Component 2: Compliance with Standards

This component reflects on evidence compiled to complete the Compliance with WSCUC Standards (Appendix 02.a) and Federal Requirements Worksheet and Forms (Appendix 02.b), which was completed with considerable assistance from across the university, incorporating a wide range of perspectives and expertise. Sections of the completed worksheet were sent to key stakeholders for direct feedback, and drafts of the worksheet were on the Reaffirmation Steering Committee shared drive for over two years. The Compliance with Standards exercise brought several of the university's strengths and challenges into clear relief.

Standard 1 asks the institution to document that it has defined its purpose and aligned its educational objectives with that purpose. CSUCI's evidence presented under the category of "Integrity and Transparency" shows that the institution has made a strong and consistent commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, work we are committed to continuing and expanding (CFR 1.2). The university also remains committed to closing the graduation rate gaps that exist between URM, first-generation, accessibility, and Pell Grant status, as well as the underlying gender gap (CFR 1.2). It is also clear that DEIA efforts are now better aligned and coordinated between divisions (CFR 1.2). The evidence in this section also makes it clear that there are opportunities to further student success efforts by more fully developing CSUCI's framework for student success (CFRs 1.1, 1.3, 1.7). It also demonstrated a need for a collective effort, championed and supported by university leadership in collaboration with the campus community, to continue to expand and grow a culture of evidence and inquiry, empowering all members of the campus to use the process of assessment and program review to serve the causes of student success and DEIA (CFRs 1.2, 1.3, 1.5).

The evidence presented under **Standard 2** under the category of "teaching and learning" demonstrates the university's many efforts and achievements in areas inherent to the institutional mission. The work done by faculty and staff to design and map several types of learning objectives has been closely aligned with WSCUC standards (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.11). Substantial planning and investment in the value of professional advising at all levels, guided in part by GI 2025, has made a

notable difference in student success and equity issues (CFRs 2.5, 2.11, 2.12). This investment of energy and resources is also closely related to the important innovations made on issues of transfer student access, and how new students, both first time and transfer, are welcomed, advised, and mentored on campus (CFR 2.13). Program assessment is becoming more commonly understood by faculty and staff as a basic element of program improvement and an important way to evaluate progress on student success issues. Recent progress in the culture and practice of assessment is also welcome, pointing to the need for further development in this area (CFRs 1.4, 2.6). As a result of recent innovations in program review and program-level planning and data analysis, every degree program submits action plan updates regularly, essential program data reviews follow, and academic assessment reports round out the cycle. These materials are then reviewed by Academic Programs and Continuous Improvement and the deans. This system also allows more progress toward the institutional mission (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.1).

Evidence presented under Standard 3 demonstrates that university's organizational structure and processes are characterized by progress. 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. In terms of how the institution sustains its operations through faculty and staff (**Standard 3**), CSUCI now documents the demographics of faculty and staff with regular updates. These data are widely accessible, disaggregated by categories like rank, gender, ethnic origin, and age. The data, for example, make it clear that the diversity of CSUCI faculty and staff (See Priority 3) and tenure density are issues that continue to require sustained and serious attention (CFRs 1.4, 3.1). Personnel policies and employee resources and process guides are widely available and accessible, and the Division of Business and Financial Affairs operates with great care for compliance and diligence to risk aversion (CFRs 3.2, 3.3, 3.4). Information Technology Services and the Broome Library play important roles in providing technological services, information resources, and professional training (CFR 3.5). Faculty, staff and student governance

procedures, roles, rights, and responsibilities are widely observed and shared (CFR 3.10), and organizational structures at the university and system levels are clearly outlined (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9).

Under Standard 4, the University presents evidence of a maturing assessment infrastructure operating at the university, divisional, and department levels, as well as progress in evidence-based planning in Academic Affairs aligned with similar efforts in Student Affairs, Business and Finance, and University Advancement. As an educational institution, we accomplish our goals through institutional learning and continuous improvement. Recently, the Office of the President has launched an Operational Effectiveness program across campus to identify redundancies and minimize inefficiencies, which demonstrates our commitment to continuous improvement for business practices and processes (CFR 4.1). Similarly, our recent Culture of Assessment efforts have reinforced a data-informed, transparent culture of evidence-based decisions (CFRs 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.8). Our capacity in our Institutional Research Office has recently been significantly expanded and the campus is a leader in using, developing, and deploying dashboards to inform critical decisions. We are fortunate to have an executive leader, President Richard Yao, who routinely communicates critical data with key constituencies, including the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor's Office, all students, faculty, and staff, the Foundation Board, and community partners (CFRs 4.6, 4.7). Expanding external accreditations, for example in Business and Engineering, support the conclusion that the campus is using data transparently for planning and self-assessment. The university also has significant avenues for transparency related to budget and has expanded the information it shares with key constituencies over the past several years (for example, by including reserve balances and other fund balances beyond the general fund). The urgency of many of our current challenges, primarily related to enrollment and an emerging new campus identity and evolving mission, has reinforced a culture of reflective inquiry that valorizes data-informed decisions and transparent communication to key stakeholders. As noted above in vis-à-vis Standard 1, we recognize a need to continue to expand our growing culture of evidence and inquiry, thereby empowering all members of the campus to use processes such as assessment and program review to serve our changing mission during these challenging times (CFRs 1.4, 1.6).