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SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution and Visit

For more than 60 years, Columbia College Hollywood (CCH) has been preparing professionals for the art and craft of the entertainment industry. CCH is a non-profit organization and holds national accreditation with the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). This accreditation, granted from 2008 through 2013, is currently in the reaccreditation process. CCH received the NASAD Commission Action Report (CAR) just prior to the Special Visit Team arriving on campus. Previously accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC) from 1979 to 2008, CCH is authorized to operate as a California educational institution of higher learning by the State of California, Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE), with approval through 2013. CCH was previously approved by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) Eligibility Review Committee to pursue Pathway B, which allowed for an accelerated pathway to Initial Accreditation.

A WSCUC Pathway B visit was conducted onsite from October 3-5, 2012. Following the Pathway B Visit and Team Report, the Commission Letter dated March 11, 2013, included recommendations for specific accreditation issues to be further explored in a Special Visit Report, scheduled for January 2014, and an onsite Special Visit, scheduled for March 2014. The Team reviewed the Special Visit Report and supporting documents prior to the visit. The Special Visit Report provided the foundation for the campus visit, and from March 12-14, 2014, the Special Visit Team (Team) conducted onsite reviews of institutional documents, held interviews with key personnel and Board of Trustees members, and led discussions with groups of students, faculty, and staff to further its findings.

The Institution’s Special Visit Report: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The CCH Special Visit Report was clearly written and organized by the Standards and specific Criteria for Review (CFR) cross-referencing both the 2008 and 2013 versions (Table 1 displays the
crosswalk between the 2008 and 2013 CFRs for clarity). The CCH Special Visit Report centered around four main issues identified in the 2013 Commission Letter: 1) Governance Development, 2) Educational Effectiveness, 3) Student Status Completion, and 4) Faculty Engagement. Documents not included in the report exhibits (proprietary) were provided onsite, as well as the NASAD Commission Action Letter, financial ratios, and graduation and retention data.

**Description of the Team’s Review Process**

During the Team conference call, team members divided the responsibilities for the writing and inquiry that would be conducted, enabling the members to explore questions, prepare lines of inquiry, and draft preliminary documents to guide the visit. The Team had the opportunity to more precisely plan its inquiry during a preliminary meeting held on March 11, 2014, before the onsite visit began. This enabled the Team to efficiently use the time allotted for interviews and discussions to extend their understanding and confirm or correct preliminary findings.

The Team had adequate time to discuss its findings, shape conclusions, and draft its commendations and recommendations. The site visit provided the opportunity to further understand the organizational commitments to CCH’s progress since 2012-13 in a more coherent whole that extended beyond the initial findings presented in the report and supporting documents.

The team chair presented the five commendations and five recommendations to the president prior to presenting those statements to an assembled group of CCH faculty, staff, administration, and students at the exit presentation on March 14, 2014.
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

Issue #1: Governance Development

Based on the recommendations from the Pathway B Team Report (2012) and the Commission Letter (2013), three issues were addressed by CCH as part of this Special Visit: 1) Board Composition and Expertise, 2) Board Reporting Structures and Committee Processes, and 3) Role of Faculty in Shared Governance. The report was candid and straight-forward in describing actions, results and plans for further improvement. (CFR 1.8)

Board composition and expertise

The Board of Trustees (the Board) has made beneficial progress towards building diversity and adding higher education expertise to its membership. Two additional members have been added to the Board—one who brings significant sophistication in higher education, both in teaching and administration, as well as in technological literacy and distance learning (including online and blended delivery), and one who was screened and recruited in order to bring financial and fund-raising expertise to the Board. In meeting with the Board, both new members demonstrated a solid understanding of a trustee’s role and familiarity with the curricular approach and mission of the institution. The first new board member serves as the Chair of the Board’s Academic Committee; the second as a member on the Board’s Finance Committee. Both new board members articulated clearly to the Team the board orientation in which they participated. The Board Chair indicated the Board’s intent to continue to add, or replace if needed, board members at the rate of one to two per year, which is is manageable. (CFR 3.9)

The position of Faculty Liaison to the Board of Trustees was created in 2012, and this faculty member now attends all Board meetings, as do the president and vice president of the Student Government Association (CFR 3.10). In an effort to provide greater transparency of the Board’s functions
and priorities, both student representatives (through Student Government Association) and the faculty member (as the Faculty Liaison) participate in portions of each Board meeting and provide direct input to the Board (portions of the meetings in which Board actions and decisions take place stay in closed session). The institution provided evidence of several meetings held with students and faculty with the purpose of providing clarification of and transparency to the role of the Board. (CFR 4.6)

**Board reporting structures and committee processes**

Significant effort has been given to clarifying and strengthening the functions of the Board committees. Board members were able to describe the function of their respective committees and provided specific examples of actions and decisions made (e.g., exploring the alternative approaches of online and blended education that could be most effective for CCH students). Review of the Board of Trustees Manual and interviews with members verified the examples. Clarification was also provided that the secretary-treasurer, an ex-officio and non-voting paid position, does not sit on the Audit Committee, and instead serves as a resource to that Committee. Similarly it was clarified that the Audit Committee, not the Finance Committee, appoints the external audit firm. (CFR 3.9)

To clarify the reporting relationships, the Board eliminated the title of Chief Financial Officer (CFO) from the secretary-treasurer. In relatively small institutions such as CCH there may not be a person that holds the title of CFO. The functions of the position may in fact be undertaken by other staff members or even outsourced. Such arrangements or “functional work-arounds” may effectively meet the WSCUC requirement of a full-time CFO. The Comptroller (full-time) is now a direct report to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and together they are effectively performing the role of CFO at CCH. (CFR 3.8)

By separating the comptroller/CFO functions from that of the Board’s secretary-treasurer (again, ex-officio and without voting privileges), the structural ambiguity (CFO reporting to Board and not to president), and the potential conflicts of interest in these roles have been effectively addressed, and a
more effective reporting structure and board/staff role clarification has occurred at CCH. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8)

There remained, however a concern that the former CFO continues as a paid staff member with the title of “Secretary Treasurer of the Board of Trustees,” and that this position could be interpreted as a source of financial information to the Board, rather than information being provided by the president or his designee. Additionally, the secretary-treasurer position does not appear on the organization chart while performing the role of a “Director of Board Relations.” Moving forward, the Board (and the secretary-treasurer) indicated that financial presentations to the Finance Committee and to the Board will be made by the president with support from the comptroller. (CFR 3.7)

In a matter related to the CFO function, the institution is urged to take note of an area gaining greater importance with WSCUC and other external entities such as banks and other lenders. That is the level of integration of key strategic financial ratios and benchmarks into financial reporting and planning. The institution’s Viability Ratio, as reported in the Required Data Exhibits, is stable over a four-year period but is quite low. A ratio of 1.0 or higher indicates sufficient expendable net assets to satisfy debt while a ratio below that indicates the institution is limited in its ability to respond to adverse financial conditions, to be flexible in its operations, and to obtain additional debt if needed. It is important to note however, determining an acceptable ratio is institution-specific with many colleges falling well below 1.0 but continuing to function well. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, 3.8)

CCH has come through a period of great change and successfully met some very serious challenges. Now may be a good time in its evolution to consider further formalizing forums or processes for cross-functional discussions. One example would be creating an enrollment management team to include, but not necessarily limited to, representation from admissions, institutional research, academic departments, financial aid, and finance. Such a team could identify enrollment patterns, develop plans to stabilize and manage the patterns, and make actionable recommendations to CCH’s executives. (CFR
3.7) The president and the institution in general, could benefit from regular cross-functional dialog at a more senior and strategic level. Creating an executive cabinet or senior staff group that formally and regularly meets to discuss, plan, and execute key initiatives that cross divisional lines could facilitate this. (CFR 3.6)

**Role of faculty in shared governance**

In addition to the designation of a Faculty Liaison to the Board, mentioned above, several other changes were made to expand the visibility and the role of faculty members in the shared governance of the institution and to ensure faculty ownership of the curriculum (discussed further in Issue #4). Evidence was provided that the academic decision-making process begins with the faculty through the academic departments, areas of emphasis, and the Faculty Academic Council. After Faculty Academic Council action, academic proposals go then to the dean, the Academic Review Board, and the Board of Trustees for review. Several examples were provided by Faculty Academic Council members and faculty of the faculty’s ownership of the curriculum. (CFR 1.3, 3.10)

A Faculty Organization Chart was provided onsite to demonstrate the faculty role in the institution’s shared governance process. In an effort to ensure faculty autonomy in academic decision-making, the dean recused himself from the discussion/development of Learning Outcomes, and received the summaries after the faculty workshops. Faculty members in groups and individual conversations affirmed that they believed their voices were being heard by the dean, the president, and the Board. Faculty also repeatedly affirmed that faculty held the primary role in driving and refining the curriculum. (CFR 3.10)
Issue #2: Educational Effectiveness

Program review and assessment

Following the Pathway B team visit in fall 2012, Columbia College Hollywood (CCH) conducted a Program Review (September 2013 through November 2013). The Review was conducted by the nine-member Faculty Academic Council, with the participation of the entire faculty, the dean, an assessment consultant, and the director of institutional research. Appropriate external reviewers were engaged and provided reports to the campus. (CFR 2.7)

A wide array of data summaries were used for the review, including disaggregated retention and graduate rates, assessment of student learning data and reports (spring 2013), course evaluation results (AY 2012-13), eight years of annual Exit Survey results (“satisfaction surveys”), including the most recent survey completed by the graduating class of 2013, Faculty Survey results (September-October 2013), the bi-annual Library Survey (January 2013), and course letter grade data for AY 2012-2013. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10)

The program review process assisted the school globally and the faculty locally. It gave a structure for discovery of the effective and ineffective practices. Program review led to a variety of actions planned at all academic levels, from courses through emphases, programs, general education, and the institution. The process enabled the campus to design and implement improvements in curriculum and assessment. A monthly Academic Bulletin has been introduced as a method for communicating across the institution, in addition to the three faculty development conferences held each year. (CFR 4.4)

An organized view of CCH’s own institutional priorities has emerged. The college has been so taken with the benefits of program review that they had planned to repeat the process every two years and not the typical 5-7 years. The team does not recommend this cycle of program review as it will not allow for sufficient time to reflect on the information gathered throughout the program review process.
The assessment consultant, working in conjunction with faculty and leadership, has been effective in the development of a sound foundation for an assessment infrastructure. Beginning with faculty training in course learning outcomes assessment, the faculty developed an understanding of learning outcomes, the role of learning outcomes in course design, the importance of measurable outcomes, and the relationship between course learning outcomes and the program learning outcomes with which these must be aligned. The faculty extracted learning outcomes from course practices, ensuring authentic reflection of the knowledge, skills, and abilities being asked of the students. From these actual course outcomes were built emphasis outcomes. At CCH, within each degree program are a variety of emphases, which fine-tune the students’ course of study. Once these higher-order outcomes were established, alignment to courses and assignments were mapped. (CFR 4.3)

Faculty conducted and completed direct assessment of course learning outcomes. These data were reported in spring 2013. The results were obtained from assessment of embedded signature assignments using faculty-developed rubrics, and indicate that, on average, students are in the ‘satisfactory’ to ‘proficient’ range for all assessed outcomes. (CFR 2.6) While course outcomes have been mapped to Emphasis Learning Outcomes (ELOs), General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), it is not yet clear how assessment results speak to outcomes at the various levels of learning outcomes. (CFRs, 2.4, 4.3)

In addition to direct assessment and due to concerns arising from the student course evaluations and Exit Surveys, a focus group with Editing/VFX emphasis students was conducted in November 2013 for indirect assessment. Thus indirect assessment was used to augment direct embedded assessment. (CFR 4.3) The campus effectively utilized an assessment consultant and a consultant to develop institutional research data. The college budget now includes lines for an assessment director and a director of institutional research.
The college has established a Quality Assurance Committee and a Student Success Committee. These committees serve to institutionalize their efforts to monitor and improve academic program quality and student support services outside the classroom. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4) Student support services currently include peer tutoring and student advising. (CFRs 2.11, 2.13)

General education

The faculty have established a defined set of learning outcomes for its General Education (GE) program, often referred to as GELOs. Information regarding the learning outcomes is available on the CCH website and in the college catalog. As identified in the Pathway B Team report (2012), “[w]hile there is no question that the curriculum and co-curriculum is deeply embedded in the fine arts, the general education program lacks a depth and breadth typically associated with a liberal arts college.”

Although CCH has expanded its course offerings since that initial visit, the purpose of the collection of courses offered to fulfill the GE requirements seems to lack intentionality or cohesion. There is much opportunity in continuing to develop an offering of courses, developed with integration to the professional practice nature of the curriculum for the major, the will further engage students in the general education program because it will be a direct link to their interest in the film and television industry and not just a set of requirements that need to be completed. As said by one student in the open forum, “The new general education courses are better than they were. At least I can use something like the Abnormal Psychology course for character development in my scripts.” (CFR 2.2a)

More often than not, however, the GE courses are seen as something that “gets in the way” of the students’ aspirations to work in the industry. More than one student confirmed that there is less flexibility among the GE faculty if a student gains an employment opportunity, making the choice between continuing the bachelor’s degree program and pursuing their vocational dreams a difficult one. Exploring new modalities and scheduling for these courses may go a long way in increasing student

\[1\] Report from the Visiting Team for Pathway B consideration for accreditation, submitted November 2012, p. 5.
engagement, retention and completion while serving as an integrative, connective tissue across the professional practice components of the curriculum. (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a)

The institution indicated that student work evaluated for the GELOs in spring 2013 fell within proficient or satisfactory (3.25 to 2.87 on a 4.0 scale). While this is a single-term data set, faculty have already started to work on an action plan establishing best practices for continuous improvement, not only in the performance of the CCH student body but in the assessment model as well.

**Issue #3: Student Status Completion**

Central to the financial stability (CFR 3.4) of any college or university, particularly those that are heavily dependent on annual tuition revenue to fund operations, is a strategic enrollment management plan that includes the full student lifecycle – recruitment/outreach/marketing to generate inquiries from a pool of prospective students, admissions, enrollment, retention, graduation/completion, and by extension, financial aid and institutional discounting. While the tactical functions are often distributed across the institution and every member of the campus community must engage in the success of its students, more successful enrollment management efforts are led by a single, executive level position to provide the vision, strategy, and tactics that connect academic offerings to the financial goals of the institution through the use of market research, data, and student-centric intervention to insure new student enrollment goals are set and met, enrolled students are retained, and departures prior to completion are systematically encouraged to return for their degree. (CFR 2.10)

The lack of centralized responsibility for the enrollment functions on campus is most clearly demonstrated by the disconnection between the outreach/recruitment function, which reports to the Comptroller/Senior Director of Finance & New Ventures, and the admissions function, which reports to the Dean of Student Services. As outlined in the external reviews provided in the team room, the two units, key participants in the enrollment funnel, set the performance goals for the operations with limited consultation and it appears, with little insight into the optimal enrollment goal for any given
term. Development of enrollment goals must take into mind costs to generate leads for inquiries, investment in converting those inquiries to applicants, and so on, to a confirmed enrollment at the term start. When asked if the outreach or admissions staff could speak to their ability to identify enrollment by source (meaning “where did the lead come from”) or the most successful sources for their enrollment efforts, no one was able to directly answer the question. Individually it appears the funnel operations are doing the best possible to support student enrollment, and in areas such as admissions processing and communications, there appears to be a vast improvement in the effort since the visiting team’s last visit to CCH, but it is clear that the campus could benefit from an integrated and strategic effort. (CFRs 2.13, 3.4)

CCH continues to demonstrate best practice through the use of a well-developed institutional research function (CFRs 2.10, 4.2) to track key indicators of student success – retention and graduation. Retention performance for the most recent cohort of students is exceptional. Data indicates a first-time, full-time retention rate for the 2011 cohort to be 85%. This is greatly improved from the fall 2010 cohort at 75% and the fall 2009 cohort at 61% retention. As CCH has developed its student support services and integrated the involvement of student affairs and academic affairs in the review of student progress through its Student Success Committee, the improvements are astounding. It will be exciting to see how those early efforts to improve retention will impact graduation rates for the institution.

As CCH deploys systemic efforts to improve student success the institution should see improvement in its completion rates. As with most specialized, non-selective colleges and universities, graduation or completion performance requires an understanding of the educational intent of the institution and, in the case of CCH, the connection to the film and television industry. As students progress through the program, they are given opportunities for employment, paid and unpaid internships or contract positions that can often interrupt enrollment, causing significant delays in

completion or interfering with graduation all together. As one student expressed during the open meeting with the visiting team, “If you get offered a job and don’t take it, you risk being black balled in the industry.”

Repeatedly, the team heard about the competitive nature of the film and television industry, putting students in a position to find a balance between degree completion and current and future employment opportunities. CCH’s 6-year graduation rate, as based on the criteria required for IPEDS reporting is concerning. It consistently hovers at less than 50%. The methodology for this calculation does not account for those who drop to part-time status or who take a leave for employment opportunities and can leave a less than ideal indicator of institutional effectiveness. As a result of the variability in student enrollment behavior, CCH is an ideal candidate for the Balance Sheet Ratios and Absolute Graduation Rate pilot project currently being tested in the WSCUC region. A member of the team and the WSCUC liaison met with the institutional research director for CCH to review the model and the institution has been encouraged to submit the results for a comparative view of graduation rates, allowing for a more comprehensive examination of institutional performance in this area. (CFRs 2.10, 4.2, 4.7)

A student profile neutral examination of graduation rates using the new Balance Sheet will be an important step for the institution but it cannot be considered a panacea for resolution of the challenges faced by CCH in regards to student completion. Efforts such as the Student Status Upon Completion research project and the scholarship program “CCH Determination Grant,” used to encourage those who have stopped out prior to graduation to return to complete the degree are important steps in better understanding the enrollment and employment needs of the CCH student/alumni constituency. This in turn will provide suggested tactical programming to improve student completion rates. CCH will be well served to consider the design of its academic programs, creating modalities and schedules that
encourage ongoing engagement with the institution, even during times of employment and industry practice. (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 4.7)

**Issue #4: Faculty Engagement**

Faculty engagement is exhibited in three distinct areas: faculty governance, the faculty role in assessment and program review, and in faculty development. (CFR 3.10)

**Faculty governance**

Faculty engage with the institution through regular quarterly meetings of the Faculty Academic Council. Additional special meetings at the request of faculty are possible. Faculty governance in specific areas captured by standing faculty committees includes Curriculum, General Education, Technology, and Outcomes Assessment. These committees function under the oversight of the Faculty Academic Council. Additional topic specific committees may be convened as needed. (CFR 3.10)

The Faculty Academic Council is intended to be the primary faculty voice and the forum for shared governance, as established by its Bylaws. Membership “shall include all individuals who primarily have academic responsibilities at the College and who are employed at least on a part-time basis.” There does not appear to be an upper limit on the number of faculty who may be members of the Faculty Academic Council, except as established de facto in the foregoing criteria. All faculty members are voting members. (CFR 3.10)

As the Faculty Academic Council achieves greater voice and tackles strategic campus issues, the faculty will thereby be taking on a greater leadership and governance role, especially in the areas of assessment, curriculum, and program review. Academic Council has mandated quarterly assessment of learning outcomes and an increased number of faculty meetings per area of emphasis. The Academic Council may find that effective assessment may require fewer assessments of course learning outcomes.
Newly available faculty expertise and energy would be available for the design and implementation of plans for program assessment.

In order to self-address the role of faculty in governance of the college, a Faculty Engagement Subcommittee was established. They advised that all members of Faculty Academic Council should be ‘core faculty’ as defined by the Board of Trustees.

The most significant message to come out of conversations with the Faculty Engagement Subcommittee was the delegation of decision-making power and authority from the college dean to the faculty. Faculty have been empowered. Core faculty serve on committees and are engaged in strategic planning and curriculum development. New faculty are integrated into the life of the campus and encouraged to participate in its culture through a faculty orientation. CCH has developed an orientation curriculum which covers such central topics as campus processes and policies addressing academic freedom, crisis management, and student life. In addition, new faculty are advised on their syllabi and curriculum through individualized meetings and reviewed five weeks in to the quarter.

**Faculty role in assessment and program review**

Issue #2 established the role of faculty in the development of course learning outcomes and course rubrics. Emphasis and program learning outcomes have similarly been created by faculty. In the spirit of continuous improvement in the area of faculty involvement, next steps would be to encourage faculty to engage in program level assessment. Particular steps should be taken to identify how student work in courses can be used to provide evidence for degree program learning outcomes and general education. (CFR 2.4)

**Faculty development**

Continuous faculty development occurs through quarterly faculty training seminars. The college budget has included special funds for attendance at off campus workshops. These funds supported
professional development of the president and dean—but now will be redistributed to faculty for their professional development needs. (CFR 2.8)

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The institution has taken to heart the recommendations of the Commission and suggestions of the prior visiting team. Potential conflicts of interest have been resolved through the changing of reporting relationships and re-designations of several functions that now report directly to the CEO. The Board clarified that Trustees who also serve in an operation role (e.g. president, secretary-treasurer) sit ex-officio and without vote on the Board. The Special Visit Report and interviews with Board members verified that the roles of committees have been strengthened and clarified and that board members are aware of their responsibilities. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)

The Team was quite impressed with the work done to connect course, program, and institutional learning outcomes. The interviews conducted on campus clarified that this process has become something much more than a quest for regional accreditation. The faculty have embraced the benefits of conducting programmatic outcomes assessment to improve the curriculum to create space for critical conversations among the faculty. Their language and behavior indicate an engaged faculty who are committed to continuing efforts for understanding and improvement. This is particularly impressive on a campus where most are not full-time, traditional faculty but rather are part-time, who serve as professional practice experts. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

CCH continues to evolve its general education program and has assessed its efficacy through the direct assessment of student work product and indirect survey data. This is much progress since the last visiting team’s presence in 2012. In addition to refining the general education outcomes for the institution, the Team was impressed with the engagement of the CCH faculty in working to develop a general education program that is engaging and enlightening for its student body. CCH would be well
served to consider a statement of purpose or guiding mission for the role of general education in an institution that identifies itself as a liberal arts college. (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a)

A comprehensive enrollment management strategy will support success in each of these areas – new student enrollment, retention, and graduation/completion. While it was possible for the institution to successfully navigate after a 20% decline in new student enrollment for FY13, volatile enrollment patterns such as those demonstrated over the last three fiscal years do not bode well for stable financial planning and sustainability. It is in CCH’s best interest to formalize a strategic enrollment operation, reporting at the senior-most level within the college, and develop a comprehensive plan that bridges the institution’s academic and financial goals. (CFRs 2.10, 3.4, 4.7)

The re-activation of the Faculty Academic Council has provided a structure and meaningful vehicle to ensure faculty input in academic matters. The new organization provides surety that faculty have the principal role in shared governance, curricular matters, and professional development. (CFRs 2.4, 2.8, 3.10)

Commendations

1. The Team is impressed with the depth to which Columbia College Hollywood (CCH), especially the faculty, have embraced the culture of assessment and continuous improvement.

2. The Team commends the entire CCH community, from the Board of Trustees to the faculty and staff, in demonstrating extraordinary commitment and dedication to the education and well-being of its students.

3. The Team holds in high regard the effective engagement of part-time faculty and their evidenced role in effective academic leadership at CCH.

4. The Team recognizes that during a period of enrollment decline, CCH has remained financially sound and has begun to assemble some of the building blocks needed for strategic enrollment management.
5. The Team commends CCH for clarifying the institution’s reporting structures, adding qualified members to its Board of Trustees, and for continuing its efforts to expand, diversify, and develop the Board.

**Recommendations**

1. The Team recommends that CCH formalize a strategic enrollment management operation, reporting at the senior-most level within the college, and develop a comprehensive plan that bridges the institution’s academic and financial goals. (CFR 3.4)

2. The Team recommends that, as part of the institution’s maturation within the higher education landscape, CCH give consideration to formalizing a senior-level executive cabinet or similar structure of presidential direct-reports to address and respond to the opportunities that lay ahead. (CFRs 3.6, 4.7)

3. The Team recommends that CCH build its annual assessment efforts through a longer-term, systematic, and full academic program review model that will allow for campus reflection and a deeper understanding of continuous improvement. (CFRs 2.4, 2.7)

4. The Team recommends that CCH continue to expand faculty development opportunities both, internal and external, to the campus. (CFRs 2.8, 3.10)

5. The Team recommends that CCH seamlessly integrate the role of General Education and the WASC Core Competencies into the students’ programmatic interests as a strategy to promote the attainment of a college degree. (CFR 2.2a)
### Table 1
**Special Visit Team’s Crosswalk between 2008 and 2013 Criteria for Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 CFR</th>
<th>2013 CFR</th>
<th>Standards at a Glance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Academic freedom; policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Honest, open communication with WASC including notification of material matters; implementation of WASC policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Clearly defined degrees re: admission requirements and levels of achievement for graduation; processes to ensure meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2a</td>
<td>2.2a</td>
<td>Undergraduate degree requirements, including general education and core competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation data, external evidence and evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Identifies and supports needs of student; tracks aggregated and disaggregated student achievement; satisfaction and campus climate; demonstrates students’ timely progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Co-curricular programs aligned with academic goals and regularly assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Appropriate student support services planned, implemented, and evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans for any deficits; integrated budgeting; enrollment management; diversified revenue sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Leadership operates with integrity, high performance, responsibility, and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority to sustain institutional capacity and educational effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Full-time CEO and full-time CFO; sufficient qualified administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Independent governing board with appropriate oversight, including hiring and evaluating CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Effective academic leadership by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Quality-assurance processes in place to collect, analyze, and interpret data; track results over time; use comparative data; and make improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Sufficient institutional research (IR) capacity; data disseminated and incorporated in planning and decision-making; IR effectiveness assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Commitment to improvement based on data and evidence; systematic assessment of teaching, learning, campus environment; utilization of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Reflection and planning with multiple constituents; strategic plans align with purposes; address key priorities and future directions; plans are monitored and revised as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Anticipating and responding to a changing higher educational environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

Compliance checklist
Credit hour policy
Marketing and recruitment review
Student complaints policy
# Compliance Checklist

**Expectations for Institutions Seeking WASC Accreditation**

(2013 Handbook)

**Instructions:** Evidence of all required elements listed below must be verified by the time of Initial Accreditation, i.e. either by the time of the first institutional visit or a subsequent visit leading to Initial Accreditation.

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

**Name of Institution:** Columbia College Hollywood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>Link(s) to Website or Portfolio</th>
<th>Candidacy CPR</th>
<th>EER</th>
<th>Initial Accred. CPR</th>
<th>EER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Educational objectives at the program and (as appropriate) institutional levels</td>
<td>Provided student achievement data; provided objectives upon request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Academic freedom policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Diversity policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Documents regarding the authority of a controlling or sponsoring entity that is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affiliated with the institution, if any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6a</td>
<td>Catalog (online, hard copy) with degree program descriptions, graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirements, grading policies (including grade appeals and changes; policies and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>procedures to protect the integrity of grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6b</td>
<td>Human subjects in research policies (if applicable)</td>
<td>Faculty do not need policy and process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6c</td>
<td>Tuition refund policy</td>
<td>Numbered 1.7i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6d</td>
<td>Disability accommodations policies and procedures</td>
<td>Numbered 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7a</td>
<td>Faculty complaint and grievance policies</td>
<td>Numbered 1.7c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7b</td>
<td>Staff complaint and grievance policies</td>
<td>Numbered 1.7d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7c</td>
<td>Employee handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Curriculum and units required for graduation (if not in Catalog – see 1.6a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Documents Required</td>
<td>Link(s) to Website or Portfolio</td>
<td>Candidacy CPR</td>
<td>EER CPR</td>
<td>Initial Accred. CPR</td>
<td>EER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date of Review</strong> → March 11-14 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2a</td>
<td>For associate and bachelor’s degrees: general education learning outcomes or list of competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2b</td>
<td>For graduate programs: statement of outcomes and competencies appropriate to discipline and degree level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes at course, program, and (as appropriate) institutional levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4a</td>
<td>Faculty bylaws or policies demonstrating their collective ownership of the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4b</td>
<td>Representative course syllabi for each degree level offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Program review processes and calendar, referencing assessment and achievement of learning outcomes and program retention/graduation rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Faculty scholarship and creative activity policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Financial aid policies, manuals, and protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14a</td>
<td>Posted policies on receiving transfer credit and criteria for determining acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14b</td>
<td>List of institutions with articulation agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2a</td>
<td>Faculty hiring and evaluation policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2b</td>
<td>Staff hiring and evaluation policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2c</td>
<td>Faculty orientation policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2d</td>
<td>Faculty handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3a</td>
<td>Faculty development policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3b</td>
<td>Staff development policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Organization chart for key leadership positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>CEO biographical information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9a</td>
<td>List of governing board members with affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9b</td>
<td>List of governing board committees with members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Documents Required</td>
<td>Link(s) to Website or Portfolio</td>
<td>Candidacy</td>
<td>Initial Accred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>EER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9c</td>
<td>Location of minutes of board meetings for last two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9d</td>
<td>Governing board bylaws and operations manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9e</td>
<td>Policy and procedure for Board evaluation of president/CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10a</td>
<td>Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10b</td>
<td>Faculty governance organization chart, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>New program approval process</td>
<td>Lists staff list and qualifications of QAC or office; provided description of process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Description of institutional research function and staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Teaching evaluation policies or procedures</td>
<td>Lists PR HB and related material which is relevant evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Description of the strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of Review ➔ March 11-14 2014

x
Institution: Columbia College Hollywood

Date: March 12-14, 2014

Overview:
Under federal regulations, WASC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

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

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

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

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.
<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? In the printed CCH Scholastic Catalog (pg. 19) and online (http://www.columbiacollege.edu/academics/academic-philosophy/policy-credit-hours)  
Comments: |
| Process(es)/periodic review of credit hour | Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X YES ☐ NO  
Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO  
Comments: |
| 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: Each course meets once per week for four hours; anecdotal feedback from students indicates that, in their experience, this is the case. |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A  
What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? N/A  
What degree level(s)? N/A  
What discipline(s)? N/A  
Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☐ 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) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | How many syllabi were reviewed? 1  
What kinds of courses? Internship  
What degree level(s)? Bachelor’s – Upper division  
What discipline(s)?  
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: Internships are the only exception to the credit hour rule. Although the policy provides an exception for short term courses, those types of course sections are not offered as part of the schedule. |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? 3  
What kinds of programs were reviewed?  
What degree level(s)? 1 associates degree; 2 BFA degrees  
What discipline(s)? Fine Arts with majors and additional emphasis choices  
Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? X YES ☐ NO  
Comments: Each program clearly articulates the number of units required for the degree, average length of the program and maximum completion time (Scholastic Catalog, p. 18) |
MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Columbia College Hollywood  
Date: March 12-14, 2014

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

<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>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Federal regulations</td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: To all polices regarding tuition and fees, an annual budget for commuter and non-commuter students, and time to completion for full-time and part-time students are all available on the web site across multiple pages. Those pages are cross linked so a student can easily find the information they seek regarding completion and cost of attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and employment</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: CCH has attempted to survey its students with limited results. It does require each new student to sign an understanding of these performance measures prior to enrollment. The statement of performance can be found at <a href="http://www.columbiacollege.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/School%20Performance%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf">http://www.columbiacollege.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/School%20Performance%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.
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### STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

**Institution:** Columbia College Hollywood  
**Date:** March 12-14, 2012

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

<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>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy on student complaints** | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?  
Yes, | Yes  
Combining |
| | Comments:  
Broadly disseminated, published in catalog and in policy documents | |
| **Process(es)/procedure** | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:  
Well laid out procedures including investigation, adjudication, timing, appeal, etc. | Yes |
| | Does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
Thorough documentation of grievances and complaints | Yes |
| | Comments:  
Each grievance or complaint thoroughly documented with process & conclusions and actions. (Including rationales) | |
| **Records** | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
Where?  
A secured file of all grievances are maintained in the Dean’s office | Yes |
| | Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: | Yes |
| | Comments:  
Very thorough process of documentation by year | |