklist Form to determine whether a course meets institutional expectations. Prior to and at the beginning of each academic quarter, all courses undergo verification for credit hour compliance and academic quality. This process involves the participation of the Registrar and a credentialed academic administrator, such as the Dean of Academic Affairs, Associate Dean, Department Chair, or Full-time Lead Faculty member on the relevant campus |
| Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet | Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?  X YES  NO  
Comments: All courses meet for 4 contact hours per week. The Academic Review Policy (see above) reviews the process for ensuring the outside of class requirement is reviewed and documented in each syllabus. |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses 
Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | How many syllabi were reviewed? 5  
What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? On ground and online  
What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s  
What discipline(s)? General Education, Visual Effects, Graphic Design and Interactive Media  
Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?  X YES  NO  
Comments: |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) | How many syllabi were reviewed? 2  
What kinds of courses? Internship Course  
What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s  
What discipline(s)? Cinema, Visual Effects, and Graphic Design &Interactive Media. Internship Course is an elective course for each BFA program.  
Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES  NO |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</td>
<td>How many programs were reviewed? 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed? BFA Cinema, AFA Cinema, AAS Film, AAS Recording Arts, BFA Graphic Design &amp; Interactive Media, AFA Design and Visual Communication, BFA Visual Effects, AFA Animation and Visual Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What degree level(s)? Associate’s and Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What discipline(s)? Cinema, Film, Graphic Design, Interactive Media, Recording Arts, Visual Effects, and Animation</td>
<td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Review Completed By: Laura Palucki Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: February 18, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal regulations** | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  
X YES ☐ NO  
Comments:  
Based on the review of the materials provided by the institution and confirmed during the Accreditation Review, CCH does not provide incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for success in securing student enrollments or awarding Title IV funds. Staff salaries are set according to experience and skill relative to equivalent positions in the general market. No bonuses or additional payment on a commission of incentive basis are made. All required disclosures are published on the campus websites:  
https://columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/  
https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/ |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  
X YES ☐ NO  
Length of program and time to completion are published for each program on the campus websites  
Los Angeles Campus programs:  
BFA Cinema: https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-emphases/  
AFA Cinema: https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-programs-study/afa-cinema-television/  
BFA Graphic Design + Interactive Media: https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-graphic-design-and-interactive-media/  
BFA Animation & Visual Effects: https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-visual-effects/  
BFA GDIM/ VFX online: https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/online-degrees/  
Chicago Campus programs: BFA Cinema: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-film/  
AAS Film: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-film-broadcast/  
BFA Graphic Design + Interactive Media: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-gdim/  
AFA Visual Communication: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-design-viscom/  
BFA Visual Effects: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-visual-effects/  
AFA Animation Visual Effects: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-vfx-animation/  
AAS Recording Arts: https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-recording-arts/  
Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  
X YES ☐ NO  
Tuition, fees, and estimated cost of attendance are published on the campus websites:  
https://columbiacollege.edu/admissions/tuition-and-fees/  
Comments:  
CCH publishes in its website its policy on satisfactory academic progress as well has how many credit hours is considered full time enrollment. Each program shares its average length of time to degree and the factors that affect progress.  
CCH publishes on its website a summary of the overall cost to degree. The presentation is uncomplicated and easy to understand because it charges students one basic tuition by credit hour with no variations for different degrees. Additional fees vary depending on degree program. Cinema students pay a quarterly production insurance fee. GDIM and VFX students pay a quarterly software licensing fee. All students enrolled in on-ground degree programs pay the quarterly premium for Student Accident insurance. These fees (quarterly) are clearly spelled out on the website. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Careers and employment</th>
<th>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES ☐ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X ☐ YES X NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
<th>Program webpages list Career Paths and Career Opportunities for each degree program and program emphasis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA Cinema:</td>
<td><a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-emphases/">https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-emphases/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA Cinema:</td>
<td><a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-programs-study/afa-cinema-television/">https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/degree-programs-study/afa-cinema-television/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Graphic Design + Interactive Media:</td>
<td><a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-graphic-design-and-interactive-media/">https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-graphic-design-and-interactive-media/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Animation &amp; Visual Effects:</td>
<td><a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-visual-effects/">https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/bfa-visual-effects/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA GDIM/ VFX online:</td>
<td><a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/online-degrees/">https://columbiacollege.edu/academics/online-degrees/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Campus programs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Cinema:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-film/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-film/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Film:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-film-broadcast/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-film-broadcast/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Graphic Design + Interactive Media:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-gdim/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-gdim/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA Visual Communication:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-design-viscom/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-design-viscom/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Visual Effects:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-visual-effects/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/bfa-visual-effects/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA Animation Visual Effects:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-vfx-animation/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/afa-vfx-animation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS Recording Arts:</td>
<td><a href="https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-recording-arts/">https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/aas-recording-arts/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no easily accessible information about the overall placement of the graduating class. CCH has an “Office of Career Services” on the CCH campus, but not on the Chicago campus. Staff in Hollywood are available for students in Chicago and make their programming available. Faculty report filling the need to bring representatives, particularly alumni, who work in a variety of entertainment industries, to the Chicago campus to talk about career opportunities.

*§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: Laura Palucki Blake
Date: 2/27/20
### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on student complaints</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: CCH has a Student Consumer Information webpage that includes links to consumer information and compliance documents. In addition to policies related to health, safety and student achievement, included in that list is a link to the Student Grievance Policy. <a href="https://columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/">https://columbiacollege.edu/student-consumer-information/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/procedure</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: All formal student complaints and grievances filed with the Director of Student Success are investigated by a Student Grievance Committee comprised of the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Departments and/or appropriate staff or faculty members. The Student Grievance Committee will meet with all respective parties to reach an amicable resolution. All parties will have equal voice in the discussion with the hope of resolving any dispute through constructive discourse. In the event a complaint or grievance cannot be resolved through discussion within the Student Grievance Committee, a student may give written expression to hold a hearing with the Executive Leadership Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where? Records of student complaints are maintained in the Student Information System. Directors of Student Success on each campus maintain copies of complaint forms submitted by students. Digital copies of the complaint forms are scanned into internal records and stored digitally a secure Google drive. Spreadsheets of student complaints are also maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, please describe briefly: Spreadsheets are maintained to monitor complaints over time. Complaints are reviewed quarterly in department meetings on each campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Review Completed By: Laura Palucki Blake
Date: 2/27/20
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>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?  
  X YES ☐ NO  
  Is the policy publically available?  X YES ☐ NO  
  If so, where?  
  In addition to the course catalog, transfer policies are also available on the on the campus websites:  
  https://columbiacollege.edu/admissions/how-to-apply/transfer-students/  
  https://flashpoint.columbiacollege.edu/admissions-3/apply/transferring-to-flashpoint/  
  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  
  Comments: |

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

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

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

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.  
Review Completed By: Laura Palucki Blake  
Date: 2/18/2020
Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix B

Institution: Columbia College Hollywood-Flashpoint Campus
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Laura Palucki Blake
Date/s of review: February 6-7th 2020

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs\(^1\) and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

   BFA – Visual Effects

   BFA -- Graphic Design & Interactive Media

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>SU18</th>
<th>FA18</th>
<th>WI19</th>
<th>SP19</th>
<th>SU19</th>
<th>FA19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time (&gt;9 Credits)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time (&lt;8 Credits)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online programs have same credit and course requirements as the ground programs.

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

\(^1\) See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.
### 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><em>Fit with Mission.</em> 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>As work in industry is increasingly moving online, and teams are based in multiple remote locations (including international locations), online learning fits professionally with what students will be asked to do in field. Course development is done with faculty, instructional designers build courses, handle updates, Director of online education works with department chairs to identify faculty, registrar handles scheduling, and director of online education facilitates course development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Connection to the Institution.</em> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</td>
<td>Online orientation is robust, technologically appropriate; multiple sources of information online and video. Also access to live person. All very accessible. Career services uses Skype and Google Hangouts to support students as well as email and in person. Access to resources is same whether you are online or in person MPD courses (multiple platform delivery) have online student joining actual in person class—ensures engagement, faculty and students report MPD is successful in increasing engagement and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</em> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and</td>
<td>All online courses use Canvas LMS for delivery. Has Live lecture,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</td>
<td>presentation, recorded lectures, presentations, student presentations, discussion boards, recorded audio and video, and some interactive capability. Students upload assignments into system, and faculty evaluate in system, offer feedback, etc. All courses are supported by Director of Online Operations. All students can see information about how and where to resolve technical difficulties. Guidelines and expectations are clear and standardized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services:</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Online students at Flashpoint have access to all services, welcome on campus, use study table, info commons, attend events. Have accesses to career services at CCH. Having Career Services at Flashpoint would be great improvement. Students, faculty and staff all mentioned this as deficit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Courses are taught by FT and adjunct faculty. Faculty teach both online, MPD and in person. Faculty support for online teaching through department chairs, Director of online programs, and Dean. Learning support is integrated into expectations and there to help when students encounter difficulty. Learning support situated well for institution. Dept chair of GDIM sharing courses with online GDIM chair (LA Based) to further augment offerings available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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.)

Courses are developed by FT and adjunct faculty in collaboration and are approved by department chair and dean. Faculty retain authority over content, but Director of Online Programs and instructional designers help faculty set up courses, access needed resources, troubleshoot, and monitor data on usage of online materials. Faculty up to speed and able to look at data to identify trends, help students.

### 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 offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?

Retention practices same as on ground. Faculty provide updates in weekly meetings to retention team. Ground students need program chair approval to enroll in online courses. Retention team then reaches out to students as well. Overall Retention Rate (FA to FA) is 60%. Numbers small, so every individual has large impact. Retention in CA better than IL, but only one person enrolled in CA. Graduation rates (4 year) are low (7%), and of concern. Retention and graduation data are monitored and discussed.

Need to follow up and see how concerns are being addressed (esp. graduation rates) 5 and 6 year grad rates (when available) will be of particular value.

### Student Learning

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?

Utilizes regular IER schedule. Department chairs and committees review results. Some courses show little to no difference between online and in person students on PLOs, other courses do. When difference is seen, instructor and director of online programs meet with department chair and
intervene in next course. Changes include adjusting content, but also change small structural elements to increase engagement, like when assignments are due. They have seen small structural changes have a significant impact on engagement, which in turn affects performance. In GDIM, they have outside professionals assess final projects, no difference between online and in person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><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 <em>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</em>?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Programs utilize regular IER process and cycle. Chairs and committees use same assessment tools as ground courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX C

Institution: Columbia College Hollywood
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Laura Palucki Blake
Date/s of review: Feb 6-7th, 2020

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
Flashpoint Chicago-Branch Campus
28 N Clark St #500
Chicago, IL 60602

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)

Flashpoint campus was acquired in March 2018 and is a branch campus. In Winter 2019 new programs and program versions were rolled out as described in self-study. Seven degrees are offered at Flashpoint Campus:

Winter Quarter Enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th># Credits</th>
<th>Avg Credits</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA in Cinema</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA Graphic Design and Interactive Media</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFA in Visual Effects</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS in Film</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA in Design and Visual Communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA in Visual Effects and Animation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS in Recording Arts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
30 Adjunct faculty and FT faculty (including department chairs) = 7.9
30 Adjunct faculty and 5 FT faculty (not including dept chairs) = 8.5

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
Examined course syllabi (online and on ground) orientation materials, retention numbers/ spreadsheet. Met with FT and adjunct faculty, department chairs, staff, Flashpoint administration, Edcura administration and students (see attached schedule)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site? | The Substantive Change Review team report from Fall 2018 included five recommendations:  
1. Align strategic enrollment management with mission and the strategic plan; the current team recommends the expansion of this recommendation to ensure that CCH develops a robust, strategic approach to all the elements of enrollment management, including not just marketing and recruitment, but retention of continuing students, and the leveraging of financial support.  
2. Review the faculty staffing plan; the institution made some good initial progress on the plan. However, given the current financial challenges, CCH has put the plan on hold for the time being, which the campuses have accepted as a necessary cost control measure. The team recommends that reinstatement of the faculty staffing plan begin when finances return to positive.  
3. Develop optimal online services; there was apparent satisfaction with the ongoing improvements to online | |
services and the team sees no need for continuation of this recommendation.

4. Monitor the ongoing integration of Flashpoint Chicago; there has been strong progress on this recommendation and the work needs to be continued until complete.

5. Review the retention plan; this is included as part of recommendation one above.

In conclusion, Columbia College Hollywood has been responsive to the concerns outlined in prior Commission actions. Furthermore, they recognize that enrollment growth and predictability is critical to their future growth and success.

### 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)

Flashpoint shares mission and goals of CCH, faculty regularly talk with one another, parallel committees, policies and structures. Administrative structure is lean but engaged. Staffing plans are appropriate, faculty roles and responsibilities are appropriate and guided by their background and training.

### 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)

Link between CCH and Flashpoint is present and clear. Students and faculty feel more connected to Flashpoint than CCH. Students deeply connected to faculty and their learning. Faculty work across campuses to discuss curricular changes and evidence of learning, but not yet a shared faculty culture, as CCH relies more heavily on adjunct faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
<th>Faculty and students appropriately trained on Canvas (LMS). Both students and faculty indicate interactions in and out of class are encouraged and supported. Classrooms and common spaces foster learning and dialog between students, faculty and staff. Information commons is integral part of educational environment, Study table is example of resource students continue to utilize even when it's not required, because it helps them structure their learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Retention committee tracks individual students. Intensive and high touch. Puts students in touch with support services they need. Student success committee examines same data, focusing on trends and uses information to make programming suggestions and changes (financial literacy programming based on retention numbers -losing students in first and second quarters) Student needs are identified and responded to quickly.</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>FT and adjunct faculty teach courses. Department chairs are responsible for oversight. Faculty are connected to one another and have access to (and use) same support and development opportunities. Faculty are aware of and participate in assessment of student learning, can articulate how their course fits in to larger program and how it contributes to broader learning goals.</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>Flashpoint faculty (FT &amp; adjunct) have primary role in design and implementation of courses and programs. Faculty courses approved by department chair, then Dean before being offered. Courses comparable to main campus offerings, internships are resourced properly.</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>Retention committee meets weekly to ID students who are struggling. Students can self-ID in questionnaire at beginning of year as well. Proactive and not just reactive. Put students in touch with services they need, follow up. High touch, multilayered. Retention has increased as a result. Time and resource intensive. Exploring idea of self-care in creative industries.</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>Institutional processes reflect good assessment practices. CLOs and PLOs are alive and impact curricular planning and course improvements. Data are examined by assessment committee and inform improvements/changes. Faculty can articulate changes they have made and impact those changes have had on learning (Oral communication example) Responsive education—if industry needs/wants skill, they incorporate it.</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 are evaluated annually, formative process. Students indicate faculty are transparent about changes they are making to courses and why they are making changes, indicating an ongoing inquiry into the effectiveness of their courses. Adjunct faculty are involved in assessment conversations and propose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job placement rates for Chicago Campus Career Services**
changes and updates to programs and courses; changes are informed by shifts in industry. Most faculty are also practitioners, and so link to industry is clear and transparent.