

**REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

CETYS UNIVERSITY

March 25-28, 2008

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
CANDIDACY**

Team Roster

Alexander Gonzalez, Chair
Brenda Barham Hill, Assistant Chair/Team Editor
William W. Durgin, Team Member
Raymond T. Garza, Team Member
Esther E. Lopez-Mulnix, PhD, Team Member
Karin Duran, Team Member

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to 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
WASC EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW OF
CETYS UNIVERSITY

	Page
I. Context and Background	1
History and Context of CETYS University	1
Accreditation Status with WASC	3
Team Review Process and Organization of EE Report	5
Quality of Educational Effectiveness Report and Alignment/Evidence	6
CETYS Response to Capacity and Preparatory Report and Recommendations	7
II. Evaluation of Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review	8
Standard I. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	8
Leadership—Performance, Responsibility and Accountability	8
Commitment to Academic Freedom	8
Institutional Response to Diversity	9
Academic Goals, Programs and Services	9
Integrity in Policies, Operations and Business Practices	10
III. Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	11
Graduate Degree Programs	12
Institutional, Undergraduate and Graduate Learning Outcomes	16
Program Review – Assessment of Educational Objectives	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued

	Scholarship and Creative Activity	19
	Support for Student Learning	20
IV.	Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability	20
	Faculty Staffing – Sufficiency and Quality	20
	Faculty Academic Leadership and Development	22
	Sufficiency of Information Resources	22
	Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources	25
	Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes	26
V.	Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	27
	Commitment to Learning and Improvement	28
	Institutional Research	30
VI.	Report Summary and Major Recommendations	30
	Commendations	30
	Majors Recommendations from the Educational Effectiveness Review	32
	Conclusion	35

WASC EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW OF CETYS UNIVERSITY

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

History and Context of CETYS University

Founded in 1961 in Mexicali, capital of the State of Baja California, Mexico, CETYS (Center for Higher and Technical Education) University is a non-profit private institution operating under the auspices of the Northwest Educational Institute (IENAC). It operates three campuses: the original Mexicali campus, Tijuana (established in 1972) and Ensenada (established in 1975.) The founders were visionaries who sought to provide quality higher education with a focus on technical and professional education that would respond to the region's need for a highly trained workforce. The institution was a pioneer of new academic degrees in the region and counts among its alumni many persons in leadership and influential roles across Baja California.

The mission of CETYS and its educational objectives are widely posted throughout the campuses and on the web site at www.cetys.mx (Criteria 1.1). The mission is strongly values driven: to contribute in the development of the moral and intellectual capacity of individuals to participate in an important way in the economic, social, and cultural improvement of Mexico. (Source: Research Guiding Plan)

CETYS offers bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees on its three campuses; however, not all degrees are offered on all campuses. Recent CETYS data show the following degree enrollments for the three campuses:

CAMPUS	August 2007			
	HEAD COUNT ENROLLMENT			
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	TOTAL
Mexicali	1071	845	21	1937
Tijuana	946	514	9	1469
Ensenada	358	165	1	524
TOTAL	2375	1524	31	3930

Source: Headcount by Degree Objective, Data Table 2.1

DEGREES GRANTED 2006	ALL CAMPUSES
Undergraduate (Bachelor's)	240
Master's	90
Doctorate	3
TOTAL	

Source: Degrees Granted, Data Table 3.1

CETYS operates within Mexican federal and state education laws and regulations as a private (independent) institution of higher education. Official recognition is held by the Secretariat for Education and Social Welfare of Baja California, Mexico. Additionally, the institution is accredited by the Mexican Federation of Private Higher Education Institutions (FIMPES), the national accrediting agency for private universities and by specialized accrediting agencies in each of its program areas for which accreditation is available. The government of the State of Baja has recognized CETYS as an “institution of excellence.”

Mexico has a National Educational System that provides a great deal of control and oversight directly from the federal government for all levels of education. The Federal government dictates many of the standards for higher education, both public and private, including the number of hours required for each degree level. The actual degree at the end of the graduation process is officially awarded and validated by the government’s Public Education Department for private institutions. Passing the CENEVAL exam is a national option for all undergraduates in Mexico in order to obtain the right to the "titulacion" (corresponding degree); CETYS requires all students take the CENEVAL prior to graduation.

Educational opportunity and achievement in Mexico are historically limited compared to the USA. Historically Mexican higher education has not included research universities as we know them in the USA. The university system, however, predates Harvard University with the founding of the Royal Episcopal University of Mexico in 1551.

The Fifth Government Report for 2005 estimated total higher education enrollment of nearly 2.5 million students with over 4,800 institutions. The main categories are public institutions (such as the National Autonomous University of Mexico, the flagship university in Mexico, public autonomous universities which are state-based institutions analogous in some respects to the CSU campuses, and private universities. The public university and autonomous university systems enroll roughly 67% of all students. Twenty universities account for more than half of the total enrollment in higher education in Mexico.

The bachelor's degree in Mexico is more specialized than is commonly the case in the US and focuses primarily on professional education. Twenty-five degree areas make up more than 85% of all degrees awarded in Mexico ranging from law and several fields within engineering, to medicine, education, international business, and tourism.

Graduate education in Mexico has grown considerably in recent decades. However, professional and doctoral level training, especially research-oriented graduate programs, are comparatively uncommon. CETYS' Proposal Elements for New Doctoral Programs cites only 2.6% of professors have the doctoral degree in Mexico.

Earlier this decade the government estimated there were 260,000 faculty members across the nation. Advanced graduate and professional degrees, especially the doctorate, are relatively less common among Mexican faculty than is the norm in American colleges and universities. Increasing the number of faculty with advanced degrees is a significant national challenge – and a goal to which CETYS wants to contribute through its doctoral programs.

Attendance and graduation rates at institutions of higher education are of concern in Mexico as they are in the U.S. There is no analogous system to IPEDS as is used in the U.S. However, a several year old report issued by the federal government reported a 48% graduation rate for the bachelor's degree nationwide. CETYS retention figures are somewhat higher with an overall 6 year graduation rate of 62%: ranging from 62% on the Tijuana campus to 61% at Mexicali and 49% at Ensenada for the 2001 entering freshman classes (Revised Data Tables 3.2).

From materials provided the WASC Team on Mexican higher education system by CETYS and in conversation with members of the Board, alumni, students and staff, it is clear that higher education in Mexico serves two explicit purposes: First, to provide quality education for the individual with the requisite cognitive skills and knowledge base for a “professional life in continuous transformation” and second, equally stressed by all, is to provide an educated citizenry that will support “social responsibilities” and contribute to sustainable economic development for the nation. Increasing educational opportunities for all citizens and improving the ‘Terminal Efficiency rate’ (graduate rate) are major national goals for higher education.

Accreditation Status with WASC

CETYS University first approached WASC in 1988 to explore the possibility of being considered the first university in Mexico to receive WASC accreditation. When asked by both the CPR and EE Visiting Teams why CETYS is so committed to achieving WASC accreditation board

members, the president, senior administrators and faculty responded that first and foremost it is CETYS' goal to be the best institution of higher education in Mexico. They view the achievement of American institutional accreditation, and specifically WASC accreditation, as a clear indicator of high standards of achievement. Further, because public higher education in Mexico is essentially free, CETYS must compete for the best students, many of whom find the cost of a private university prohibitive. Being an institution of excellence and being perceived as such will enhance CETYS' prestige and competitiveness for the best students in Baja California.

The University submitted its Eligibility proposal to WASC in fall 2004. CETYS was notified of its eligibility to begin the process toward WASC candidacy and accreditation in March 2005 following review by the Panel of Eligibility Review Committee. The letter of notification commented that CETYS' goal of achieving WASC accreditation was challenging owing in part to areas of cultural and institutional differences in Mexican higher education practice from WASC and common US higher education standards. Among those areas were:

- Academic freedom
- Effectiveness of the governance structure
- Lack of a general education program typical of WASC accredited institutions
- Capacity to offer doctoral programs

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Team visit was held February 28 – March 2, 2007. The Report contained important commendations regarding CETYS University, noting that many areas of practice are exemplary:

- Its clearly articulated mission and educational philosophy that are well integrated and pervade the institution;
- An unusually focused and engaged Board of Trustees, including a local chapter board on each campus, both of which take seriously their governance and fund-raising roles in support of CETYS' mission and values;
- Strong financial status and management of resources in a conservative manner with the deliberate intent to assure the adequacy of resources to support the educational mission of CETYS;
- The passionate commitment of faculty, staff, students, alumni and board members to the institution and its values of student formation;

- The University’s culture of evidence-based decision-making and strategic planning in support of continual self-improvement, especially at the board and senior administrative levels.

In his May 2007 message to President Blancas de la Cruz, WASC President Ralph Wolff highlighted several areas from the CPR report “...that will need to be addressed in the Educational Effectiveness Review:”

- “The Team found that CETYS does not meet WASC expectations in its doctoral programs.” Elements needing to be addressed included the creation of a doctoral culture, faculty research and scholarship, faculty preparation and credentials, cohort size, and the lack of sufficient library resources;
- Strategic academic planning, especially for current and any future graduate programs, which includes consideration of the educational structure and rationale for all programs and alignment with needed faculty and other resources;
- Library resources, which were “...considered to be very basic and not adequate to meet WASC expectations at all degree levels, but especially in support of doctoral programs.”

The Team Report contained ten major recommendations, among which were:

- Enhancing, program evaluation and focus on learning outcomes; with “more of a focus on academic planning that utilized data and analysis more deeply” ;
- Professional qualifications of faculty and opportunities for advancement of full-time faculty;
- The need to invest substantially in its information resources;
- Improved utilization of institutional data, with a focus on student learning and success “including graduation and retention;”

Team Review Process and Organization of EE Report

In the Team’s view it is important to provide essential background regarding CETYS and the outcomes of both visits because the Commission is asked to act on the recommendation regarding CETYS’ readiness for moving to formal Candidacy for accreditation under WASC. Thus this report combines elements of the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report as well as Educational Effectiveness.

Prior to visiting CETYS University the Educational Effectiveness Review Report, Data Tables and the Institutional Portfolio were mailed to all Team members. The Team also had prior access to

the CETYS WASC website. A number of additional materials were provided during the course of the visit, including a detailed PowerPoint presentation on the Educational Model, Academic Reform and Student Learning Assessment.

During the Team conference call questions, issues, and concerns were discussed among the members, and the Chair provided guidance regarding the upcoming visit, logistics and schedule. Key issues to be addressed during the EE visit were discussed and additional background on CETYS' application for WASC accreditation was shared for the benefit of new team members.

Prior to the CPR visit CETYS translated a modest number of documents into English for the benefit of Team members. However, we discovered during the course of the visit that many materials we wished to review were available only in Spanish. While several Team members speak and read Spanish, this caused some difficulty in document review and understanding of the institution. Therefore, for the EE review CETYS expended considerable effort to have a wide range of materials translated into English. This was very helpful to the Team. Providing documents in English should continue to be the foundation for any future review as well.

Unlike the prior year when the CPR Team split its time among the three campuses, the Team spent its entire time on the Mexicali campus. During both visits, the Team met both as a group and individually with a broad range of constituents: the president, members of the board of directors, key senior administrators, deans, faculty and students. The EE team had the opportunity to meet with key faculty and staff from the Tijuana and Ensenada campuses who drove to Mexicali for the visit or via video conference. As had been the case during the CPR visit, everyone was open, cordial, and helpful in their discussions with members of the Team.

The Team Report is organized in sections consistent with the four WASC Standards. The report concludes with a Summary and Major Recommendations.

Quality of Educational Effectiveness Report and Alignment/Evidence

At the outset, CETYS chose to utilize the comprehensive approach to both of its reports. In his May 2006 letter to Ralph Wolff, President of WASC, President Enrique Blancas de la Cruz stated that the CETYS EE Report would “focus on the reinforcement of a culture of evidence, evidence of learning outcomes and the effectiveness of graduate programs.” The Educational Effectiveness Report utilized the four WASC Standards and criteria for review as guides. It is the Team's judgment that throughout the process, at both the Capacity and Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness phases, CETYS has remained actively committed to following WASC's philosophy

and processes in the course of learning to address “the depth of the institutional analysis that was required as part of the overall accreditation process and specifically for purposes of the Educational Effectiveness phase.” (CETYS EE Report, pg. 1) Indeed, the focused work undertaken by CETYS to address WASC standards and to utilize the experience as an opportunity for institutional self-improvement is exemplary.

CETYS Response to Capacity and Preparatory Report and Recommendations

Shortly after receipt of the CPR Report, CETYS organized to discuss and analyze recommendations made in the Team Report and to prepare for the Educational Effectiveness Review. Because the four working groups (one for each WASC Standard), had proven effective and productive for the CPR preparations, this organizational structure was also utilized for the EE preparation phase. In all, over 40 individuals participated actively as members of these working groups. At the outset, the President appointed a coordinator for the entire effort, Ms. Laura Carillo de Anda, whose full-time focus for the past several years has been leading the WASC Candidacy preparation efforts.

One of the first efforts following receipt of the CPR Report was the thorough discussion and analysis of each of the recommendations made in Ralph Wolff’s letter and the Team Report. CETYS has displayed a fierceness of purpose throughout the CPR and EE preparation stages. Not only has the institution organized internally with broad participation across all constituencies, but it has also availed itself of opportunities to send teams to WASC workshops on assessment and other topics, and brought leading consultants on learning outcomes assessment, libraries and the use of educational technologies to the campus to better educate the faculty and administration regarding best practices in these areas. The Team was impressed with these extended efforts taken by CETYS to educate the institution regarding key areas of educational performance expected of WASC accredited institutions and the unusual quickness of response in key areas, such as learning outcomes assessment and improved library resources, discussed in more detail later in this report.

EVALUATION OF CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

Standard I. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

CETYS University has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes and values (CFR 1.1, 1.2). The congruence between mission and core values and all the university does was remarkable to both the CPR and EE Visiting Teams. Core values are reflected, often explicitly, in everything from individual course syllabi through program educational objectives and operational procedures. The Board has periodically reviewed and reaffirmed the mission, vision, and values of CETYS. All team members found evidence of this in nearly every conversation held with members of the CETYS community.

CFR 1.3 Leadership—Performance, Responsibility and Accountability

CETYS University operates as a multi-campus system headed by the president at the Mexicali campus. The Team was impressed during both visits by the significant leadership the president has provided throughout CETYS' process of seeking WASC accreditation. His commitment has been unwavering.

The position of Vice President for Academic Affairs was created over a year ago, signaling an important restructuring to give management and planning for academic affairs more focus and strength. The impact of this leadership change is beginning to be evidenced in stronger academic coordination and planning across the colleges and campuses.

The CETYS governing board is comprised of business leaders from the region. Team members met with board leadership during both visits and were impressed by their clear focus on the long-term growth and development of the institution. The CETYS Board and administrative management have a clear structure for the financial planning, budget development, and financial management of the University system. The Team saw consistent evidence of board leadership in policy development, long term planning goals and regularized monitoring of the administration of the financial activities of the system as a whole, as well as on the individual campuses.

Commitment to Academic Freedom

As CETYS noted in its CPR Report, the concept of academic freedom (CFR 1.4) differs in Mexico from that observed in American institutions of higher education. Nevertheless, the

University has a policy on academic freedom published in its Faculty Handbook which is consistent with its philosophical and ideological values. Through discussions with faculty and students during the CPR Review the Team received confirmation that CETYS promotes open academic discourse and exploration, within the context of the University's strong values orientation.

Institutional Response to Diversity

While there are clear differences in the social environment between Mexico and the United States such that the concept and values of diversity as addressed by CFR 1.5 do not apply in the same manner, CETYS' humanistic values which stress personal responsibility as well as tolerance and respect for differences among persons are consistent with the fundamental notion of respect for diversity. There is gender parity in enrollment and all programs are open to qualified students irrespective of race, religion, or socio-economic status. The university makes a concerted effort to identify talented low income students and recruits them with financial aid. Approximately 70% of the student body receives some form of financial aid provided by the university, either scholarships or loans.

Academic Goals, Programs, and Services

The CPR Team was provided with numerous examples of published materials describing academic programs, institutional mission, and values which are available to prospective and current students (CFR 1.7). Each degree program has clearly established course requirements that are presented to all students. Undergraduate programs of study are scheduled with sufficient flexibility to allow students to complete degree requirements in four - five years. CETYS' faculty members monitor student retention, often reaching out on a personal basis to encourage students to continue or return to their studies. Academic program services, including coordination of the nationally-mandated 500 hours of Community Service for each undergraduate, are managed through the academic programs. CETYS goes beyond this to require an additional 400 hours of Professional Service connected directly to the major. The university has admission, registrar, financial aid and other functions as would normally be found in U.S. institutions of higher education. As is typical in Mexico, none of the three campuses is residential.

Integrity in Operations, Policies, Business Practices (CFR 1.8)

Throughout the CPR visit, the Team observed evidence of policies and sound business practices in place that are followed effectively and consistently. The following examples were particularly notable:

- Board policies and actions provide strategic direction aligned with institutional objectives.
- The Board Planning Committee regularly monitors a Balanced Scorecard of key indicators that includes the number of students enrolled by campus and program, faculty teaching load, satisfaction of students, alumni and employers and financial aid awarded. This same Scorecard is incorporated at the program level to inform performance and guide priorities for the annual work plan.
- The financial affairs of CETYS are managed consistently throughout the system, under the direction of the Vice President of Administration, with the assistance of well-qualified and experienced financial directors on each campus. The budget development process is clearly defined, responsive to institutional goals, and is reviewed and approved by the Board.
- An independent audit of the University's Financial Statements is conducted annually.
- Funds developed for restricted purposes are accounted for and used for their restricted purposes. Such funds are designated primarily for scholarships and infrastructure.

CETYS used its preparation activities for the Educational Effectiveness Review as an opportunity to focus on its educational objectives and, in particular, to enhance its indicators and evidence that desired levels of achievement are being attained (CFR 1.2). This is an institution that has for years worked to assure itself of the educational achievements of its graduates through the requirement that all students take the national CENEVAL examination and constant interaction with local employers to assure that graduates have the skills necessary to support local industries. The EE Review process, however, provided an opportunity to move beyond these efforts. The self-study noted that a

. . . challenge for the institution is the systematization of learning assessment, integration of the faculty responsible for this area, and incorporating these actions in the annual plan of learning assessment, which is set to begin the first semester of 2008. Only through continuous evaluation of the different academic programs, as well as of the impact of alumni in the community, will the efficacy of the institution's effort be proven (pg. 9).

CETYS is an institution driven by data-gathering and utilization of evidence to assure itself of appropriate operations as well as quality educational outcomes. It was clear to the Visiting Team

that it had used both WASC reviews to renew and sustain its commitments and efforts in this regard.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

CFRs 2.1 and 2.2 address in part, the appropriate content, standards and nomenclature for the degree level awarded. Through review of course syllabi and published materials regarding undergraduate and graduate degree programs during the CPR visit, the Team was assured that this expectation is met for the bachelor's and master's degrees. Because rigorous governmental review and approval is required of all courses of study and degree requirements, it was the Team's perception that core learning abilities and competencies are required of all degree programs (CFR 2.7). The EE Report noted that while CETYS students generally score above the national average on the CENEVAL exam, there are some academic programs in which students do not have such favorable results. An assessment is underway.

The General Education component of the undergraduate curriculum differs in practice from that commonly found in US colleges and universities, in large part because 'preparatoria' (secondary) education is considered to provide students with the breadth of general education before advancing to the university where one focuses on professional education. At CETYS, the areas of critical thinking, oral and written communications, values education (central to the CETYS mission) and disciplinary breadth are imbedded in courses in the major fields.

Bachelor's degree programs are offered in three selective areas: engineering, business administration and humanities and social sciences. CETYS academic programs seem to conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards (Criteria 2.1). Degree programs have clear course and unit expectations for all students (CFR 2.1, 2.2). All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by CETYS are clearly defined in terms of entry-level and graduation requirements (CFR 2.7). Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the majors (Criteria 2.2). CETYS programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved as evidenced by class syllabus and curricula coordination (Criteria 2.5).

Recent changes in academic administration, with the creation of deans for each of the colleges as well as a graduate dean, have streamlined the organizational structural but more

importantly from an academic standpoint, facilitates intellectual exchanges, especially between 'licenciatura' (bachelor's) and master's students and faculty.

Additionally, an impressive program of curricular development managers (CDM's) and Subject Matter Experts (SME) began in 2004 has been implemented for undergraduate programs. The purpose is to review and redesign (as necessary) all courses in the degree programs. Learning objectives, institutional values, course requirements and materials are clearly delineated (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.6). Syllabi for each course are developed in relation to overall institutional goals and values, program goals, and course learning objectives. Each syllabus also reflects how the pedagogy to be used in and out of class assignments is connected to the learning outcomes for the unit and the course. This process provides a notable level of instructional quality control.

Since the CPR visit the Graduate College has undertaken curricular review and has modified some master's degree programs as well.

Graduate Degree Programs

As noted, a major focus of the Educational Effectiveness Review was on graduate education, most particularly doctoral education. Major concerns raised in the CPR report were:

- The need to develop a graduate culture, in particular, a doctoral culture to support graduate student learning and research;
- Academic planning, for current and potential new graduate programs, that considers the rationale and alignment with all needed resources;
- Sufficient and appropriate institutional resources that includes qualified faculty and library/learning resources to support graduate education, specifically at the doctoral level;
- Lack of evidence available at the time of the CPR visit of the coherence, appropriateness and rigor of the courses offered at the graduate level;

In response to these concerns, CETYS devoted considerable effort during its EE Review preparations and in the report on graduate education. Course syllabi for graduate courses at both the master's and doctoral level were provided the EE Team in English. Team members met with representative students and faculty from all graduate programs and probed the scope of graduate studies, rigor of courses, research expectations, qualifications of faculty and availability of appropriate graduate-level learning resources.

The CPR Report stated CETY's "graduate educational model has a professional performance and training focus [with] emphasis placed on application and professional practice, rather than on the creation and training of students for basic research careers." (pg. 7) As of December 2007 CETYS enrolled 1524 graduate students (Summary Data form). Graduate academic programs are offered in four main areas: business management (with 12 concentration areas), engineering (with 11 concentration areas), education (with 4 concentration areas) and psychology (with 5 concentration areas). CETYS noted that due to government regulations in master's programs, the number of concentrations seems quite large. However, not all concentration areas are currently offered; student demand and the availability of appropriate faculty determine when concentrations are made available.

The masters' degree in psychology requires 16 courses of which eight are part of the common core requirement (there are five sub-area concentrations). The EE Team notes that the total number of courses far exceeds U.S. University requirements for the M.S. degree, even in program with a non-thesis option. In the U.S. context a similar program would require 12-14 courses. At the time of the next review of this program, the number of courses required for the degree should be evaluated in relation to Mexican, US and other countries' standards. At the same time, consideration might be given to adding a course in inferential statistics. Such a course is a common requirement for doctoral programs in the U.S., should students wish to enroll in an American program after completion of the CETYS masters.

The engineering program offers seven possible foci at the undergraduate level in addition to the master's in engineering. All programs are designed to be responsive to the needs of local industry. A review of the curriculum and learning outcomes which are under development for graduate programs, provided evidence that the engineering programs are appropriate in content and scope.

The university is encouraged to plan more strategically for its engineering programs, both to envision the likely future needs of the growing high technology businesses in the area and the expected movement of those businesses beyond manufacturing towards design and development. An advisory board for engineering would be helpful in gaining input from area industries. CETYS could capitalize on the fact that almost all of the M.S. students conduct industrial projects with nearby high technology industries that could lead to expanded opportunities for faculty scholarly research and applied research to the benefit of both faculty and students.

Programs in business seem to be evolving. For example, the doctoral program once titled DBA (doctorate in business administration and development) it is now the DA (doctorate in administration). Similarly core faculty report that their MBA (master of business administration) is probably a misnomer and they refer to it as an MAO (master in organizational management).

CETYS offers four master's degrees in education, three of which are relatively new: The original program in Education, and a new program in Education with 3 emphasis: Special Education, Organizational Development and Culture of Legality. The same rigorous standards of curriculum and course development have been applied to these programs. Learning outcomes are now being articulated and metrics defined. Owing to its commitment to help improve the quality of teaching in Baja California schools, CETYS offers these programs at half tuition to entice students to enroll in the program.

Currently two doctoral degrees are active: Doctor of Administration (business) and Education and Values (EE Report, pgs. 20, 21).

Doctor of Administration

The Proposal Element for the Doctoral Program in Administration (business) states that the degree is designed to promote the development of professionals and scholars who are working in the private sector, government, and academia to become scholars with the necessary research skills and tools to “confront opportunities and challenges of the 21st century” The program began in 1998. Currently there is one active cohort with 28 students enrolled. To date, five students have completed the doctoral degree.

CETYS seems to value and attempts to promote scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, as well as creative activity. However, the institution's level of understanding and promotion of scholarly activities seem limited as evidenced by the business doctoral dissertations that were reviewed (Criteria 2.8, and 2.9). These dissertations clearly demonstrated weaknesses in that most of them did not meet normal expectations in the following areas: APA writing style, critical review of the literature, research methodology, and the results and limitations of the study. Authors seem to lack understanding of research methodology (sample selection, instrument design, validity and reliability). There also seems to be some confusion as to when qualitative and quantitative methods are appropriate. They don't recognize the need to let the research questions guide the methodology that should be used. Once a research method is selected dissertation authors do not seem to understand sample selection or the consequences of that process on validity and the generalizability of the results. Also, some dissertation authors did not include details of the

following: sample selection, instrument design, validation process, or the rate of responses included in the research. Given the weak methodology section of most of the business dissertations, it follows that there was also a weakly supported conclusion, and a lack of a section that explores the limitations of the study.

Currently, CETYS has redesigned the curriculum with regard to research classes and they are being taught by graduates of U.S. doctoral programs. It is possible that these research classes will provide doctoral candidates with the necessary skills to strengthen the research methodology of their dissertations. Further, it is also possible that the new research instructors will guide the dissertation process in a manner that is consistent with WASC standards (Criteria 2.8 and 2.9)

Doctorate in Education and Values

In response to a perceived need to address national concerns regarding values in education and promotion of the culture of law and civility in Mexico, in January 2006, CETYS inaugurated a doctoral program in Education and Values in conjunction with internationally recognized leaders in the field from two Spanish universities. The program has three curricular objectives (Doctoral Program on Education and Values, October 2007):

1. To train education specialists who are capable of designing, developing, applying and evaluating projects in the field of values;
2. To educate graduate students with the needed skills and ability to design research projects in the field of values, using appropriate quantitative and qualitative methodologies;
3. To contribute to the cultural transformation of the region starting with the formal and systematic study of education and environmental values.

The first cohort of 18 students (originally 23) is nearing the end of its coursework and students are beginning the process of defining dissertation topics. Those interviewed were articulate and passionate about the value of the course of study and its significance to them personally and professionally as well as in terms of what they will be able to contribute to society upon completion of the degree.

While the students that were interviewed and the director of the program indicated that the Spanish faculty members are recognized for their research and publication in the field and as well as being strong teachers, the Visiting Team expressed several concerns regarding the program. First, CETYS is entirely reliant on the eight faculty members from Spain to provide the bulk of the course of study. Only three Mexican faculty members, one from CETYS, contribute to the academic program. Over time, how sustainable is this program model that is reliant on bringing faculty from

Spain and sending students to Spain for two extended summer courses? While applauding CETYS' commitment to introducing doctoral education in this area of national and regional need, the Team advises CETYS to consider in its academic planning the development of resources and capacity to support the program pedagogically through its own or more regional faculty to a greater degree than is now possible (CFR 3.1, 3.2).

Students spoke of how helpful faculty have been in providing materials – articles, books and other publications – needed for their studies. The Team again reiterates its recommendation that CETYS ensure that needed resource and research materials for this and other doctoral programs are available from its own library.

Because no students have reached the dissertation/project phase, the Team was not able to review the culminating paper for the Doctorate in Education and Values. While students interviewed indicated that research and writing expectations have been rigorous in all their coursework, the Team did not review any materials and is thus unable to verify this expectation (CFRs 2.1 – 2.5).

The Team also expresses concern that, as planned, doctoral students will have a single advisor for the dissertation/project. As explained by the students, there will be only one advisor working with each student, not a committee of several faculty members, as is common in U.S. universities. It is not uncommon in the U.S. to utilize outside faculty who have expertise in a student's topic area but are not part of the institution's own faculty, to serve on dissertation committees. We recommend consideration of adding faculty – perhaps from U.S. universities – to the dissertation advisement committee. This could be an important quality-control mechanism for both the students and provide students with more breadth of background and expertise during the dissertation/project writing phase.

While CETYS has historically offered a doctoral program in psychology, there is no active program at the moment and none is anticipated. It is the Visiting Team's understanding, that consideration is being given to either redesign the Doctor of Administration degree with new areas of emphasis, or to suspend the program while a new program is being developed. Should Candidacy be granted, CETYS understands that any new doctoral programs, including a redesigned Doctoral of Administration will require going through the Substantive Change process for approval.

Institutional Undergraduate and Graduate Learning Outcomes (CFR 2.4)

CETYS has taken seriously WASC standards regarding learning assessment. The EE Report (pg. 3) notes that:

Changes in the organizational structure of CETYS University such as appointing a new Academic Vice-president, as well as a restructuring under a scheme of schools and colleges, are facilitating the institutional incorporation of a learning assessment culture.

From all the evidence available to the Visiting Team, CETYS seems to have begun using indicators and sources of evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives (Criteria 2.4). The institution has a long history of working with employers and collecting survey data regarding alumni qualifications in the work force.

A Learning Assessment Generic Model was developed in the summer 2007 by the Director of Planning and Academic Effectiveness. The outcome of work by faculty led to the definition of four Institutional Learning Outcomes applicable to all academic programs (EE Report, pg. 15; Results on Learning Outcomes, September 2007, pgs. 3-4). In addition, CETYS continued its institutional education regarding learning outcomes assessment by bringing a noted expert in the field to campus in January 2008 to conduct a workshop for faculty. There are plans for her to return in the fall.

The faculty has continued to identify and map learning outcomes within each academic program. The Team reviewed course syllabi that clearly designate the inclusion of institutional learning objectives and how they are developed through course requirements. It is indicated that data sources will include courses (curricular mapping), course work, final projects and applied research projects (where applicable). Through their interviews with faculty and review of materials, EE Team members verified that program metrics and rubrics are either in place or under development for all programs. The process for assessment is well defined and includes feedback cycles for program improvement, stakeholder involvement in refining learning outcomes, and periodic review of educational objectives. Plans are fully engaged to implement systematic gathering of evidence of learning with concomitant organization and analysis of that evidence to close the assessment loop. There is a clear commitment to resources, by way of staffing, training and institutional education, to developing an institutional culture of evidence. Beyond learning objectives identified in each standardized syllabus as part of the 2004 Academic Reform and the development of the core institutional learning outcomes, the program-specific list of outcomes for the schools seems to be in the emerging or developed stage. Assessable outcomes seem to be at the emerging state. Alignment and curricular mapping is developed across all undergraduate and graduate programs.

Student understanding of desirable program outcomes seems to be in the developing stage. Program outcomes are included in most syllabi and are readily available on the web and on Black-Board (Criteria 2.5).

Assessment planning is at the emerging/developed state; CETYS is in the process of defining specific educational outcomes for all programs but there are as yet no outcomes data available for review.

Program Review – Assessment of Educational Objectives (CFR 2.7)

CETYS employs a sophisticated Educational Model which is grounded in its Mission and linked to its educational philosophy, pedagogical principles, a “Formation Framework” and curriculum design. (Educational Model, Academic Reform and Student Learning Assessment, March 2008). The EE Team found the coherence of the model, with its thorough linkage to all areas of the academic program, to be impressive. The faculty is well versed in the model and its articulation from academic program planning and curricular design through the orientation of faculty to the institution and student learning outcomes.

The Mexican government requires all programs to be reviewed and re-submitted for recertification purposes every 4 years and CETYS uses that requirement as an opportunity to review its educational objectives and academic programs. (EE Report pg. 12) A comprehensive program of Academic Reform was instituted at the undergraduate level in 2004; since that time over 150 faculty members have been actively involved in reviewing learning objectives and redesigning nearly 250 courses across the curriculum (Report of Redesigned Programs and Participating Faculty, 2007). The goals of the reform effort are to ensure currency of material, pertinence of the course of study and sustainability of the program. CETYS is also in the process of developing learning outcomes for all programs and incorporating them into the overall Reform process. While the Academic Reform process is a notable achievement, the process of academic program review is presently internal, undertaken by faculty in the program working under the leadership of the college deans and VP for Academic Affairs. Some aspects of the traditional model of academic program review followed by U.S. colleges and universities, such as analyzing the sufficiency and qualifications of faculty, learning resources and institutional support are not practiced as part of program review at CETYS. A self-study is not prepared, nor is there a practice of bringing outside faculty in the field to participate in the program review. The EE Team recommends that CETYS inform itself of

standard program review practices in U.S. universities and consider adopting some of the methodology in addition to its own rigorous Academic Reform process. (CFR 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

It was apparent to both the CPR and EE Visiting Teams that CETYS seems to value and attempts to promote scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity. Ample evidence was presented during the CPR visit of a well-coordinated effort to promote linkages with industry and the community in order to enhance student learning.

Faculty members encourage students to write papers in widely acceptable formats (such as the IEEE and APA formats) and present them at local or international conferences. In some cases CETYS supports student travel. For example, a group of engineering students went to Japan. This also helps the students improve their English language and presentation skills.

CETYS seems to have identified the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences, and levels of satisfaction as evidenced by modifying the curriculum at the undergraduate level to offer three math classes versus two (2004) and by modifying the curriculum at the graduate level by offering a sequence of three dissertation classes and summer seminars in research to improve the lack of research skills at the doctoral level prior to 2007 (Criteria 2.10 and 2.11). However, as noted in earlier regarding the doctorate in business, the institution's level of understanding and promotion of scholarly activities seem limited as evidenced by the doctoral dissertations that were reviewed (Criteria 2.8, and 2.9).

While faculty members are encouraged to pursue their own scholarship, there is not a strong culture of doing so across the institution. Professional development is encouraged and supported, but CETYS would do well to encourage its faculty to take greater advantage of close ties with local industry which could conceivably provide greater opportunities, especially for applied research in such fields as business and engineering.

Assessment of Student Needs, Satisfaction (CFR 2.10)

CETYS is unusual when compared to an institution in the U.S. since it has substantial evidence of externally validated evidence of the success of its graduates. The CPR Report noted that results of the external exam (CENEVAL), students' feedback, surveys of alumni, and reports from employers and professional practice coordinators are all good vehicles used by the institution to assess students' needs and level of satisfaction.

Students and alumni are often a university's best advertisement. Both Visiting Teams found this to be true at CETYS University. Students with whom Team members met in group sessions were very engaged, positive about the university and proud of their education. They clearly have a good relationship with the faculty whom they consider accessible and concerned. Students observed in the classroom were very engaged, had a lot of dynamic exchange with faculty, and were very focused on the teacher.

The University relies on a number of satisfaction surveys, including those of current students, alumni, and employers, to provide indicators of satisfaction with the educational process and outcomes. Students complete evaluations at the end of each course. Both students and faculty attested to the University's reliance on feedback and evaluation as tools for course and institutional improvement.

Support for Student Learning (CFRs 2.10 – 2.14)

CETYS presented substantial evidence in addressing support for student learning. Co-curricular activities are highly congruent with CETY's academic goals and support students' professional and personal development (CFR 2.11) and include student "congresses," which are organized periodically with the participation of students from various majors; research projects (sponsored by companies, such as Honeywell and Samsung), which are conducted by faculty and student teams; and a contest sponsored by Microsoft. Centers to support student learning exist on each campus. These centers provide mandatory orientation for new students, orientation for parents, vocational guidance, and learning strategies. Students at risk are referred to the centers to attend workshops on learning skills.

Many students commented of both the full-time and part-time faculty members' commitment to students. There are mechanisms in place to monitor academic achievement and to assist students who are in trouble to receive tutoring, counseling and help with study skills.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Faculty Staffing – Sufficiency and Quality (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

CETYS relies heavily on part-time faculty to complement a relatively small number of core full-time faculty members. CETYS data for 2007 indicate that full-time faculty on the three campuses

comprise between 36% of the total number of undergraduate and 40% of graduate faculty. At the national level FIMPES asks for a 33% benchmark (Data Table 4.1). Plan CETYS 2010 identifies the need to increase the number of full-time faculty in order to support specialty areas in the curriculum (EE Report, pg. 27).

As of fall 2007, 50% of undergraduate faculty held the master's degree, with the remainder holding the bachelor's; 33% of faculty teaching at the master's level hold the doctorate, with the remainder holding the master's; all faculty teaching at the doctoral level have the doctoral degree (EE Report p. 28). The percentage of faculty holding advanced degrees appears to have improved since the CPR Visit and the VP for Academic Affairs has a goal of continuing to increase the number of faculty members with advanced degrees. The CPR Visiting Team expressed a concern regarding whether there is a sufficient number of coherent core faculty for each program who are setting the intellectual climate and direction. The EE Visiting Team concurs and supports CETYS' ongoing efforts to hire and retain faculty with appropriate graduate degrees.

CETYS seems to have an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds in business (Criteria 3.1 and 2). However, at this time they have only three full-time faculty members, one at the undergraduate and two at the graduate level (Criteria 3.3) who also act as program coordinators. CETYS business graduate programs do not employ at least one full-time faculty member each for the MBA and the DA. (Criteria 2.2).

Thus, faculty seem to have multiple responsibilities and while they seem supported in their development activities (study of doctoral degrees, workshop and seminar attendance) designed to improve teaching and learning, they don't seem to have enough time to conduct research or mentor students (Criteria 3.4).

Most of the engineering faculty members have ties to CETYS via their own undergraduate educations. The allegiance and enthusiasm create an impressive dedication to the university and its students. However, a more diverse faculty would be helpful in strengthening the engineering programs as well as the university overall by bringing a broader range of experiences, practices, and perspectives. As a result, effort should be made to recruit a more diverse faculty.

Team members' review of the documents provided regarding the academic qualifications of graduate faculty revealed that existing faculty possess adequate academic credentials to provide instruction at the graduate level, especially when compared to other Mexican universities. Twenty six of the 55 CETYS graduate faculty hold a doctoral degree, and only two were granted by CETYS.

However, this impressive proportion of external degrees is not present among the 29 masters level graduate faculty. Most of them hold CETYS degrees. While recognizing the challenges in attracting faculty with degrees from other institutions, the Team reiterates its encouragement to CETYS to seek to diversify its faculty by hiring members from differing backgrounds to the degree possible.

Faculty Academic Leadership and Development (CPR 3.2 – 3.4)

Teaching and learning centers exist to support faculty. New faculty members receive an introduction to university life. Regular workshops on pedagogy are routinely offered to all faculty members. Additionally, guest speakers from U.S. and Canadian universities are invited. Faculty members also can take a certificate in “learning based education” through CETYS which counts towards their evaluations (EE Report, pgs. 21-22).

Faculty members in engineering are strongly encouraged and, in fact, do participate in professional society meetings. Some are supported for advanced degrees. There are additional opportunities that could easily be seized and would provide opportunities to strengthen the scholarly aspects of faculty activity. First, curricular innovation is clearly taking place and would provide opportunities for the faculty members involved to present and publish their work in the various forums focused on engineering education. Second, almost all of the Masters of Science students conduct industrial projects primarily with nearby high technology industries. Many of these projects could be brought into alignment with the faculty scholarly interests and would provide bases for continued applied research and its presentation and publishing at conferences.

The Team would encourage CETYS to support more faculty development activities for all faculty members by way of attendance at academic conferences as well as presentations of scholarly and applied work.

Sufficiency of Information Resources (CFRs 3.5 – 3.7)

The recurring theme throughout the CETYS reports and subsequent visits was one that demonstrated a unified dedicated purpose held by CETYS faculty, staff, and board to achieve the goals of academic excellence and social responsibility created and maintained by an institution which states the need to establish a tradition in which alumni respond as authentic leaders in community welfare in the areas of engineering, education, business, and government. The integral role of information literacy, research, and the library in the successful achievement of these institutional goals was also identified, reviewed, and affirmed (EER, p. 30).

Of major import is the need for a multilayered culture of research which is crucial to these goals and must be established and nurtured so that faculty and students can have adequate support for the growth of these academic and social endeavors which lead to true learning and scholarship. As noted, the Mexican tradition and history of public and academic libraries differs from that found in the United States, so the creation of a new culture of research – based in part on sufficient and appropriate information resources -- will be no small feat. This fact must be taken into account as recommendations and plans are made and implemented. The purposeful determination demonstrated to date by CETYS will again serve the institution well as it feels its way in this area. But, CETYS will do well to study the existing research cultures in academic environments in the other countries in which they already have alliances.

Following the EE on-site visit, it is apparent that CETYS continues along its long held path of forward movement as evidenced, in part, by the thorough and focused development of the strategic plan for its libraries which addresses current and future needs, including the anticipated growth in depth and breadth of the academic program. The strategic planning report, Sistema CETYS Universidad Plan Estratégico del Centro de Información 2007-2010, carefully reviews the three campus information centers as a group and as individual operations with shared and unique needs and responses. While the Plan Estratégico has not yet been approved by the Board of Trustees, there is a good deal of confidence in the plan because of its congruence with the academic program.

An additional, connected theme in all documentation and in on-site meetings across the university is to add depth and quality to the curriculum through increased oversight and development of research skills in individual courses as demonstrated by the academic reform work of the Curriculum Development Managers (EE Report, p. 12). The recent revisions of syllabi seem to systematically contain research and information literacy opportunities at all levels of coursework. The assessment and evaluation components that are becoming standardized pieces of the learning outcomes of each course provide appropriate opportunities to introduce, develop, and sustain the cohesion of course content, thinking (critical, analytical, and creative), and research.

The strategic plan also responds to a report by a professional, academic librarian from UCLA (Parker), who made an independent visit for the purpose of review and evaluation. Parker further addresses the connection between the library and research skills and the current and future curriculum. While all academic areas are connected to information literacy, the major areas of focus in the WASC report directly related to libraries and research skills are found in Standards 2 and 3,

particularly in relation to the areas of facilities, access, collection, and professional education and training and development of personnel.

The WASC CPR report contains a finding that the library collection consisted largely of textbooks as required by Mexican law. The response in the Plan Estratégico carefully applies the standards from the Association of College and Research Libraries in a review of the current collections and projects the growth needed to adequately support undergraduate and graduate programs. A goal of 85,000-100,000 volumes has been identified in order to provide basic support and a richer array of resources for current academic programs at the three campuses. Regular and consistent augmentations to the information resources budget must be factored into each annual budget (Parker, p. 8). Additional support in the form of media collections and online databases with full-text access to resources that specialize in content in the graduate programs would also be required to provide the necessary depth and breadth. The current practice of consortial access to databases should continue as a means of attaining fiscal and educational efficiencies. The amount of resources that would be required to meet these goals would be substantial. However, adequate, regular progress could be attained annually as a demonstration of institutional commitment to stated academic goals. Growth and development in academic programs and faculty development require parallel growth in information resource collections and access.

The increased physical collection will also require adequate shelving and facilities for use. This may in time require the expansion or re-conceptualization of the current physical facilities. The Team noted that ground had been broken recently on a new library facility for the Ensenada campus, an indication of CETYS' commitment to expanded support for library resources.

Standard 3, CFRs 3.1 – 3.3 provide criteria pertaining to personnel, including professional preparation and number. The WASC CPR report (p. 22) identified the lack of professional training or credentials of all the librarians' at all three campuses. Currently none of the staff members who hold the position of librarian possesses the American requirement of a graduate degree in Library Science. The Plan Estratégico calls for annual staff development programs for each area. CETYS is to be commended for providing support for librarians to achieve professional training: One of the librarians has been accepted into a library science graduate program at the University of Arizona and, upon completion, another librarian plans to follow. The added professionalism that will come as a result of obtaining appropriate credentials will increase expertise as well as provide the rationale to include the library and information literacy as a valued and earned contribution to academic planning discussions. In addition, the improved professionalism would facilitate greater

collaboration with teaching and learning centers (Parker, p. 24). It is logical to promote parallel improvement for both classroom faculty and librarians so that they will be enabled to work together in a partnership that springs from their increased content and teaching abilities.

CETYS should continue to take advantage of readily available professional expertise, such as that provided by its consultant, San Diego State University, and Alliant University as a means to add needed expertise and experience for future development. The anticipated reorganization and planning process that will unify such functions as online catalog access, acquisitions, cataloging, physical processing of materials, and others, are part of the Plan Estratégico. Significant progress has been made on the development of a new campus portal by the MIS unit. This portal will facilitate a number of academic and administrative functions and will be used by the libraries to provide easier access to online resources and make connections with course content and activities. This increased and more obvious Library presence should be exploited fully for its information literacy value as noted in the “Engagement of Faculty with Information Resources” (p. 26) of the WASC CPR report.

The current orientation program for all new students and faculty (p. 27; EER, p. 14) is a laudable beginning that should be systematically expanded throughout academic program planning and implementation. The inclusion of basic and advanced research skills as a measurable learning outcome across the curriculum will not only assist in the reinforcement and application of course content but will provide students with lifelong learning skills that will serve them well if they are to continue as leaders in their fields of endeavors. The presence and confident demonstration of competence in the use of a full range of analytical, critical, and creative thinking skills, which are fundamental to research, will positively contribute to the establishment and development of the culture of research for both students and faculty and the viability of an academic program in today’s global economy.

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources (CFRs 3.5 – 3.7)

The review of the financial statements and interviews with Board members, financial administrators and the independent auditors provided consistent evidence that CETYS is successfully managing its resources in a conservative manner with the deliberate intent to assure the adequacy of resources to support the educational mission of CETYS.

Physical resources on all three campuses appear well maintained and adequate to support current educational objectives. Classrooms and laboratory facilities are quite good. Computer

laboratories are well-equipped, well maintained, and comfortable. Teaching laboratories are well-maintained and appear to be receiving excellent new equipment. Campus plans have been developed for new construction and renovation. Ground-breaking for a new library facility was held at the Ensenada campus in February 2008. Other library facilities needs had been addressed earlier. The commitment and success of system and chapter boards in the acquisition of funds to support these needs is exemplary.

Organization Structure and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.8 – 3.11)

CETYS University operates with a highly structured organizational culture designed to support all aspects of institutional operations, from the governance and oversight functions of the Board and leadership of the Office of the President, through the newly revised organizational structure which now includes a Vice President of Academic Affairs (CPRs 3.8 – 3.11). The Team was provided with numerous documents in translation verifying the legal status, organizational structures and institutional by-laws.

CETYS has an organization chart that clearly depicts positions, associated responsibilities, and lines of authority (Criteria 3.8). As noted, it has an independent governing board consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority (Criteria 3.9) and a chief executive whose full time responsibility is to the institution (Criteria 3.10) However, it does not appear that the CETYS faculty exercises the same level of academic leadership or act consistently to ensure both academic quality and maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character (Criteria 3.11) as would be expected of a U.S. institution. Given the nature of the Mexican culture and that the majority of the faculty members are adjuncts or part time instructors, this might be expected. Nevertheless, CETYS as an organization seems to incorporate all segments into its processes of operation and governance.

The University operates as a multi-campus institution, supported by the president's staff at the system-wide level from the Mexicali campus and by a Director on each campus. It has the major administrative functions that exist in American universities, including Director of Planning and Academic Effectiveness, Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of Information Technology, Director of Institutional Advancement, Vice President of Administrative Affairs and directors of each campus. A Director of Research was recently hired as well to help enhance research opportunities for faculty and students and explore the possibility of developing research centers, perhaps in collaboration with US universities. While there is no Dean of student life, there

is a Director of Educational Services who oversees such functions as Registrar, educational counseling and provides support for some student activities.

As part of its effort to enhance its academic programs, CETYS has reorganized its academic governance. There is a recently appointed Vice President for Academic Affairs to whom the four Deans of the Colleges (Graduate Programs, Business, Engineering, and Psychology). The Dean of Graduate Programs was also recently appointed. The directors of each academic program on the campuses report to the respective Dean. Academic planning and integration of all academic programs is intended to be strengthened through this system-wide academic governance structure. The roles and working relationships among and between key administrative officers in the system-wide office and on the campuses as well as between administration and faculty appears to be clear to all.

CETYS has a well-developed process for the development and management of the annual budget. The Team believes the process for management of expenditures in accordance with the approved budget, appears to be clear and consistently followed throughout the organization.

Curriculum development for all programs appears to be responsive to local industry needs. An example was the creation of an aerospace engineering concentration within mechanical engineering on a very short timeline in connection with the establishment of a division of a major aerospace manufacturer. The Engineering College would be well served to implement a more strategic planning process both to envision the likely future needs of the growing high technology businesses in the area and the expected movement of those businesses beyond manufacturing towards design and development. An advisory board for engineering – as well as other programs -- would be helpful in gaining input from area industries.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Standard 4 seeks to ensure that “the institution conducts sustained, evidence-based and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives.” Both the CPR and EE Visiting Teams judged CETYS performance in this regard to be exemplary. From institutional planning and academic program development and evaluation, the faculty, administration and Board have demonstrated a long-standing commitment to quality and excellence through the establishment of ambitious goals, monitoring performance, and its focus on doing all it can to become the best university in Mexico (CFRs 4.1 & 4.2). The board, president and senior administrators have incorporated strategic planning, the establishment and

monitoring of annual objectives, and goal-based budgeting into institutional life. A Balanced Scorecard of strategic indicators is closely monitored as well. While the Team commends CETYS for its use of data and evidence in planning and decision-making, it encourages further and deeper analysis of some data, such as retention and attrition patterns for men and women and by other key demographic characteristics, to better guide academic planning. While the Team saw evidence of considerable data collected across the university, more evidence of how those data are analyzed and used in support of decision-making is needed.

At the present time, Plan CETYS 2010 is guiding broad university initiatives and directions that address such areas as enrollment growth and program development by campus, infrastructure support, enhanced marketing and fund raising and the achievement of WASC accreditation. Work has already begun on CETYS Plan 2020, further evidence of institutional commitment to strategic planning.

The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies (faculty members, students, alumni, Board of Trustees and industry and community leaders) in institutional reflection and the planning processes (CFR 4.1) to define and align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic priorities of the institution (CFR 4.2). The EE Visiting Team reflected those academic planning activities in the form of a long-term perspective for new programs and degrees. However, this is a newer institutional endeavor and thus is not as comprehensive as is broader institutional planning.

With the creation of the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs and a revised academic governance structure, the University has an opportunity to plan institution-wide for academic programs, especially at the graduate level. With its strong ties to the local business community CETYS could effectively employ advisory boards in its academic planning efforts. The Team encourages the efforts already undertaken for enhanced academic planning, program evaluation and focus on learning outcomes.

Commitment to Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.4 – 4.8)

The Educational Effectiveness Visiting Team saw considerable evidence of CETYS' commitment to institutional learning and improvement. Examples include bringing to the institution a number of experts for consultation in such areas academic libraries and learning outcomes assessment to work with campus leaders and faculty in developing plans for improvement in these crucial areas. The Academic Reform plan of 2004 has led to re-structuring all undergraduate

courses to ensure standardization in content and pedagogy in the same course taught on different campuses (CFR 4.7). Thus far, standardization and revisions have occurred in over one-hundred courses across the curriculum. It was clear to all members of the Visiting Team that CETYS University takes seriously the purposes and implications of Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. During the course of both visits Team members questioned the President, board members, faculty, administrators, students, and alumni regarding why CETYS, as a Mexican university, would want to achieve WASC accreditation. The responses were clear and consistent: To achieve CETYS' mission and goals and to be the best university in Mexico.

The CETYS marketing office has responsibility for conducting feasibility studies with potential employers prior to implementation of any new academic programs (CFR 4.4). A rigorous set of standards for evaluating the need, currency and feasibility of new programs is applied and an impressive amount of data collected and analyzed as part of this process.

CETYS has a history of utilizing satisfaction surveys and other measures to gather information from a variety of constituencies, including employers of students and alumni, to inform it about the institution's performance (CPR 4.8). Two of the 14 dashboard indicators monitored by the board include alumni's evaluation of their CETYS education and employer's evaluation of the work performance of CETYS graduates.

The CPR Visiting Team reflected some concern about the academic planning and program review process however, especially with regard to faculty's preparedness to gather evidence of learning outcomes and analyzing the data collected in time for the Educational Effectiveness review. As noted in this report, substantial work to develop a learning outcomes assessment plan for CETYS was accomplished in a year's time. Collection of learning outcomes and analysis of evidence to 'close the loop' is yet to follow.

CETYS has charged planning bodies (CDMs) with a regular schedule and the existence of an understandable and coherent plan for assessing the attainment of educational objectives. Evidence of this criterion seems to be the massive curricula review initiated in 2004 that involved the significant curricula change (Criteria 4.1). Nevertheless, there seems to be a lack of an organized planning process at the institution, thus resulting in lack of coordination of personnel and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution (Criteria 4.2). CETYS seems to have begun institutional research capacities as evidenced by the guidelines established by the CDMs as they develop and modify curricula (Criteria 4.4). However, there seems

to be a lack of well coordinated data bases sufficient to meet all external reporting needs, or the dissemination of information through clear publications (Criteria 4.5). Leadership at most levels seems committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment CETYS has begun to use (Criteria 4.6). However these processes are not yet well established (Criteria 4.7).

Institutional Research (CFR 4.5)

The Department of Institutional Effectiveness reports directly to the President. It is responsible for coordinating institutional planning and evaluation processes and collects key data university-wide. Data collected include semester-by-semester data on enrollment by program and campus, various alumni follow-up surveys and studies of educational supply and demand in Baja California.

Between the customer satisfaction surveys, the faculty evaluation process, the market research and focus groups (CPR 4.8, Team members saw substantial evidence of feedback affecting planning and university directions. We encourage further development of this process as more depth of academic quality and planning is pursued.

The Team also reviewed evidence with regard to CFR 4.5 about how well institutional research addresses strategic data needs and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. We concur with CETYS' conclusion (page 31 of the CPR report) that it needs to implement an institutional information system that allows wide dissemination of data and provides a venue for analysis and consultation.

REPORT SUMMARY AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

The WASC EE Visiting Team again wishes to express how impressed it was with many aspects of the educational program and institutional functioning of CETYS University. During both the CPR and EE visits the commitment of all members of the institution to have CETYS be recognized – and to be – the finest institution of higher education in Baja California if not in all of Mexico was clear. Institutional aims are impressively backed by action and commitment of resources. We offer the following:

- The Team commends the institution for having a clearly articulated mission and educational philosophy that are well integrated and pervade the institution. The CETYS educational philosophy of personalized education infused with values was clearly evident everywhere.
- CETYS University clearly used the process of preparing for both the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review as an opportunity to identify recommendations for change and improvement. It also presented a plan of action. Quite important is the institution's commitment and keen desire to utilize the WASC accreditation process as a vehicle for real improvement.
- CETYS' financial status and management are particularly commendable in the Team's view. CETYS is successfully managing its resources in a conservative manner with the deliberate intent to assure the adequacy of resources to support the educational mission of CETYS.
- The faculty, staff, board members, students, and alumni are clearly and passionately committed to the institution and its values of student formation. All team members found evidence of this in nearly every conversation we had.
- The institution uses a variety of strategies to communicate the importance of high quality teaching and learning. Some are ones that would not be usual in the U.S. context. For example, a staff member who checks that every class session starts on time and does not end early; random drug testing; comprehensive faculty evaluation every semester, with those type of members who do not meet standards not being rehired; and an extensive system of course syllabus development (CDM) to ensure consistency across instructors.
- The CDM system developed and used by CETYS undergraduate faculty impressed the Visiting Team. It is exemplary in our view.
- An impressive amount of evidence has been or is being gathered. There is a culture of evidence-based decision-making, especially at the Board and senior administrative levels.
- Administratively CETYS is organized effectively, including a strong central administration in order to achieve its mission.
- CETYS' support for professional development is commendable: several senior administrative staff members have been ACE fellows and the university has supported several faculty members as they pursued doctorates outside of Mexico.
- The role of the Board is clear and consistent. There are clear boundaries between the Board and administrative functions.

- Institutional planning is a priority and is clear and consistent.
- CETYS has taken seriously WASC standards regarding learning assessment. The EE Report (pg. 3) notes that “Changes in the organizational structure of CETYS University such as appointing a new Academic Vice-president, as well as a restructuring under a scheme of schools and colleges, are facilitating the institutional incorporation of a learning assessment culture.”
- The commitment and success of system and chapter boards in the acquisition of funds to support the institution’s needs is exemplary.
- From institutional planning and academic program development and evaluation the faculty, the administration and Board have demonstrated a long-standing commitment to quality and excellence through the establishment of ambitious goals, monitoring performance, and its focus on doing all it can to become the best university in Mexico

Major Recommendations from the Educational Effectiveness Review:

While noting CETYS’ many strengths and the measurable progress made in key areas of WASC concern, the Team offers the following recommendations:

- Doctoral Programs

As noted in the CPR report, CETYS does not fully meet WASC expectations in its doctoral programs. This is due largely to the lack of a doctoral and research culture as is commonly practiced in the U.S. We strongly encourage CETYS to continue to address deficiencies in its doctoral programs with particular emphasis on the creation of a doctoral culture in which:

- The practices of faculty research and scholarship are greatly strengthened along with preparation and credentials of CETYS faculty. Both will contribute to more academically rigorous programs as well as establishing a doctoral culture to support graduate student learning and research, and a more robust doctoral student experience overall.
- Sufficient and appropriate library/learning resources are ensured to support all graduate education, specifically at the doctoral level.
- The appropriateness and rigor of the courses offered at the graduate level, especially at the doctoral level, through learning outcomes assessment. In particular, the evidence indicates that doctoral dissertations could be appreciably improved in quality (see comments earlier in this report regarding dissertations in the business doctorate).

- With particular reference to the Doctorate in Education and Values the Team advises CETYS to consider in its academic planning the development of resources and capacity to support the program pedagogically through its own or more regional faculty to a greater degree than is now possible (CFR 3.1, 3.2).
- Doctoral students working on dissertations should have the benefit of a committee of several faculty members, as is common in U.S. universities.
- Given the lack of clarity of the program and the very slow progress of its students in the Doctor of Administration program, the Team recommends the suspension of admission to the program until such time as the purpose, goals and viability of the program can be substantiated. When CETYS determines that it wants to reinstate the program, it will have to seek the appropriate permission from WASC. In the meantime, students currently in the program should be provided the opportunity to complete their course of study.

- Library and Learning Resources
CETYS recognizes that WASC expectations regarding library and learning resources are significantly different from common practice in Mexican higher education, and has taken impressive steps to address this issue. The Team recommends continuing:
 - The substantial investment needed in expanding and improving information collections and resources available to students and faculty at all three campuses (paper and electronic).
 - To take advantage of readily available professional expertise, which has already been productively used and Alliant University as a means to add needed expertise and experience for future development.
 - To support professionalization of library staff and faculty development so that the two may be enhanced in parallel, thereby strengthening the academic programs and student learning.
 - Incorporate information competence in the development of student learning outcomes and into course syllabi as they are being revised.

- Learning Outcomes

CETYS' commitment to a strong educational program with demonstrated outcomes precedes the WASC visits. However, it is early in its development of a comprehensive system of student learning outcomes that is faculty driven and that produces measurable outcomes that lead to ongoing academic and curricular improvement. The Team therefore recommends continued focus on these efforts.

- Faculty

CETYS and the WASC Visiting Teams recognize the challenges the university faces in reaching and sustaining a faculty with the level of academic qualifications and expertise expected by WASC Standards. The university's efforts to address this challenge are commendable. To further progress in this regard we recommend:

- Working to assure sufficient numbers of coherent core faculty for each program who are setting the intellectual climate and direction with a concomitant reduction in the over-reliance on part-time and adjunct faculty The EE Visiting Team supports CETYS' ongoing efforts to hire and retain faculty with appropriate graduate degrees.
- Assuring that there is at least one full-time faculty member for each academic program, especially at the master's and doctoral level.
- Continued efforts to recruit a more diverse faculty in terms of origin of graduate degree.
- Enhanced support for faculty research and scholarly activities to expand the research culture to both undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Expanded opportunities for development of full-time faculty, especially outside of CETYS.

- Academic planning

Both Visiting Teams were impressed that CETYS is an institution that plans carefully for its future, with strong alignment across mission, values, goals and resources. The Visiting Team, however, believes that academic planning is not as comprehensive as broader institutional planning. We therefore recommend:

- Strengthening the consistency and exercise of faculty academic leadership to ensure both academic quality and maintenance of the institution's educational purposes and character, as would be expected of a U.S. institution.

- Enhancing academic planning and program evaluation with more of a focus on utilizing data and analysis more deeply.
- CETYS is encouraged to inform itself of standard program review practices in U.S. universities and consider adopting some of the methodology in addition to its own rigorous Academic Reform process. (CFR 2.7)
- Utilization of Information data
CETYS is an institution guided by data and information; this is something it does well and consistently. The Team, however, sees opportunities for continued improvement, including:
 - Improved utilization and analysis of institutional data with a focus on student learning and success including graduation and retention.
 - Continued development of its institutional research and learning outcomes assessment activities so that the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment, especially as they relate to student learning and program evaluation are firmly embedded in the academic life of the university.
 - Continue to develop and expand the utilization of well coordinated data bases sufficient to meet external reporting needs, to support informed decision making and dissemination of information internally as well as to external audiences.

CONCLUSION

CETYS University's application for accreditation by WASC is a unique undertaking. On the university's part it has meant many years of work learning about U.S. and regional standards of higher education, evaluating the differences between the two systems and how they would apply them to their institution. In addition, it has meant implanting many changes and new practices in a relatively short period of time. The experience of considering an institution of higher education that is not incorporated in the region and whose primary language is not English has also offered a number of philosophical and practical challenges.

Both Visiting Teams, however, found real opportunities in this pre-Candidacy review. CETYS has clearly demonstrated that the WASC standards have been helpful to it as a developing institution and have provided direction and focus for institutional self-improvement. Faculty members have been deeply engaged, especially around learning outcomes. WASC has benefited as well in learning about Mexican higher education in general and CETYS' specific educational model and practices – many of which are exemplary. It is the Team's perspective that this kind of cross-border

relationship can be an enormously valuable opportunity, providing both CETYS and WASC with many points of connection.

While the Visiting Teams did find many differences between the two systems, it also found many similarities. The critical role of the Board, a clearly articulated mission, vision and set of values, as well as strong and clear leadership, are common factors necessary for any institution of higher education to be successful. In addition, the Visiting Teams found an engaged and committed faculty and staff dedicated to their mission and focused on student learning, quality, and to becoming the best university in Mexico. Given that context, the opportunities to engage in the WASC review process provided the Visiting Teams both an opportunity for review as well as learn from the experience. The entire process should prove valuable not only for CETYS but for WASC as well as it considers new and uncharted areas relative to accreditation in an increasingly global environment.