Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four forms that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the cited federal requirements. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.	Institutional Information California State University, Los Angeles Institution_____
Self-Review Rating 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply **Importance to address at this time** A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply	Type of Review: • Comprehensive for Reaffirmation Initial Accreditation Other _____ Date of Submission: __6 / 11 / 2018__ 　　　　　　　　　　　　　Mo　　Day　　Year Institutional Contact: Karin Elliott Brown

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

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

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	1	B	We have a published statement.	http://www.calstatela.edu/mission-statement Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2		2	A	Institutional data available to the public http://www.calstatela.edu/institutionalEffectiveness/ie-dashboards -Through the Graduation 2025 Initiative we are actively focusing on improving retention and graduation rates	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 5: *Student Success.* Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	2	A	Part of university values and personnel/professional policies. We have a Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Ethics.	Academic Freedom Statement. http://www.calstatela.edu/mission-statement http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/ch6 http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/ch2d	
1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.	1	A	"Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" is an institutional value and supported in practice.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10	The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.	1	A		Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12	The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.	1	B	http://www.calstatela.edu/studentconduct http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Judicial%20Affairs/Docs/student_grievance_procedures.pdf http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Student%20Conduct%20Office/docs/grade_appeal_policy.pdf http://www.calstatela.edu/orad/research-human-subjects-irb http://www.calstatela.edu/osd http://www.calstatela.edu/sfinserv http://www.calstatela.edu/financialaid	Evaluated during comprehensive review. Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review.	

1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7		1	A		Audits submitted with Annual Report.	
1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.		1	B		Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction*. Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? Academic freedom (1.3), responding appropriately to diversity (1.4), and institutional autonomy (1.5) all stand out as highly important. "Students need more assistance to understand program objectives." (Commenter.)
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? • Community partnerships • Diversity and inclusiveness • Student advisement and support continue to improve
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? A consensus of respondents suggest that making objectives more widely recognized, making data public, and support for academic freedom are areas to address. Survey commenters noted areas to improve are: making objectives more widely recognized and making data public, providing for non-traditional students' specific needs. Survey commenters expressed as concerns: lack of diversity from director up, but improvement with recent hires; not enough full-time faculty; more enrollment of African-Americans needed.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Teaching and Learning						
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	2	A	A few programs are not staffed by sufficient faculty.	Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist".	
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4		1	A	The ILOs were a result of several years of vetting. University Catalog describes entry-level and degree completion requirements -Program learning outcomes capture the distinctiveness of the discipline-specific degrees	Program descriptions in Catalog. Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3	The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).	2	A	Some programs have more developed assessment. Strengths and opportunities for improvement relevant to this criterion were identified at town hall meetings.	Description of General Education program with reference to Core Competencies. Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	
Criteria for Review (1)	**Guidelines (2)**	**Self-Review Rating (3)**	**Importance to Address (4)**	**Comments (5)**	**Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)**	**Team/Staff Verification (7)**
2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3	Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.	2	A	Commenters from surveys and town hall meetings have noted strengths and opportunities for improvement in this area. Graduate programs have well articulated PLOs and the Academic Senate is in the process of reviewing and approving Graduate Level Learning outcomes for the Institution	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	

2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5	The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.	2	B	Commenters from surveys and town hall meetings have noted strengths and opportunities for improvement in this area.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs.*
2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4	Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.	2	B		Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality*, and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4		2	A		Evaluated during comprehensive review.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4	The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.	2	B	Some relevant concerns expressed in town hall meetings. An Institutional Assessment team and College Assessment Coordinators work with programs to ensure that SLOs are assessed and progress described in annual reports (IEEI)	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6		2	A	Significant interest expressed in town hall meetings about program review with strengths and opportunities for improvement identified.	Description of Program Review process and calendar for academic and co-curricular units. http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review Also addressed during review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 5: *Student Success,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Scholarship and Creative Activity						
2.8	The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2	Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	2	B	Strengths and opportunities for improvement in regard to student involvement in research were identified at town hall meetings.	Policies related to faculty and student research. http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/ch6a#permanent%20instructional	
2.9	The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. X 3.2		2	A	Ratings are based on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and questions raised at town hall meetings.	Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure. http://www.calstatela.edu/engagement http://www.calstatela.edu/orad	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	2	A	This is an area of emphasis an ongoing improvement.	Included in Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		2	A	Ratings are based on feedback from town halls focused on the Writing Center, Career Center, civic engagement, etc.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6	Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.	2	A		Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.	
2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1		2	A	Feedback from town halls offered mixed reviews of financial aid and career counseling.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6	Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.	2	A	Opportunities for improvement in serving transfer students were identified at town hall meetings.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: *Student Success.* Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist."	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? Areas of greatest importance: progress toward degree completion (2.10), students understanding program requirements (2.12), service to transfer students (2.14) Due to the semester conversion process, program review and programmatic assessment were delayed for some programs over a two-year period. However, the program review process has recommenced and programs are receiving assistance with developing and implementing comprehensive assessment plans as part of the program review process.
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? Degree coherence (2.2), integrated course of study (2.2a), and student learning outcomes (2.3) are institutional strengths. Significant attention and resources have been directed to ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight. Fostering of diversity is viewed as a strength by many. Quality of programs (2.1, 2.2) is a strength. Program support (2.3) and review (2.7) are strengths. The institution collects data well. We do OK on analyzing data.
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? Time to degree completion is an area that is being addressed and needs improvement (2.10). Closely related, is the need to help students understand requirements (2.12). Overall, efforts to improve use of data to improve student achievement are needed and have been initiated. Writing Center services are not enough to address the writing limitation of some of our students. Career counseling and placement services need to be more fully integrated with academic advisement.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	2	A	Concerns about diversity of faculty and faculty advising were expressed at town hall meetings. A notable strength is the increased number of faculty hires in recent years.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4		2	A	Multiple methods of performance appraisal are used. Concerns are being addressed about boosting response rates for Student Opinion Surveys since online administration was initiated.	Faculty Policy Manual or Handbook.	
3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4	The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	1	A	Center for Education, Teaching, and Learning is a commonly identified strength.	Policies, budgets, or other indicators of faculty development programs.	
Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources						
3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7	The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.	1	A		Audits submitted with Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.	2	A	CETL and ITS provide training on the use of technology. We also make available online tutorials (Lynda.com). However, not all faculty utilize these available resources.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	A		Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	1	A		Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	B		Position Descriptions for CEO, CFO.	
3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7	The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	1	B		Board members' names and affiliations; Board committees and members; Board bylaws; CEO evaluation process.	
3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.	1	A		Faculty governance committees, bylaws, or similar evidences.	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? Committed faculty/staff (3.1), faculty/staff development (3.3), and institutional financial stability (3.4) emerged as highly important.
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? Institutional financial stability (3.4) was the highest rated strength. Other highly rated strengths included: faculty/staff development (3.3) and leadership integrity (3.6). Faculty are well supported by Center for Education Teaching and Learning.
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? While no areas called for significant development, areas that need to continue to improve are: information technology resources (3.5), faculty affairs issues (3.2), and ensuring adequate faculty resources (3.1).

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

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10		2	A	Concerns about quality raised at town halls include some large classes and assuring writing proficiency.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	
4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10		2	A	New software (Tableau) and dashboards are making it easier for faculty. Concern expressed at town hall meeting about programs collecting data.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
Institutional Learning and Improvement						
4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6	The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.	2	A	Institution is committed to improvement. Significant interest in assessment issues were expressed at town hall meetings. Both strengths and opportunities for improvement were identified.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 6: *Quality Assurance,* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6	Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.	2	B	This varies across departments and programs.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	
4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7		2	B	Some programs do this very well, however, many do not involve external stakeholders From January to April 2016, the strategic planning process included input from more than 2,500 stakeholders with 20 strategic planning workshops that 1,267 participants: 137 administrators, 538 staff, 314 faculty, 232 students, 24 Alumni Association Board members, and 22 President's Council members.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3			2	A	This does occur, it could be more systematic. The new strategic plan includes refined statements of mission, vision, and values. Priority areas are: (1) Engagement, Service, and the Public Good; (2) Welcoming and Inclusive Campus; (3) Student Success; (4) Academic Distinction. Key initiatives and metrics were identified for each priority area.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	
4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.			2	A	This does occur, it could be more systematic.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? Addressing issues of change (4.7) emerged as the issues of greatest importance. Other important areas: quality assurance (4.1), institutional research capacity (4.2).
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? Institutional research capacity (4.2) and ongoing improvement of teaching/learning (4.4) emerged as strengths. We have the infrastructure in place. We were on a good trajectory, however, we were delayed three years due to semester conversion.
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? Some expressed concern about the transition to electronic format for student opinion surveys and lower response rates compromising means of obtaining evidence of quality teaching for the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

Summative Questions

1. **Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?**

   A two-phase approach was used. The first phase was to seek input from essay writing team members on CFRs relevant to their essays. The second phase was to solicit broad participation from multiple stakeholder groups of Cal State LA by publicizing the availability of an online survey based on the worksheet. The online survey was developed as a project of the Cal State LA Office of Institutional Research in consultation with the WSCUC Steering Committee. The ALO led the publicity effort, which included outreach at a required meeting of all staff, [alumni outreach described], through Academic Senate, and through Associated Students, Inc. Collected data were tabulated by Steering Committee members. Modal ratings (or means when no clear mode was identified) from the surveys were entered into the worksheet. Comments in the worksheet are summary descriptions of comments collected in surveys.

2. **What areas emerged as institutional strengths that could be highlighted in the institutional report?**

   As noted in Essay 2: Several areas of strength were identified through our institutional self-review process; five are highlighted in this narrative: (1) a well-conceived strategic plan and implementation process supported by a strong culture of shared governance; (2) institutional commitment to diversity, ethical and civic responsibility and civic engagement in our academic curriculum, co-curricular programs and campus climate; (3) increased resource commitment to support student success through advisement and enrollment management; (4) increased efforts to promote a culture of assessment for continuous program improvement; and (5) institutional support for faculty and staff development activities to improve teaching, learning and assessment of learning outcomes.

3. **What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?**

   On January 22, 2016, over 150 faculty, staff, students, and administrators participated in the strategic planning kick-off workshop. Breakout sessions focused on how participants would like Cal State LA to be distinguished in five areas. Findings included: http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Cal%20State%20LA%27s%20Strategic%20Plan/kick-off_meeting_visual_recap_and_summary_doc.pdf

   1. Academic Experience: (A) need a baseline set of expectations for faculty/student success; (B) need for ways to assess what works best for successful teaching; (C) access to different ways to do research and hands-on learning; (D) cultural competency; (E) supporting core competencies in math & writing; (F) graduate student mentoring of younger students & career success; (G) need for more staff support.
   2. Student Experience and Success: (A) supporting students "all the way through"; (B) alumni mentorship; (C) need for increased tools/support systems; (D) being in community; (E) need for seamlessness; (F) creating library space for more interactions; (G) paths to graduation & beyond; (H) need for better service coordination; (I) need to use language for enhancing success.
   3. Great Place to Work: (A) meaningful relationships (no silos); (B) career development; (C) role clarification; (D) trust in shared governance; (E) leveraging talent; (F) creating communities; (G) technology.
   4. Fiscal Stability: (A) culture of excellence/enrichment & investing in students & Golden Eagle family; (B) students in community [research/internships]; (C) meaning of enrollment growth; (D) fundraising/grants/alumni.
   5. Leadership in Community: (A) enhancement at three levels; (B) reinventing local economy; (C) community needs assessment; (D) partnerships.

4. **What are the next steps in preparing for the review?**

   Townhall meetings in Fall 2017 provided an opportunity for stakeholders to provide feedback on the draft Institutional Report. This feedback was incorporated in the worksheet.

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

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

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

Teams complete these four forms and add them as appendices to the team report. They are included here in order for the institution to provide the necessary information for the team. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

    (i) It reviews the institution's-

        (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

        (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

    (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

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

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

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

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

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

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

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

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ❐ YES ❐ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? http://ecatalog.calstatela.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=772#Credit_Hour
	Comments: The undergraduate program length requirement is discussed at http://ecatalog.calstatela.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=704 The program length requirement for master's degree programs is discussed at http://ecatalog.calstatela.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=732
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)? ❐ YES ❐ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ❐ YES ❐ NO
	Comments: The recent conversion from the quarter to semester system necessitated careful review of credit hours and program length. Details are available at: http://www.calstatela.edu/semesterconversion
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ❐ YES ❐ NO
	Comments: See http://www.calstatela.edu/registrar/university-scheduling-office-0
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed?
	Type of courses reviewed: ❐ online ❐ hybrid
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per 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?
	What kinds of courses?
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ❐ YES ❐ NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed?
	What kinds of programs were reviewed?
	What degree level(s)? ❐ AA/AS ❐ BA/BS ❐ MA ❐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? ❐ YES ❐ NO

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? ❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: [The relevant Section (see bottom of the page) is on p. 632 at http://legcounsel.house.gov/Comps/HEA65_CMD.pdf , but where is this compliance posted on the Cal State LA website? I could not find explicit evidence of compliance.]
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ❑ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: [I don't see any explicit mention of this anywhere. These should be FAQs at: http://www.calstatela.edu/admissions/admission-faqs-all-students]
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ❑ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ❑ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Many resources are available at the Career Development Center. http://www.calstatela.edu/univ/cdc [Explicit descriptions of resources could be added here.] [There should be brief descriptions of career opportunities at every department's website. There isn't at all of them.] Through the Career Development Center, students have access to the Mentor Network which enables them to talk to alumni and other professionals who have volunteered to offer themselves as resources for career development. http://www.calstatela.edu/univ/cdc/wheretogo.php

**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 requirements do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.
(See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ❏ YES ❏ NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? ❏ YES NO If so, where? Student Affairs site and links accessible from the Student Affairs site (see below).
	Comments: Some relevant policies/procedures are also available in the Faculty Handbook Systemwide Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation Against Students and Applicants for Admission and Systemwide Procedure for Handling Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation Complaints by Students https://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/appr Non-Discrimination Statement and Discrimination Complaint: http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/appq
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ❏ YES ❏ NO If so, please describe briefly
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ❏ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: Student Grievance Procedures: http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/apph and http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Judicial%20Affairs/Docs/student_grievance_procedures.pdf University Student Grievance Committee Statement of Grievance Form: http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Student%20Conduct%20Office/docs/statement_of_grievance_form.pdf Dean of Students website access to grievance procedures and statement of grievance form: http://www.calstatela.edu/deanofstudents Non-Discrimination Statement and Discrimination Complaint: http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/appq Systemwide *Policy* Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking against Students and Systemwide *Procedure* for Addressing Such Complaints by Students (Executive Order 1097 Revised June 23, 2015): http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1097-rev-6-23-15.pdf with link to this policy/procedure from http://www.calstatela.edu/campusclarity/university-policies-and-procedures
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ❏ YES ❏ NO If so, where? All files related to student grievance files are maintained for seven years in a locked file cabinet in a secure storage location in the Office of the Dean of Students per our Cal State LA Student Records/Information Retention and Disposition Schedule https://www.calstate.edu/recordsretention/documents/Student_Records.pdf and Administrative Procedure 707 http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/Administration%20and%20Finance/Procedure/ap707.pdf.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ❏ YES ❏ NO

	If so, please describe briefly: We introduced the use of Maxient for recording CARE, Student Conduct, and Title XI electronic case files, messaging, and tracking during AY 205-1206. We have plans to add student grievance reports to Maxient during AY 2017-2018. Maxient affords us the opportunity to confidentially store information and observe trends in these areas.
	Comments: Per our current student grievance procedure, the Office of the Dean of Students Office (Current President's Designee for this process is housed in this office) addresses student grievances as appropriate for the situation.

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? ❒ YES ❒ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ❒ YES ❒ NO If so, where? http://www.calstatela.edu/academicsenate/handbook/ch4c#transfer for graduate students.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ❒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Policy applies to master's level students only. A procedure is described for undergraduates at http://www.calstatela.edu/academicadvisementcenter/frequently-asked-questions. Information for undergraduate students about articulation/transfer credits is available at http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudiesT/articulationtransfer-credits Transfer equivalencies of community colleges is available at http://www.calstatela.edu/undergraduatestudiesT/california-state-university-los-angeles-transfer-equivalencies Individual academic programs have there own procedures listed online.

*§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 WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.