

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To CETYS Universidad

November 15-18, 2011

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Initial Accreditation

Team Roster

Chair:

Brenda Barham Hill, CEO, ret., Claremont University Consortium.

Assistant Chair: Carmen Sigler, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, ret., San José State University.

Team Members:

Karen Graham, Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, Chapman University
Alex Granados, Associate Academic Dean for Strategic Initiatives and Associate Professor of Intercultural Studies, The Masters's College and Seminary.

WASC Staff Liaison: Richard Osborn, Vice-President

The evaluation Team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Numbers
SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review	6
• Alignment with the Proposal	
• Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report	
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review	7
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	
A. Systems for the Enhancement and Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning	21
B. Student Success, Including Retention and Graduation	23
C. Program Review	25
SECTION III. OTHER REVIEW ISSUES	30
A. Financial Stability	30
B. Credit Hour Policy	31
SECTION IV: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	32
APPENDICES	
Credit Hour	
Compliance Audit	

I. SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

CETYS University is a private non-profit institution of higher education located in Baja California, Mexico. CETYS was founded in 1961 in the city of Mexicali with the support of a group of visionary businessmen committed to providing local students with the opportunity of receiving a high quality university education without leaving the region. Today, the CETYS system offers undergraduate and graduate programs in three campuses, Mexicali, Tijuana (established in 1972) and Ensenada (founded in 1975).

Since its inception in 1961, CETYS has had a humanistic orientation and a commitment to contributing, through its alumni, to the improvement of society. This commitment and aspiration are made explicit in the mission statement which states that:

The driving purpose of CETYS is to contribute to the development of individuals with the moral capacity and intellectual preparation to participate in an important way in improving economic, social, and cultural aspects of the nation.

CETYS University has a total enrollment of 2292 undergraduate FTE and 454 graduate FTE. As its name (Center of Higher and Technical Education) suggests, CETYS offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in Business Administration (Business Administration, Marketing Administration, International Public Accounting, International Business, Graphic Design), Social Sciences and Humanities (Law, Education and Psychology) and Engineering (Industrial, Cybernetics Electronics, Mechanical, Computer Science, Digital Graphic Design, Mechatronics and Software). In addition, the CETYS

CETYS Initial Accreditation

system operates secondary schools at all three locations, as well as English as a Second Language (ESL) program through its Centro de Idiomas (Language Center).

As a Mexican institution of higher education, CETYS University is subject to regulation by the Mexican authorities at the state and federal levels and its programs have received official recognition from the appropriate government agencies. The Secretaría de Educación Pública, the national higher education regulatory agency, has granted CETYS full authority to offer degrees at the Technical, Secondary, Professional and Graduate levels. Similar authority has also been granted by the State of Baja California.

Additionally, CETYS is accredited by the Mexican Federation of Private Higher Education Institutions (FIMPES) and achieved reaccreditation under the “Lisa and Llana” category, which is the highest designation that can be received from this national agency.

Recent accreditation history: As noted in the CPR Visit Report, the “review of CETYS University for initial accreditation by WASC is historic, in that it is the first institution to be considered for accreditation incorporated outside of the United States”. The formal accreditation process was initiated in 2004. A year later, CETYS was granted eligibility and, subsequently, advanced to Candidacy in 2008. The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit for Initial Accreditation took place in October of 2009. On February 10, 2010, the Commission voted to schedule the Educational Effectiveness (EER) visit for November 2011.

CETYS submitted its EER Report for Initial Accreditation in August of 2011. After having reviewed the materials, the members of the Visiting Team held a conference call

CETYS Initial Accreditation

on October 10, 2011 to discuss the institution's progress towards meeting the Core Commitments and Commission Standards, to identify areas for clarification prior to the visit, to define areas for further inquiry during the visit and to develop a preliminary schedule for the visit.

The Initial Accreditation EER visit was conducted on November 15-18, 2011. The Team visited the Tijuana and Ensenada campuses and met with the Board Chair, Lic. Juan Ignacio Guajardo Araiza, members of the IENAC Executive Commission, CETYS President Fernando León García, Vice President for Academic Affairs Esther Mulnix, Arturo Alvarez, VP of Administration, campus and system level administrators and representatives of all three campuses including faculty, staff, students and alumni.

The Team presented its commendations and recommendations to President Fernando León, as well as the Board Chair, and other CETYS representatives on November 18th, 2011. At the conclusion of the visit the Team Chair observed that the accreditation process

. . . has been a long and arduous process for CETYS, characterized by exemplary commitment and hard work on the part of all members of the University community, from the Board of IENAC, two presidents and academic and administrative leadership, to the faculties and staff on the three CETYS campuses.

The Chair also expressed the Team's appreciation for the institution's generous and gracious hospitality, for the cooperation and professionalism of ALO Laura Carrillo and for the openness and candor with which all members of the CETYS community answered the Team's questions.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

A Compliance Audit was conducted and appended to this report.

B. The institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report:

Alignment with the Proposal: As required for Initial Accreditation reports, the EER report submitted on August 24th, 2011 followed the Comprehensive Approach and was organized into four essays addressing the four WASC Standards. The report, which was well organized, addressed all Standards and CFRs. However, it was primarily descriptive in nature and the EER Team found it lacking in the depth of institutional self-reflection and analysis that is expected of EER reports. For this reason, CETYS was requested to provide an addendum to the EER report.

The Addendum, submitted on October 25th, 2011, was organized into several sections addressing different aspects of the institution's engagement with the WASC process, the challenges faced and the lessons learned:

1. Educational Effectiveness at CETYS University, an Institutional Perspective.
2. Meaningful Involvement and Analysis of Educational Effectiveness.
3. Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Program Review Process.
4. Efforts to Promote the Development of Student Success
5. An Updated Data Portfolio.
6. Holistic Approach.
7. Response and follow-up to the Recommendations of the Institutional Capacity Visit in 2009.

Quality and Rigor of the Review and the Report: The report was the result of an impressive effort of system and campus-wide collaboration. The roster of contributors provided in the report, includes the entire CETYS administrative team and a large number of faculty and staff members from the three campuses. In addition, the institution was responsive to the Team’s requests for additional information and submitted all required documentation, as well as a 34-page addendum, in a timely manner.

In the course of the visit the Team was able to confirm that faculty members were an integral part of the review and report preparation. Indeed, in meetings with the Team many of them remarked that the WASC accreditation process had brought together faculty from all three campus and helped strengthen their sense of community.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

In its letter dated March 3, 2010, the WASC Commission emphasized the importance “of continued attention to all the issues raised on pp. 32-35 of the [CPR] Team report” underscoring the need for greater faculty involvement in planning and governance as well as continued hiring of well qualified faculty. In this section of the report, the EER Visiting Team will provide a detailed description and analysis of the institution’s response to these recommendations focusing on the following areas: 1) faculty, 2) library and learning resources, 3) academic planning and 4) learning outcomes.

1. Faculty

Description and Findings

The Visiting Team for the CPR recommended that CETYS provide continued and focused attention to the following issues:

CETYS Initial Accreditation

- Increased hiring of full-time faculty with doctoral level qualifications
- Development of and support for a graduate culture of research and faculty scholarship
- Definition of the role of the Faculty Senate and the faculty's participation in shared governance
- Increased faculty participation in the strategic planning of the University
- Realignment of the role of the Academic Council leading to stronger faculty participation in assessing academic programs and student learning outcomes

All five areas were addressed in the CETYS University's EER Report and the Visiting Team verified evidence that the changes related to these issues have been effectual in increasing the qualifications, participation, and voice of the faculty at CETYS.

New Faculty Hires (CFRs 3.1, 3.2). During 2009 and 2010 the University hired 23 new faculty members. In 2011 the University hired an additional 6 new faculty with either PhD or ABD qualifications. In addition, CETYS has honored its commitment to provide support to current faculty members who are pursuing doctoral degrees. This has resulted in 8 faculty members completing their doctoral work and receiving their degrees in the last two years, while an additional 9 faculty members are at the dissertation phase of their doctoral work. The University has established a new hiring protocol identifying, among others, the following preferred qualifications: Ph.D. or appropriate terminal degree, bilingual skills and international experience. CETYS has also started to conduct national and international searches instead of limiting itself to local searches. It was evident to the

CETYS Initial Accreditation

Visiting Team that CETYS University is not only committed to acquiring more full-time faculty but also committed to increasing the quality of its faculty.

Culture of Research and Scholarly Activity (CFRs 28, 2.9). In response to the CPR report, a faculty task force reviewed the research productivity of faculty at CETYS to establish a baseline for comparative improvement. The task force compiled an inventory of 102 research projects conducted during the last three years (2008-2011) and highlighted the following findings:

- 50% of the projects were completed in 2010 and early 2011
- 41% of the projects were carried out by undergraduate students completing course or degree requirements
- 25% of the projects were carried out by faculty members
- 16% of the projects involved undergraduate students
- 13% of the projects were carried out by graduate students
- 3% of the projects were carried out by faculty assisted by undergraduate students
- 2% of faculty research projects received external funding

From this baseline report, the institution claims that the foundation for a culture of research and scholarly activity does exist at CETYS. To build upon that foundation, CETYS has launched several new initiatives (such as the creation of Centers of Excellence) to further increase productivity.

CETYS also reports that graduate research “has increased dramatically” due to participation in projects sponsored by CONACYT (National Council for Science and

CETYS Initial Accreditation

Technology) a Mexican governmental agency that fosters scientific and technical development and provides funding for projects related to regional economic development. CETYS faculty members (and students) are working in collaboration with community businesses and corporations to extend their own research agendas and also to contribute to local economic development needs and business enterprises. In 2009 four CONACYT projects were funded and completed and in 2010 eight CONACYT projects were completed. The faculty report that the increase in these kinds of projects is expected to be a trend and that local businesses are, in fact, requesting more projects that can be accommodated.

The CETYS 2020 Strategic Plan envisions that the newly created Centers of Excellence will enhance collaboration among faculty for research projects and highlight the accomplishments of faculty research and scholarship. The establishment of these centers is another indication of the institution's increased focus on research and scholarship.

CETYS University has also established and funded an on-going series of renowned International Visiting Scholars (Distinguished Chairs, Distinguished Visiting Faculty and Visiting Faculty/Scholars) who spend three weeks at CETYS teaching seminars, mentoring faculty and students, and collaborating in the development of potential research agendas for faculty and students. Major scholars from Finland, Spain, India, Canada, and the United States are just a few of the recent visitors to CETYS under this Internationalization/Faculty Development Initiative.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

Finally, to support and encourage more research and scholarly activity on all three campuses of CETYS University, new Instructional Development Centers have been built and equipped in each of the libraries. The centers include training rooms with up-to-date presentation technology and a full lab for instructional materials development. The Library Staff have visited and studied models from other Universities in order to offer instructional and research support at international best practice levels.

Realignment of the Role of the Senate and Faculty Participation in Shared Governance and Academic Planning (CFR 3.11). At the time of the CPR visit, CETYS had just established its first Faculty Senate. Initially, faculty elected six members (two from each campus) to constitute the Senate. During this first phase, the Senate focused on organizational matters (developing by-laws and ground rules) and its members participated in university-level search committees and in two major initiatives at the University: CETYS 2020 Strategic Plan and a review of the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation System. They also engaged in extended conversations about the role of the Faculty Senate at CETYS and on how to achieve better representation of faculty across the colleges and campuses. As a result of these deliberations, several adjustments have been implemented including adopting a new name, the Academic Advisory Council, and increasing the number of council members to eight. In September 2011, CETYS held system-wide elections in which faculty voted to select members of the Academic Advisory Council. According to faculty members interviewed by the Visiting Team, the elections generated significant interest on the part of faculty members.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

The Academic Advisory Council has set up four permanent commissions, specifically devoted to addressing the following areas: Curriculum and Co-Curriculum, Faculty Development, Institutional Policy and Academic Organization, and Student Life.

This action addresses all concerns of the CPR visiting Team regarding faculty oversight of the curriculum. (For additional information regarding faculty participation in the planning process, see Section C.3).

Analysis and Recommendations

The Visiting Team concluded that CETYS had been responsive to the recommendations stemming from previous visit and had been successful in expanding the faculty's role in shared governance. The Team recommends continued maturation of the faculty governance system to ensure meaningful oversight of curricular and faculty matters and appropriate participation in University governance.

2. Library (CFRs 3.6, 3.7)

Description and Findings

The recommendations from the CPR Report underscore the need to focus attention on library acquisitions and the enhancement of library resources at all three campuses of CETYS University:

The Team stresses the importance of continuing annual enhancement of library acquisitions and resources to ensure appropriate and sufficient learning resources (physical and digital) in support of undergraduate and graduate programs by discipline and to meet the expectation that students and faculty are to be actively engaged in research.

The EER Report provided by CETYS directly addressed this recommendation and the Visiting Team found additional evidence during the visit to conclude that the institution

CETYS Initial Accreditation

is allocating more resources to support the library's mission and investing in facilities, acquisitions, and instructional support services.

Facilities. In response to previous WASC recommendations, CETYS has invested significant resources in building a new library on the Ensenada campus and remodeling and enlarging Library facilities at Mexicali and Tijuana. All three library facilities have increased the number study spaces (both individual carrels and group study rooms) as well as the electronic resources available to support faculty and student research, instructional development, and instructional materials development. Library facilities are now modern, welcoming learning centers for students and faculty (CFRs 3.6, 2.2b, 2.3).

Information Literacy for Students & Faculty. In response to WASC recommendations from the CPR visit and within the framework of the Library Strategic Plan, the library staff developed an Information Skills Certificate Course for the entire faculty, including adjunct faculty. Starting in 2009, the course was delivered on all three campuses. To date 147 professors have registered for the course and 43% will complete the course in 2011. In addition to this major professional development undertaking, the library staff also has offered courses in the development of information skills, use of e-books, and use of library databases for both students and faculty.

Increased Acquisitions. Since the CPR visit in 2009 the print collection has grown from 70,611 to 76,823 holdings at the time of the EER visit. In addition electronic holdings have grown from 83,867 in 2009 to 91,967 in 2011. Total collections have grown from

CETYS Initial Accreditation

154,478 in 2009 to 168,790 in 2011. This growth represents an annual expenditure of \$270,000 in 2009, \$280,000 in 2010, and \$290,000 in 2011. In addition to these acquisitions, the University has continued to build its interlibrary loan program through agreements with universities in Mexico and the United States (Universidad Iberoamericana Noroeste and San Diego State University) resulting in increased interlibrary loan activity (from 27 books in 2009 to 229 books in 2010).

Library Staff Training. The University provided resources for consultants from exemplary libraries in the US to visit CETYS campuses and for the library staff from CETYS to visit other University library facilities. Library staff have also engaged in professional development and significant research on support services for both faculty and staff.

Analysis and Recommendations

The EER Visiting Team saw convincing evidence that student learning and faculty scholarship have been significantly enhanced in the past two years through library holdings and services. In addition, the library facilities now offer a visible and demonstrable symbol of teaching and learning at CETYS. The Team commends CETYS for these accomplishments and urges the institution to follow through on the implementation of other improvements envisioned in the Library's Strategic Plan.

3. Strategic and academic planning, with evidence of faculty involvement (CFRs 4.1, 4.4, 4.6)

Description and Findings

CETYS Initial Accreditation

CETYS has a well-established history of Board-mandated institutional planning that predates its application for WASC accreditation. As noted in the EER Report and confirmed in a meeting with the Executive Commission of the Board, the CETYS Board (IENAC) has required an institutional strategic plan each decade. At the time of the 2009 CPR visit CETYS leadership was engaged in analyzing the results of the CETYS 2010 plan and beginning the 2020 plan. Faculty, administrative leadership and the Board were involved in the evaluation of the achievements of the 2010 plan. Faculty participation in the development of CETYS 2020 strategic plan, especially in relation to academic priorities and initiatives, was greatly increased from prior planning processes. The president's First Report of Activities 2010, provided as evidence in the EER report, and enumerated achievements of major strategic goals over the past decade in key areas such as enrollment growth, increases in student scholarships, facilities enhancements on the three campuses and the goal of achieving WASC accreditation.

Results of the CETYS 2010 plan analysis informed aspects of the 2020 plan that was adopted by the CETYS Board in September 2010. This new plan, a copy of which was provided as evidence in the EER report, is guided by four core vision pillars: 1) High educational quality; 2) Globally Competitive; 3) Learning community; 4) Sustainability. These, in turn, provide the framework for six broad objectives, each of which has a list of measurable initiatives or goals to be achieved:

1. High quality faculty
2. Foster holistic education of the student
3. Consolidate campus and infrastructure services

CETYS Initial Accreditation

4. Integrate best technological and platform services
5. Promote innovation and diversity of educational offerings
6. Achieve better efficiencies and diversity in fund raising

Twenty-two initiatives have been identified to address the objectives of the plan.

In keeping with long-standing institutional practice, multiple internal and external constituencies were engaged in assessing institutional position, articulating priorities and the future direction of the institution. The EER report cites faculty, directors, international experts, parents, alumni, employers and professional associations as being among those providing input into the planning process. Broad campus involvement of faculty and academic administrators was confirmed by the Team members in their interviews with various individuals and groups. As an example, the faculty initiated and produced a report on international education that ultimately informed the strategic plan pillar relating to internationalization.

CETYS has been responsive to the WASC recommendation that faculty be more engaged in the development of the 2020 strategic planning process than had been the case in the past. The EER report notes that “the basis and essence of CETYS 2020 is [an] academic plan, with all the colleges and faculty of the three campuses involved.” The relatively new Academic Council (Senate) provides a new mechanism for faculty involvement in planning and assessment of the achievement of goals.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

All the colleges participated in development of academic plan in CETYS 2020 (Addendum, pg. 28). This was confirmed by Team members in interviews with the Deans of the Colleges, members of the Academias (analogous to academic departments across the three campuses) and individual faculty members.

Both the EER report and Addendum provided substantial detail regarding academic and strategic planning at CETYS. In particular, the report cites increased gathering, analysis, dissemination and use of data in support of planning and decision-making across the institution. It is clear from the EER report as well as discussions with Board members, the president, senior administration and faculty members that WASC's notion of 'culture of evidence' has not only permeated the institution but also that the concept has been embraced with alacrity. CETYS' reliance on evidence and data are viewed as vital to planning and decision-making on the strategic and academic levels.

Analysis and Recommendations

Planning is part of the culture of CETYS (CFRs 4.1, 4.4, 4.6) and it is evident that the sophistication and rigor of planning at CETYS has increased in the years since its first eligibility CPR visit. Faculty participate more extensively in planning processes, especially academic planning through the Academias, and the Academic Council (Senate). It is evident from discussions with faculty from the three campuses that they are also more fully engaged in academic planning. The gathering, analysis and dissemination of information and evidence of institutional achievement, always a part of

CETYS Initial Accreditation

the CETYS process, appear to be stronger, especially as regards the use of information to guide academic planning and improvement.

As the institution reflected in its EER report, planning processes have been strengthened as a result of engagement with the WASC accreditation process, most notably through greater inclusion of faculty in academic planning and the utilization of data to inform decision-making and planning institution-wide.

4. Learning Outcomes (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6)

Description and Findings

The Visiting Team for the Capacity and Preparatory Review recommended that three areas involving learning outcomes at CETYS should be strengthened:

- Continue work on Institutional Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes. Complete the cycle, show evidence of completed outcomes assessment and improvements implemented by time of EER (CFR 2.3)
- As the faculty continues to assess learning through the curriculum, we remind CETYS that WASC standard 2.11 states that ‘co-curriculum programs are assessed.’ We encourage the university to use the systems developed for academic program review, appropriately adapted to assess academic and co-curricular programs.
- Appropriate institutional data with analysis, such as student satisfaction data and retention and graduation statistics, should be shared with academic and student support services so that they may utilize the information gleaned from these data

CETYS Initial Accreditation

to develop their own assessment and continuous improvement processes. (CFR 1.2).

In the EER report (pp. 12-13) and the Addendum (pp. 28-29) , CETYS described how it has responded to all three areas.

Institutional Learning Outcomes and Program Learning Outcomes. (CFR 2.3). The implementation of and commitment to institutional learning outcomes assessment and improvement was evident to the Visiting Team. CETYS has put together the Resultados de Aprendizaje Institucionales (RAI or Institutional Learning Outcomes) measurement strategy to strengthen academic development. Categories in this strategy include: clear and effective communication in Spanish (ILO1), continuous learning (ILO2), critical thinking (ILO3), and openness to cultural diversity (ILO4). ILOs have been assessed and evaluated in the 2008-2010 cycle by the Centro de Desarrollo para Mejoramiento Académico (CDMA or Center for Academic Development and Improvement). CETYS used an ILO scale of insufficient, sufficient, good but needs improvement, and outstanding. The ILO scores are:

ILO1 – 8% insufficient, 15% sufficient, 37% good but needs improvement and 40% outstanding

ILO2 – 15% insufficient, 24% sufficient, 31% good but needs improvement, 30% outstanding

ILO3 – 16% insufficient, 24% sufficient, 39% good but needs improvement, 21% outstanding

ILO4 – 5% insufficient, 13% sufficient, 37% good but needs improvement, 45% outstanding

The Institutional Assessment results were used by the academy and CDMA for revision and modification of assessment instruments, improvement to the programming and cycle of assessment, training workshops for preparation and functioning of the Institutional

CETYS Initial Accreditation

Electronic Portfolio (IEP) as repository of evidences, Information Literacy Program for Faculty (ILPF) and CETYS Faculty Certification Program (CFCP), and training workshops with external experts (Dr. Mary Allen, Dr. Marilee Bresciani). But the fundamental assessment question that CETYS still needs to address is what will be done so these institutional learning outcomes percentages are improved? What are reasonable goals for institutional learning outcomes for the next assessment cycle? These types of questions are being discussed now by faculty and administrators, and are the kinds of questions that must guide and shape academic improvement and institutional effectiveness.

Co-curricular programs. CETYS reports that it has measured informally and “in a non-systematic way co-curricular areas” (Addendum p. 29), that it has developed a time-table for the review of co-curricular programs and that the institution has initiated the process of measuring assessment outcomes for the library.

Appropriate data analysis. CETYS reports progress in the area of institutional data gathering and dissemination, for example, making available to academic units information about retention and graduation rates and the results of student satisfaction surveys. (Addendum, p. 29).

Analysis and Recommendations:

The Educational Effectiveness Review visiting Team confirmed the evidence presented by CETYS and, through various interviews conducted with students, faculty and

CETYS Initial Accreditation

administrators, verified that the institution continues to mature its culture of assessment and is moving from emerging to developed. However, the Team also observed that the assessment of co-curricular programs (CFR 1.2) is still at the initial stage and urges CETYS to proceed expeditiously with the implementation of assessment programs for all co-curricular areas.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

A: Systems for the enhancement and evaluation of educational effectiveness and student learning (CFRs 2.3, 2.5, 2.10, 2.11, 4.4-4.8)

Description and Findings

A major focus of the WASC EER visit to CETYS University was to document evidence that the University has created a sustainable infrastructure system for the enhancement of Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning. The ability of an institution to embed the processes of assessment of learning into its on-going, daily activities adds assurance that the institution will sustain the assessment of learning over time. It also represents an institution's commitment to improvement whether or not the institution is undergoing accreditation review.

The EER Visiting Team found that CETYS University has an unusual and even exemplary commitment to institutional improvement and excellence. All constituents of the University, from the Board of Trustees to administrators to faculty to students verbalize and demonstrate a genuine belief that assessing student learning and university services not only improves student learning but also improves faculty pride in their work, curriculum development and redesign, administrative decision-making about strategic

CETYS Initial Accreditation

planning, and communication across campuses and between administration and faculty.

These explanations of their commitment to educational effectiveness were repeated consistently in all interviews the Team conducted with all constituents.

Analysis and Recommendations

Evidence of the understanding of learning and service assessment was observed and recorded by the Team in interviews with faculty, students, administrators, and staff. In addition, evidence of the logistical systems and protocols for assessment was demonstrated by reports generated, college-level written plans/instructions for assessment protocols, program review templates and rubrics, timelines and schedules, learning outcomes in syllabi, and specific curriculum changes in courses and programs.

Of particular interest to the Team was the creation of e-portfolios (RAI) for the submission of student assignments and projects related to the institutional learning outcomes identified by the faculty. The submission of these works as well as the assessment and results are published on a dedicated assessment portal (PIA) enabling groups of faculty members to assess the student work and disseminate the results of that assessment to the faculty and administration. In Spring 2011 the University also purchased the SICU information system to support institutional decision making in all essential areas of assessment including student learning, faculty development, curriculum review. The SICU information program has embedded the process of assessment and shared the findings of assessment into the regular expectations of the faculty workload. They have also made the sustainability of the assessment protocols efficient and accountable. Both administrators and faculty report that the assessment portfolio will be

CETYS Initial Accreditation

used for all program learning outcome assessments as well as the institution and college-level outcomes that have been developed by the institution.

The WASC EER visiting found sufficient convincing evidence of sustainability in both the commitment to assessment and in the logistical systems/protocols developed by the University.

B. Student Success, including retention and graduation (CFRs 2.10 , 2.11)

At the time of CPR visit, the Team observed that CETYS University “demonstrated a long history of focus on student success, including attention to students’ academic achievement and personal success, to retention and graduation.” In the months following the CPR Review, the CETYS has continued to track retention and graduation rates and has analyzed the most significant trends in terms of retention and graduation.

CETYS reports that, while “as a system and using a weighted average, [it] has a first year retention rate of 89% and a sixth year completion rate of 62.5%”, these rates vary by campus.

	Mexicali	Tijuana	Ensenada	CETYS system
First Year Retention Average last 6 years	90%	90%	85%	89.3%
6 Year Graduation 2004-2010 cohort	69%	60%	52%	62.5%
6 Year Graduation 2005-2011 cohort	69%	60%		62.5%

CETYS also reports that, as part of its strategic plan CETYS 2020, it has set an institutional target of 90% first-year retention and 70% sixth year graduation rates. The

CETYS Initial Accreditation

institution points out that these goals compare very favorably with the sixth year graduation rate at the “national level in Mexico [which] has an index below 50%”.

The EER Team also suggested that it would be important for CETYS to investigate the reasons for student attrition and to disaggregate retention rates by academic program.

According to the EER report CETYS has been responsive to the Team’s recommendations:

1. The student services professionals at the CEDE (Center for Student Development) have tracked student performance and implemented strategies to support students at risk that have enhanced student retention.
2. CEDE personnel at all three campuses have identified and tabulated the reasons why students drop out.
3. Additional resources have been allocated to the Ensenada campus CEDE.
4. The SICU system now generates information “on efficiency of student completion by academic program”.

Analysis and Recommendations

After reviewing all the information provided by CETYS, members of the EER Visiting Team met with personnel from all three CEDE centers and listened to presentations in which they described their process for identifying students at risk and the many programs

CETYS Initial Accreditation

and services that they make available to students. The Team concluded that CETYS is seriously committed to the success of its students.

C. Program Review (CFR 2.7)

Description and Findings

The Institutional Review Process requires institutions to present an analysis of the effectiveness of the program review process with special emphasis on the achievement of program level learning outcomes. According to its EER Report (pp. 13-14), CETYS is firmly committed to periodically review all academic programs with the ultimate goal of making “necessary, ongoing improvements to curriculum and academic services.” To this effect, CETYS has adopted a program review policy (Portfolio of Evidence, exhibit Ev2) and all three colleges have established a Time-Line for Program Review (Ev80).

The institution has also modified the process itself (which originally had been designed to meet requirements of the federal agencies overseeing higher education in Mexico) to follow WASC guidelines and expectations. The new revamped process (initiated in 2010) was led by the “Academias” (learning communities comprised of faculty in the same discipline). These academies owned the process: they analyzed the respective program’s mission, the development of its vision, its learning objectives and educational objectives, the potential for students to succeed, and the recommendations of accrediting institutions and they identified resources needs (number of faculty, classroom and technology needs) in light of current trends in the required discipline fields. They also developed and

CETYS Initial Accreditation

refined rubrics, engaged in curriculum mapping and exchanged ideas and opinions with colleagues within the colleges and across the system.

Following WASC guidelines and expectations, the faculty involved in the program review process also requested and analyzed data provided by a number of other campus departments and utilized existing studies and reports such as results of the EGEL exam issued by the National Center for the Evaluation for Higher Education (CENEVAL), satisfaction surveys of employers and alumni, school statistics, and reports from CEDE (Center for Student Development).

During the last year, the following academic programs were reviewed: business administration, marketing administration, industrial engineering, computer sciences engineering and master's in business administration. According to information provided in the Addendum (p. 2), these programs enroll a significant number of CETYS students: “the Engineering programs reviewed represent 35% of all undergraduate engineering students; business programs comprise 34% of all undergraduate engineering students; and the MBA covers 40% of all graduate students.” An additional 12 programs are slated to be reviewed by 2014.

According to WASC's expectations that the program review process should not be a *pro forma* exercise but rather an opportunity for institutional learning and improvement, CETYS has embraced the process as a vehicle for improvement of its educational programs and as an opportunity to become a more effective organization. The Addendum

CETYS Initial Accreditation

(pp. 9-14) includes a section (entitled, Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Our Program Review Process) in which faculty who participated in the first cycle of program review reflect on their experience and identify the learning achieved through the process. In their reflections, faculty expressed, among others, the following opinions:

The WASC accreditation process has led us to evaluate the review process for programs which we had been carrying out, and to complement them in a meaningful way with an approach that is focused less on descriptive documentation and more toward a profound analysis of quantitative data and identification of areas of opportunity and improvements for the strengthening of the teaching-learning process, and always as the central point the achievement of meaningful student learning.

The process of program review (2010), which is the first one that CETYS has done based on the WASC framework, showed the presence of divergent faculty views and interests, which had to be balanced with the learning needs of students, academic programs, and the institutional goals. The program review framework provided an element of control that helped CETYS develop the review of programs in a structured and efficient manner.

Having completed the first cycle of program review, CETYS arrived at a number of significant conclusions (Addendum, pp 13-14) and formulated the following self-recommendations: a) “to keep on track the academic program review process established in the schedule for each College”, b) to continue faculty training in order for them “to comprehend [...] the methodology and maintain their leadership role in the process”, and c) to develop the necessary policies and processes for the effective “exchange of information between academic, administrative, and planning areas in a systematic and cyclical manner.”

Sampling of Recent Program Reviews:

The Visiting Team also reviewed in detail documentation related to the recently completed review of the Bachelor in Marketing Administration (BMA) and found it to be

CETYS Initial Accreditation

exemplary in the amount and range of data evaluated: results of student performance in national examinations, results of course level assessment of SLOs, portfolios of student work, student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, results of the external review conducted by the Board of Accreditation of Accounting and Administration Instruction (the professional accrediting agency for business programs in Mexico).

The Visiting Team was also impressed by the effective manner in which program review results have led to proposed changes in PLOs (changing their number from 4 to 6), curricular offerings (creating a course on Operations Management) curricular mapping (to address possible sequencing errors) and assessment of student learning (development of departmental rubrics and exams for implementation in selected courses).

Equally impressive has been the level of faculty engagement with the results of the review. For example, when assessment results revealed a considerable gap in students' ability to communicate in English, and noticeable deficiencies in statistics and research methodology competencies, the faculty immediately began to reflect on the reasons behind these results. The findings were discussed in numerous meetings in which faculty shared portfolios, experiences, initiatives, and opinions and discussed best practices in evaluation of student learning, students' attitudes toward their own development, organizational and academic challenges for English as a Second Language teaching and learning, contents of portfolios, students' reflections regarding their own learning, the use of technology for teaching purposes, contents and results of the EGEL, and recommendations for improving teaching quality.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

The Visiting Team, utilizing the rubric for assessing the integration of student learning assessment into the Bachelor in Marketing Administration (BMA) program review affirms that required elements of the Self-Study are developed, the process of review is emerging, planning and budgeting are highly developed, annual feedback on assessment efforts is developed, and the student experience is emerging.

Analysis and Recommendations:

The Visiting Team, reviewed all materials provided by the institution, sampled program review reports and interviewed faculty members, school directors and professional staff from all three campuses to assess the impact of the program review process and its alignment with the institution's quality improvement efforts and academic planning and budgeting. At the conclusion of the visit, it became evident to the Team that:

- a) CETYS has embraced a culture of “accountability”, whereby the quality of teaching is analyzed according to demonstrable student learning.
- b) The institution has enabled the faculty to participate effectively in the process by providing professional development workshops led by leading experts on the subject.
- c) CETYS faculty members “took the process of program review and they made it their own”.
- d) That the program review progress has led to program improvement as evidence by the recent Bachelor in Marketing Administration program review.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

The Team also observed that many of the recommendations arising from the CACECA accreditation review of the BMA program (increase in the number of full-time faculty, appropriate support for faculty engaged in doctoral studies and increased scholarly productivity) mirror those of current and past WASC review Teams and urge CETYS to continue to pay attention to faculty qualifications and the building of a research culture.

Finally, the Team urges CETYS to proceed with the review of co-curricular units in a timely manner.

III. OTHER REVIEW ISSUES

A. Financial stability (brief consideration of response to economic challenges (CFRs 3.5, 3.6))

Description and Findings

While the economic downturn of the past several years affected the Mexican economy at the macro level, it fared better than many other countries because it is an oil producing country. Baja California, because of the presence of the “maquiladoras” (international assembling plants) was in a better position economically than other regions of Mexico. Evidence in the form of the most recent audited financial statement and budget show that after a slight dip in FY2009 revenues rebounded in FY2010 and now exceed those of FY2008. Total net assets over the three-year period grew by 31%. By long-standing policy operating reserves are budgeted annually and surpluses are committed to institutional needs and priorities.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

While it has no endowment at present, the institution maintains numerous reserve accounts in areas such as scholarships and operations which can be drawn upon when needed. The existence of these reserves together with strong financial management and oversight has provided CETYS with the capacity to be nimble in adjusting to changing economic circumstances.

In 2010 the Mexicali region was rocked by a sizable earthquake that seriously damaged a number of academic buildings of the CETYS high school and university campus.

Fortunately, insurance proceeds for damaged facilities have provided funds for the restoration or replacement of as many as three academic buildings. The insurance funds are currently set aside while a final facilities plan is being developed for Board approval. The president has insisted that careful planning for academic needs be incorporated into facilities planning so that damaged buildings are not merely replaced, but rather that they are designed to support the CETYS education of the future.

Analysis and Recommendations

In meetings with the VP for Administration (CFO) and members of the Executive Committee of the CETYS Board Team members were able to confirm that the financial status and operations of CETYS University historically have been closely monitored by the Board of Trustees which is comprised largely of business people who insist on conservative financial management. The EER Team commends the institution for his long-standing history of prudent financial management which has enabled it to respond

quickly and with flexibility to changes in enrollment and the economy. Financial stability is a clear strength of CETYS University.

B. Credit Hour Policy. Considerable time was spent by the WASC EER Team prior to and during the visit in seeking to understand the Mexican system of granting university-level academic credit. As a federally chartered university CETYS is bound by Mexican law to its system of credit hours granted at the undergraduate and graduate levels for “hours of learning” which include both classroom and out-of-classroom learning. The attached Credit Hour Policies and Procedures form both indicates the degree to which CETYS credit hour policies and practices do or do not conform to the new WASC Commission policy, and explains the differences from the US system and compares the two. An Excel spreadsheet which provides a mathematical computation of credits for both undergraduate and graduate degrees between Mexican and US institutions also accompanies the form.

The Team’s conclusion from the analysis of credit hour policy and practice is that while the Mexican metrics for awarding credit differ significantly from standard US practice, the hours of education required by Mexican law and adhered to by CETYS exceed those of similar degree levels in the US. The Team’s recommendations regarding Credit Hour Policy are included at the end of this report.

IV. SUMMARY: MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus of the Educational Effectiveness Review is on student learning as evidenced by their educational achievement and on institutional learning as evidenced by the systems

CETYS Initial Accreditation

the institution has developed to improve its performance and review its processes so that they too are strengthened. The Team was also tasked with looking at institutional progress on several areas raised by the Commission in its CPR action letter in 2009.

At the conclusion of the EER visit for Initial Accreditation (representing the fourth WASC visit to CETYS University) the Visiting Team offered several commendations, in recognition of some of the institution's most significant accomplishments:

1. The Team commends CETYS for the many activities that faculty and other members of the CETYS community have undertaken over the past seven years to learn about WASC expectations and standards, to understand concepts such as educational effectiveness, continuous improvement and culture of evidence and to become familiar with the Standards of Accreditation. The EER Visiting Team, as well as previous WASC Teams, has been impressed with CETYS' commitment to excellence and institutional improvement - a culture that was in place before the WASC journey began, and that served as a major impetus for the decision to seek WASC accreditation.

2. The Team commends CETYS University for its commitment to continuous improvement which is genuine and permeates every level of the University. The Team appreciates the fact that CETYS intentionally and voluntarily sought WASC accreditation as an indicator of the institution's standards of excellence and aspirations to, in the words of the Board chair, "become better and better and better and better."

CETYS Initial Accreditation

3. The Team commends current and past Board members for their clear and stalwart leadership of CETYS University over its 50-year history. Members of the Board are deeply committed to the vision and mission of this institution. They truly carry out the Board's obligation to duty of care and loyalty to the University.
4. The Team also commends the Board for its leadership in ensuring a smooth presidential transition with consistency of institutional vision and mission.
5. The Team commends the CETYS faculty for genuinely embracing the concept of a culture of evidence, for educating themselves about learning outcomes assessment and program review and for their commitment to engage fully in these processes to both strengthen student learning and improve themselves as teachers.
6. The Team applauds the steps taken at CETYS over the past few years to expand the faculty's role in institutional governance, notably through the creation of the Academic Advisory Council and Academies. Shared governance is one of the unique features of higher education. The Team trusts that greater faculty engagement in academic governance will contribute to enhancement of the CETYS professoriate and its contributions to the university overall.
7. The Team commends CETYS for its commitment to planning. With the CETYS 2020 plan, recently adopted by the Board, CETYS has added meaningful faculty engagement and leadership in academic planning to its long history of strategic planning.
8. The Team commends CETYS for the many steps that the institution has taken to expand its understanding of the role and importance of the university academic library and learning resources. The resources that it has committed to improving library

CETYS Initial Accreditation

facilities and holdings (both paper and electronic) and to train library staff to understand their critical role as partners in the educational process are laudable.

Recommendations. The Visiting Team made the following recommendations:

1. CETYS must continue to implement its plan to increase the number and percentage of faculty members with doctorates. CETYS is also urged to continue to support current faculty who are in the process of completing the doctorate and to support other faculty who may wish to pursue the Ph.D. in the future. While 50% of the faculty with the doctorate is an admirable goal, growth of the institution and the quality of its programs may require CETYS to go beyond that, especially given its goal of internationalization and being globally competitive. This is particularly important at the graduate level where the Team believes the ultimate goal should be for **all** full-time faculty to hold the doctorate. Indeed, the Ph.D. (or appropriate doctorate) should be a requirement for appointment to full-time faculty position with teaching responsibilities at the graduate level.

2. CETYS must continue to mature the structures and processes of faculty governance including the Academies and Academic Advisory Committee. It must ensure that the faculty voice is represented in decision-making and that the Academic Advisory Council has a demonstrable impact on the university. In the future, the institution must focus as well on how the four technical commissions of the Council evolve and define their work.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

3. With regard to library and learning resources, CETYS should follow through on plans to enhance and build library collections and support staff to adequately support student learning.

4. In the area of learning outcomes and program review, the Team offers a number of recommendations:
 - a. The faculty should complete the additional 12 program reviews identified to be completed by 2014 and develop a timeline to complete the remaining five reviews within five years.
 - b. Each program should establish a multi-year schedule for the assessment of all program learning outcomes (PLOs) to ensure that at the time of a program review, all PLOs have been assessed.
 - c. The process of academic program reviews should include external evaluators. Evaluators should be faculty from exemplary academic programs. They should be expected to visit the campus, meet with students and faculty, review the program self-study and provide a written report with recommendations. The Team suggests that CETYS consults the WASC Program Review Resource Guide for guidance on the elements of strong program reviews.
 - d. CETYS should follow through with plans to develop and implement program review of all co-curricular programs, placing them on a schedule of periodic review.

CETYS Initial Accreditation

5. Use of Institutional Data - The CETYS EER report stated that the University “hopes to establish an institutional policy to facilitate and promote the exchange of information between academic, administrative, and planning areas in a systematic and cyclical manner.” The Team strongly urges the rapid transformation of this hope into the reality of robust information systems that allow for the retention and analysis of information in ways that are highly accessible, clear and usable by CETYS faculty and administration in support of assessment, decision-making, budgeting and planning. The faculty, especially, are eager for more and more accessible data to draw on for their learning assessment, program reviews and for planning purposes.

Team Report Appendix
CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Institution: CETYS
 Kind of Visit: EER Candidacy
 Date: Nov. 15-18, 2011

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all CPR, EER and Initial Accreditation Visits. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	<p>Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?</p> <p>Comments: CETYS conforms to Mexican law in the granting of credit hours toward the bachelor's and master's degrees, but it has not adopted a policy as required by WASC. <u>The Credit Hour Policy for the Academic Programs of CETYS University</u>, provided as part of the EE report, is a translated summary of a document issued by the Mexican SEP (Secretary of Public Education) on July 10th, 2000. Failure to comply with the Mexican minimum credit hour requirements may result in cancellation of the Official Recognition of Studies. CETYS abides by this law. CETYS provided additional documentation regarding its credit hour policy in November in response to questions raised by the Team chair. This document further explained the metrics for granting credit hours as well as total academic hours required for the bachelor's and master's degrees in Mexico. Finally, the team chair met during the visit with the VPAA and former Registrar to verify the credit hour confirmations. See the attachment for a further explanation of the metrics and counting of credit and degree hours under the Mexican system vs. the US system.</p>	No
Process(es)/ periodic review	<p>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)?</p> <p>Does the institution adhere to this procedure?</p> <p>Comments: By the Time of the February WASC Commission meeting CETYS should adopt and present a Credit Hour policy in compliance with the new WASC policy. This should include all required elements of the WASC policy, including a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments and indication of when and how this is done. The Mexican law and context of granting credit, as well as a comparison to WASC standard, should be included in documentation provided to WASC. CETYS needs to ensure that all syllabi clearly indicate the number of credits for the course.</p>	<p>Yes, but it is not included in a written policy statement</p> <p>The VPAA indicated that it does, but this needs to be clearly stated in a CETYS policy.</p>

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
	Comments: Electronic reports and records for courses offered in the fall semester were reviewed in the Registrar's office. All undergraduate courses carry 8 credits; graduate courses carry 6 credits each. The attached document from CETYS describes the Mexican legal system for granting of credits at the undergraduate and graduate levels.	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? – What discipline(s)?	None were reviewed
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	
	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)	What kinds of courses? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? <i>Undergraduate and graduate</i> What discipline(s)? <i>Business, Marketing, Law, Education, Engineering, Humanities, Psychology</i>	56 syllabi for a variety of traditional classroom courses.
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	
	Comments: CETYS has begun to experiment with online courses. The Team was informed at this time less than 1% of CETYS courses are offered online.	

How many syllabi were reviewed? *56 syllabi*
 What degree level(s)? – *Undergraduate and graduate courses*
 What discipline(s)?

Analysis of CETYS Credit Hour practices vs. WASC/US Standard:

The cultural and legal requirements for granting of university level credit hours in the US and Mexico differ.

Undergraduate Credit, Bachelor's Degree - Under Mexican law, one credit is granted for undergraduate courses for each hour of learning activity, whether that is in-class instruction or out-of-class learning activity. Undergraduate courses carry 8 units each. Semesters are 16 weeks long. In contrast, US practice grants one credit for three hours of 55-minute hour in-class instruction plus two hours of out-of-class learning activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The typical semester is 15 weeks.

CETYS has a 16 week semester. CETYS undergraduate courses each have 128 hours of instruction and out-of-class work vs. 135 hours for a 3 unit US course. Forty-one undergraduate courses are required for a bachelor's degree (Licenciatura) vs. 40 3 unit semester courses in the US.

The bachelor's degree under the Mexican system consists of a total 5248 hours of in- and out-of-class learning. In discussion with the CETYS VPAA, who has experience teaching in both American and Mexican higher education, noted that the 4 hours/week of out-of-class time is a conservative estimate. In addition, by law, the bachelor's degree requires 500 hours of social service that includes an academic component and 400 hours professional

practice related directly to the degree program. The total for the BA in Mexico is 6148 hours, compared to 5400 hours under US standard practice.

See the attached spreadsheet for a comparison of course and degree hours between CETYS and US higher education at the undergraduate level.

Graduate Credit, Master's Degree

Graduate courses at CETYS carry six credits each, with 3.6 hours of in-class and six hours of out-of-class activity in a 16 week semester. The master's degree under the Mexican system consists of 14 six unit courses for a total of 2150.4 hours of in- and out-of-class learning. A 30 unit US master's degree consists of 10 six unit courses for a total of 1350 hours in- and out-of-class learning. The overall Mexican master's degree hours of learning requirements exceed the US standard in this example. It should be noted that requirements for the master's degree in the US vary from 30-45 semester units, depending upon the degree. A 45 unit master's degree would require 2025 total hours of learning, still less than the CETYS/Mexican master's degree.

See the attached spreadsheet for a comparison of course and degree hours between CETYS and US higher education at the master's level.

Recommendations to be included in the Team Report:

1. By the Time of the February WASC Commission meeting CETYS should adopt and present a Credit Hour policy in compliance with the new WASC policy. This should include all required elements of the WASC policy, including a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments and an indication of the when and how this is done. The Mexican law and context of granting credit, as well as a comparison to WASC standard, should be included in documentation provided to WASC.
2. CETYS needs to ensure that all syllabi clearly indicate the number of credits for the course.
3. CETYS should prepare an explanation of the basis for awarding undergraduate and graduate degree credits to accompany all transcripts for students who may wish to transfer courses to a US accredited institution. This will allow the US institution to assess the credit equivalency between a typical eight unit undergraduate course which is roughly equivalent to a three unit course in US institutions of higher education.

CREDIT HOUR COMPARISON - CETYS AND US STANDARD PRACTICE

	<u>Bachelor's Degree</u>		<u>US Standard</u>
	<u>CETYS</u>		
Each Course	8 credits		3 credits
	328 credits for BA		120 credits for BA
	4 class hours/week out-of-class hours/ <u>+4</u> week		3 class hours/week + <u>+6</u> out-of-class hours/week*
	8 hours/week		9 hours/week
	<u>X 16</u> weeks (semester) 128 hours/semester		<u>X 15</u> weeks (semester) 135 hours/semester
For the BA degree	128 hours/course/ semester <u>X 41</u> courses 5248 total course hours		135 hours/course/ semester <u>X 40</u> 5400 total course hours
Additional CETYS/ Mexican requirements	hours social service; + 500 paper required hours internship in <u>+400</u> major		
Total hours for BA degree	6148 degree hours		5400 degree hours

CREDIT HOUR COMPARISON - CETYS AND US STANDARD PRACTICE

	<u>CETYS</u>	<u>Master's Degree</u>		<u>US - 30 unit degree</u>		<u>US - 45 unit degree</u>
Each Course	8 credits/course			3 credits/course		3 credits/course
	84 units for MA			30 units for MA		45 units for MA
	3.6 class hours/ week			3 class hours/week		3 class hours/week out-of-class
	<u>+6</u> out-of-class hours/week 9.6 hours/week			<u>+6</u> out-of-class hours/week 9 hours/week		<u>+6</u> hours/week 9 hours/week
	<u>X 16</u> weeks 153.6 hours/semester			<u>X 15</u> weeks 135 hours/semester		<u>X 15</u> weeks 135 hours/semester
	153.6 hours/course/ semester <u>X 14</u> courses			135 hours/course/ semester <u>X 10</u> courses		hours/course/ 135 semester <u>X 15</u> courses
Master's degree	2150.5 total course hours			1350 total course hours		2025 total course hours

Prepared by Brenda Barham Hill
CETYS EER Team Chair
18-Nov-11

**COMPLIANCE AUDIT CHECKLIST
FOR WASC VISITING TEAM**

Institution: CETYS
Team Chair: Dr. Brenda Barham Hill

Type of Visit: EER Candidacy Date: _Nov 15-18, 2011
WASC VP: Dr. Richard Osborn

Standard 1						
CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response (1/5/12)
1.1	1.1	Mission Statement	Provided			
1.2	1.1	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels (X 2.3)	Provided			
1.2	1.2.1	Public Statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning) (X Data Table 3.2	Retention data provided by campus and academic program	Student learning outcomes by program not on website.		Student Learning Outcomes by program will be to be uploaded on the CETYS web page on or before January 12, 2012.
1.3	1.3	Organization chart (X 3.8, 3.11.1)	Provided			
1.4	1.4	Academic freedom policy	Faculty statement provided	No statement for students or staff	Develop appropriate academic freedom policy for students and staff.	CETYS recognizes that a formal policy on academic freedom that applies to students is required and will proceed to its formulation and

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

1.7	1.7	Catalog (online and hard copy) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies	Provided			communication to the student body. In the same manner, also an Academic Freedom Policy for Staff will be formulated and communicated to CETYS personnel.
1.7	1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies.	Provided in supplement 10/21/11			
1.7	1.7.2.1	Policy for grade appeals.	Provided			
1.7	1.7.2.2	Records of student complaints		Maintains copies of all student concerns, suggestions and complaints.	Establish a written policy that a record of formal student complaints will be maintained for no less than six years, in	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
1.7	1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies (X 1.7.4)	Faculty Handbook states faculty has the ability to raise concerns and have them addressed.	No formal, written faculty grievance policy exists at present, but statement indicates that faculty has ability to raise concerns and have them addressed.	compliance with CFR 1.7. Designate an office to maintain student complaint records. The CETYS Academic Senate should work with the Provost to develop and adopt an appropriate Faculty Grievance policy and procedures, to become part of the Faculty Handbook. (see Description)	CETYS submitted a statement that it is developing a faculty grievance policy.
1.7	1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievance. (X 1.7.4.1)		Not currently maintained	Establish a policy that a record of formal faculty complaints will be maintained for no less than six years. Designate an office to maintain faculty complaint records.	CETYS will follow-up on the WASC Team recommendation to maintain a record of faculty grievances for at least six years.
1.7	1.7.4	Staff grievance policies (X 1.7.3)	Provided statement of legal and other expectations			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
1.7	1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances and complaints. (X 1.7.3.1)	for staff training and development	Not currently maintained	Establish a written policy that a record of formal staff grievances will be maintained for no less than six years, in compliance with CFR 1.7. Designate an office to maintain staff complaint records.	CETYS will also maintain a record of staff grievances for at least six years, per WASC policy.
1.7	1.7.5	Employee Handbook		Visiting Team was provided with numerous documents provided relating to employee rights, responsibilities, training expectations, etc. but not a complete handbook.	The Team recommends that CETYS compile all appropriate employment related policies and conditions for non-faculty staff across CETYS campuses into an appropriate Employee Handbook which is publicly accessible to all staff.	
1.7	1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complaint files	Provided, by campus for 2010			
1.7	1.7.6.3	Policies and		Not provided	Contact AACRAO for	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
1.7	1.7.6.4	procedures to protect the integrity of grades Tuition and fee schedule	provided - Information is publicly available in the institutional catalog on www.cetys.mx		guidance on developing an acceptable policy on protecting the integrity of grades. The policy should be submitted to WASC by the time of the February 2012 Commission meeting.	
1.7	1.7.6.5	Policies on tuition refunds	Information is publicly available in the institutional catalog on www.cetys.mx "English, then click on catalog", page 17, "Financial			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

			Information.”			
1.8	1.8	Regular independent audits of finances (X 3.5)	Provided, with explanation from Mexican auditor re differences from American accounting and reporting practices.			
1.9	1.9	WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies	Letter provided, dated Oct. 12, 2011			
Standard 2						
2.1	2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each	Provided			
2.2	2.2	Complete set of course syllabi for all courses offered	Provided			
2.2	2.2.1	General Education requirements	Documentation provided re CETYS approach to General			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
2.3	2.3	SLO's for every program (X 1.2)	Education, and agreement with WASC regarding this requirement. Provided. Review of SLOs is incorporated into the program review process.	Documents provided as part of the visit indicated that not all program SLOs have been fully developed.	CETYS faculty should ensure that the development of SLOs for academic programs are completed.	
2.7	2.7	Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention / graduation and achievement of learning outcomes (X 4.4.1)	Provided	Current program review process does not fully address retention/graduation assessment.	Program review process needs to be revised to address all elements cited in CFR 2.7	CETYS will ensure that all elements requested by WASC are incorporated in program reviews.
2.7	2.7.1	Regular schedule of program review (including for non-academic units)	Provided			
2.8	2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	Policy for the assignment of academic work	The Faculty Evaluation System document in the	Augment current faculty policies to include expectations	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
2.10	2.10	Data on student demographics	load and excess workload for Higher Education Faculty (2009) provided.	Evidence folder does not reference expectations or evaluation of faculty on the basis of their scholarship or creative activity.	for faculty scholarship and creative activity; add to Faculty Evaluation System, handbook or other appropriate document.	
2.10	2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs (X 4.6)	Basic student demographics by campus were provided Provided – disaggregated by campus and program;			WASC recognizes that ethnicity distinctions are not applicable in CETYS' context. Recommend that data also be disaggregated by gender to allow for enhanced understanding of retention and graduation patterns.
2.10	2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the courses or program level, as	Provided			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

		appropriate				
	2.10.3	Policies on student evaluation of faculty (X 2.10.4)	Provided			
2.10	2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students (X 2.10.3)	2008 Faculty evaluation forms provided			
2.11	2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	Provided			
2.11	2.11.1	Policies on financial aid (X 3.5.2)	Financial Aid Rules and Regulations, 2008 Provided		Recommend periodic review and update of rules and regulations; how are these made available to students and faculty?	
2.12	2.12	Academic calendar (X 1.7 catalog)	Provided			
2.13	2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year	Provided – copies of printed brochures and program descriptions			
2.13	2.13.1	Registration procedures	Provided - 2008 schematic and description of			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

2.14	2.14	Registration forms	registration procedures, flow and staff responsibilities Provided			
Standard 3						
3.1	3.1	Policies on staff development	Provided description and schedule of annual Staff Certification program and training for various CETYS staff	Not submitted; Numerous separate training schedules and forms were provided for different types of staff training that takes places.	It is recommended that the Staff Handbook include a policy statement on staff training to ensure they are provided with necessary training in legally mandated or other areas of training to ensure appropriate expertise and competence.	
3.2	3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full time, part time, adjunct, tenure track, by program	Provided			
3.3	3.3	Faculty hiring policies (X 3.4.2)	Provided			
3.3	3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policies and	Provided – Faculty		Academic administration and	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
		procedures (X 2.10)	compensation and Evaluation System, 2008		faculty should periodically review and update these policies and procedures, as appropriate	
3.3	3.3.2	Faculty Handbook if available	Guide for the Instructor of Higher Education provided; also EV 52		Submission is analogous to a Faculty handbook – It addresses a range of policies and practices for all CETYS faculty (full- and part-time,	
3.4	3.4	Faculty development policies (X3.4.1)	2009 memorandum from VP for Academic Affairs noting the creation of Institutional Faculty Integral Faculty Development Program provided; schedule of required faculty development program			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
3.4	3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures (X 3.4)	provided by CADJ; General Statute, Articles 89, 90 Provided – annual training and development for all faculty			
3.4	3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty (x 3.3)	Provided			
3.4	3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	Faculty Role in Assessment of Student Learning, with list of supporting documents			
3.5	3.5	Audited financial statement (X 1.8)	Provided, with auditor explanation of differences between American and Mexican accounting			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

3.5	3.5.1	Appropriate financial records (Budget, Cash Flow)	practices Submitted - Audited financial statement with Statement of Cash Flow;			
3.5	3.5.2	Appropriate policies and procedures for handling of financial aid (X 2.1.1.1)	The document provided includes a brief description of CETYS procedures for the issuance of scholarships and scholarship discounts. It is clear that CETYS has professional staff and scholarship committees as well as policies relating to the granting of scholarships in		While recognizing the CETYS is not responsible to the US DOE for records on federal student loans, it is encouraged to develop internal policy and procedures to financial aid fund disbursement and monitoring. This is a financial management issue.	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

3.5	3.5.3	Campus maps	place. Provided			
3.6	3.6	Inventory of technology resources for student and faculty (X 3.6.1, 3.7)	Provided			
3.6	3.6.1	If online or hybrid, information on delivery method (X 3.6, 3.7)	N/A			
3.6	3.6.2	Library data / holding size & Committee (Strategic Plan)	Provided			
3.7	3.7	Inventory of technology resources for staff (X 3.6, 3.6.1.)	Attachment 3.6.1 includes a statement that administrative staff have IT equipment and support		In the future an inventory (list) of technology resources for staff should be provided, as requested.	
3.8	3.8	Organization chart (X 1.3, 3.11.1)	Provided			
3.9	3.9	Board list	Provided			
3.9	3.9.1	Board member bios	Provided			
	3.9.2	List of board committees	Provided			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
3.9	3.9.2.1	Minutes of board meetings for last two years	Provided			
3.9	3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operation manual	Provided			
3.10	3.10	CEO bio	Provided			
3.10	3.10.1	CFO bio	Provided			
3.10	3.10.2	Other top administrators' bios (e.g. cabinet, VPs, Provost)	Provided			
3.10	3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president / CEO	Provided in Evidence documents, 3.10.3			
3.11	3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority	Provided – Academic Senate			
3.11	3.11.1	Faculty organization chart (if applicable) (X 1.3, 3.8)	Provided			
3.11	3.11.2	Minutes of last year's faculty meeting	Provided – minutes of various 'Academy' faculty		In future, recommend that only minutes of the prior academic year's faculty meetings be provided, and that a	

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
			meetings – many from 2009 and 2010		Table of Contents be included to help the reader understand whether all faculties meet each academic year	
Standard 4						
4.1	4.1	Strategic Plan (X 4.1.2)	Plan CETYS 2020 – approved by the Board September 2010			
4.1	4.1.1	Operations plan	2011 Operations Plan provided; also EV57			
4.1	4.1.2	Academic plan (WASC plan) (X 4.1)	Provided – part of Plan CETYS 2020			
4.2	4.2	Description of planning process	Provided with website link			
4.2	4.2.1	Process for review implementation of strategic plan	Provided with website link			
4.4	4.4	New program approval process	Steps to Open a New			

CFR	Audit #	Documents Required	Provided - Expectation Met	Item Submitted Deficient	Team Recommendation	CETYS Response
-----	---------	--------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	----------------

4.4	4.4.1	Program review process (X 2.7)	Academic Program - provided			
4.5	4.5	Description of institutional research function and staffing	Provided			
4.6	4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (X 2.10.1)	Provided			

Revised 1/8/12