

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

To ArtCenter College of Design

March 28-30, 2017

Team Roster

Brenda Barham Hill – Chair
CEO, Claremont University Consortium, Retired

Joseph M. Slowensky – Assistant Chair
Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs, ALO, Professor of Film and
Media Arts, Chapman University

Richard A. Fass – Team Member
Vice President for Planning, Pomona College, Retired

Brian M. Thomason – Team Member
Associate Vice President and University Controller, Adjunct Professor of Accounting, Finance
and Hispanic Studies, Pepperdine University

Maria Zack – Team Member
Chair and Professor of Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences, Chair of Physics and
Engineering, Point Loma Nazarene University

Christopher Oberg – WSCUC Institution Liaison
Vice President and COO, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	2
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	2
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	6
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	7
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	7
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	7
C. Component 3: Degree programs: meaning, quality and integrity of degrees.....	14
D. Component 4: Educational quality, quality assurance and improvement: program review and assessment; student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation; use of data and evidence	16
E. Component 5: Student success: student learning, retention and graduation	26
F. Component 6: Sustainability: financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment.....	32
G. Component 7: Reflection and plans for improvement	36
SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	38
APPENDICES	41
A. Federal Compliance Forms	41
1. Credit Hour Review.....	41
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	45
3. Student Complaints Review	47
4. Transfer Policy Review	50
B. Off-Campus Locations, as appropriate.....	52
C. Distance Education, as appropriate	52

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

ArtCenter College of Design (ArtCenter) was founded in 1930 by Edward A. “Tink” Adams, an advertising man and educational visionary. It was the first such institution to teach real-world professional skills to artists and designers to prepare them for professional careers in advertising, publishing and industrial design.

“Learn to Create. Influence Change” is the mission adopted by ArtCenter following a yearlong visioning and strategic planning process launched by President Lorne Buchman in 2010. As stated on the website [<http://www.artcenter.edu/about/get-to-know-artcenter/mission-and-vision.html>], this concise mission statement is ArtCenter’s response to “how art and design impact our global society. Part call-to-action. Part promise.” (CFR 1.1)

ArtCenter, whose main campus has been in the arroyo hills above the Pasadena Rose Bowl since 1976, is a private, non-profit professional art and design institution offering BFA degrees in Advertising, Graphic Design, Illustration, Film, Fine Art, and Photography and Imaging. The BS degree is offered in Entertainment Design, Environmental Design, Product Design, Transportation Design, and Interaction Design. MFA and MS degrees are offered by ArtCenter in Art, Film, Media Design Practices, Industrial Design, Transportation Systems and Design, Environmental Design, and Graphic Design. A non-degree Humanities and Sciences program offers General Education courses while the Integrated Studies program offers

foundation-level classes along with non-unit workshops in areas such as drawing, sketching, painting, typography and various digital media applications.

ArtCenter expanded its campus beyond the arroyo hills site in 2004 to include a two-story building and parking structure with 36,000 programmable square feet on Raymond Avenue; in 2014 ArtCenter purchased a six-story building on Arroyo Parkway that provided an additional 91,000 square feet. The facilities acquired since 2004 have been renovated for ArtCenter use, with the exception of four floors of the Arroyo Parkway site for which planning is underway.

ArtCenter operates on a year-round schedule of three semester-long terms. Enrollment at ArtCenter for spring term 2017 was 1936 undergraduate and 207 graduate students with a total FTE of 1995. There were 114 full-time and 471 part-time faculty teaching in fall 2016. It is a hallmark of ArtCenter that it historically has relied on working professionals in a wide range of art and design fields to best prepare students for their future professions and to ensure currency in the curriculum. Many of these part-time faculty have been with ArtCenter for many years, creating a consistency of content and practice in collaboration with full-time faculty.

ArtCenter is accredited by WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) and by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). NASAD accreditation was most recently renewed in 2009. ArtCenter was first formally accredited by WASC in 1955 and by NASAD in 1963. ArtCenter is also a member of the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD).

WSCUC acted to issue a formal Notice of Concern in 2010 following the ArtCenter's Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Review (2007 – 09). A Special Visit was held in fall

2012. The Special Visit focused on the following areas of concern: 1) strategic planning; 2) use of data in support of evidence-based decision-making; 3) diversity in curriculum and culture; 4) role of faculty in governance; 5) student learning assessment and program review. The Commission considered the report of the special visit team to ArtCenter in February, 2013. In its March 11, 2013 action letter removing its Notice of Concern, the Commission noted that much progress had been made in the areas of strategic planning, evidence based decision-making, and diversity in curriculum and culture. The role of faculty in institutional governance as well as student assessment and program review were noted as areas for continued institutional focus and development.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The Team employed WSCUC's 2013 revised accreditation review process, beginning with an Off-Site Review (OSR) held on November 10, 2016, and Accreditation Visit March 27 – 30, 2017. The Team's responses to and questions about the Comprehensive Report were collected in writing and discussed during a team pre-OSR conference call and more extensively during the OSR. Questions and issues raised by the team formed the substance of the team's discussions about the accreditation review of ArtCenter and guided the Summary of Lines of Inquiry which were submitted to the institution following the Off-Site Review. An introductory conference call was held with the ArtCenter president and senior academic and administrative staff as part of the Off-Site Review.

The Off-Site review concluded with the team's development of Lines of Inquiry for the ArtCenter review which was submitted to ArtCenter along with a list of additional

documentation the team wished to receive either as part of the response to the lines of inquiry or to be made available in the team room at the time of the visit. The lines of inquiry about which the team wished to probe further during the visit included: 1) assessment and program review, how student learning data are used to drive decision-making and the development of a culture of assessment; 2) board of trustees' governance and engagement in decision-making; 3) strategic plan, with particular focus on the budgeting process and financial model guiding implementation of the plan; 4) the philosophy and effectiveness of General Education; 5) finances, focusing on the budget process, endowment growth, and enrollment modeling; 6) faculty governance and organizational structures' effectiveness, how the contract-based faculty model allows for stability and effective governance ownership and how the concept of shared governance works between the faculty and administration in decision-making.

The March 27 – 30, 2017 Accreditation Visit to ArtCenter began with a tour of the South Campus facilities which are the focus of ArtCenter academic space expansion. Over the course of two days the entire team or several members met with the president and provost, WSCUC steering committee, representatives of the board of trustees, executive staff, the CFO, senior vice president for development, associate provost for student affairs, associate provost for faculty affairs, director of faculty development, Staff Council, the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee and the Diversity Committee as well as several faculty governance committees: Chairs Council, Curricular Program Review Committee, Faculty Status and Policy Committee. In addition, team members met with representatives of the Humanities and Sciences (General Education) faculty and other faculty regarding assessment and program review. Open meetings with faculty, staff and students were also held.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

Both the September 2016 ArtCenter Comprehensive Report and the January 2017 Response to the Summary of Lines of Inquiry were thorough, well-organized, and demonstrated progress with core issues as identified by the 2013 Commission action letter and the team's lines of inquiry as well as those identified internally by ArtCenter. Evidence supporting the report and response was extensive and clearly presented.

ArtCenter's comprehensive report described demonstrable achievements in core areas as well as frank recognition of further progress to be made. In its review of report narrative and related evidence as well as interviews with board members, administration, faculty, students and staff the team found broad and deep engagement of all constituencies of the ArtCenter with the foci of the comprehensive report and evidence provided in support of issues previously identified by the Commission and the team. At every step of the review process ArtCenter representatives were responsive and candid in response to team requests for additional information and questions raised. The visiting team is appreciative of the ALO and ArtCenter for facilitating an effective comprehensive review process. (CFR 1.8)

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The March 2013 Commission Action Letter highlights two areas for continued focus and development: role of faculty in governance, and student learning assessment and program review. The bulk of the team’s time spent in meetings with administration, faculty, and staff focused on the ArtCenter’s responses to these two areas. It was evident from ArtCenter’s Comprehensive WSCUC Report, its response to the team’s Summary of Lines of Inquiry, evidentiary documentation provided and discussions with administration, faculty, and staff that substantial effort and resources have been devoted since 2013 to addressing the role of faculty in governance (shared governance) as well as student learning assessment and program review.

The team concludes that ArtCenter has thoughtfully and deeply engaged the two areas noted by the Commission. See Sections II.B. and II.D. of the report for detailed analysis of shared governance and student learning assessment and program review.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

ArtCenter has been engaged in a process of defining, clarifying, and articulating its mission, vision, and values for several years, most particularly since the 2012 WASC Special

Visit that encouraged broad involvement in a strategic planning process. ArtCenter undertook a five year planning process in 2011, Create Change which identified three pillars: The Conservatory Spirit, Convening Diverse Communities and Disciplines and New Spaces for Learning. Upon its completion a second planning effort was launched, Create Change 2.0; this was approved by the board of trustees in March, 2017, ArtCenter describes Create Change 2.0 as the ‘how’ of achieving goals identified in the original plan.

ArtCenter’s Comprehensive WSCUC Report makes several observations and offers a number of recommendations about ongoing work needed to document and assess progress toward achieving the goals outlined in the strategic plan. It appears to the team that the effort is now deeply embedded in the culture of ArtCenter and that the institution is engaging in appropriate planning activities. In particular, processes for program reviews, learning assessments and regular data collection and reporting through the office of institutional research are being thoughtfully developed. (CFRs 1.1, 2.4, 2.6, 4.2)

The institution has a typical academic freedom policy for faculty that is part of the Faculty Handbook, but a comparable policy for students was still under review at the time of the visit. (CFR 3.2)

Over the last few years, ArtCenter has been paying significant attention to affordability and accessibility; and to the diversity of its curriculum, its student population, and its faculty and staff hiring, with active involvement of representatives from all of those constituencies. The recently created position of director of diversity, equity and inclusion (not yet hired) is one example of this commitment. (CFRs 1.4, 2.2, 3.1)

The team finds that ArtCenter accurately represents its goals and programs, and treats its faculty, staff, and students fairly. In addition, there are comprehensive Faculty, Staff, and Student Handbooks with required and typical policies protecting all constituents. Previous WASC visits, as well as the current WSCUC visit, confirm that the institution is also committed to full and candid cooperation with the accreditation process. (CFRs 1.6, 1.7, 1.8)

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

ArtCenter has an innovative model of providing students with an applied arts education in a conservatory environment. Their programs and program-specific educational objectives are well aligned with this mission and vision. The institution involves students in significant active learning via the use of studios, student project/experimentation spaces, practical projects, and a well-shaped system of senior portfolios and shows (CFRs 2.4, 2.5, 2.6).

ArtCenter leverages its proximity to the arts, design, media and entertainment industries in Los Angeles to recruit a team of professionals in the creative arts who serve as adjunct faculty and teach much of the coursework. This is consistent with the institution's mission and objectives and provides a unique educational opportunity for the students. It does; however, appear to create some tensions that the institution is addressing: the governance burden, placed on the limited number of full-time faculty supplemented by part-time faculty and the setting of expectations for faculty scholarly activity, particularly for full-time faculty. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.1)

It is clear that ArtCenter has invested a great deal of effort in establishing program learning outcomes and developing the infrastructure to support assessment of student learning

and program review. However, these processes are new and have not yet produced longitudinal data. As can be seen in the team's report on component 4 & component 6, the institution has work to do to finish the linkages between program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes for all courses, gather robust learning outcomes data, and shape its program review process but it has been very intentional in launching these processes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)

General Education. The department of Humanities and Sciences provides the General Education coursework for all departments of ArtCenter. Art Center has an innovative approach to connecting broad intellectual knowledge with applications of that knowledge to the institutional "maker" culture. All undergraduate students take forty-five units of coursework in the Humanities and Sciences curriculum and the learning outcomes for this coursework are clearly aligned with WSCUC's Core Competencies. While this approach to general learning is intriguing, the team believes that it would be helpful for ArtCenter to review the curriculum in light of both the fundamental need for makers to have broad knowledge that will feed their creativity and curiosity as well as WSCUC expectations for general learning. Standard 2.2a describes coursework that ensures "breadth for all students in ... social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons," for example. Humanities and Sciences has established itself as an engaged part of the academic community and as ArtCenter seeks to recruit more traditional college-aged students, a clearer website presence for Humanities and Sciences would help to communicate the breadth of educational opportunities available for current and prospective ArtCenter students. (CFR 2.2a)

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

Faculty and Staff: ArtCenter generally seems to have aligned its operations, staffing levels, structures, and physical plant with its educational objectives and strategic plan. ArtCenter has engaged many constituents of the campus community in the assessment and review processes at the institution. While the institution certainly employs faculty and staff who are committed to the institution and its success, the sheer number of institutional committees in addition to the teaching load create workloads for full-time faculty and staff that may be challenging to manage. The team encourages faculty and administration to consider this issue further, with an eye toward maximizing effectiveness while not overburdening faculty. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources: ArtCenter is financially stable with “clean” audits and a robust planning process that is aligned with the strategic plan. It is important to note that while the strategic plan informs the budget process, it has not been assigned an expense target for implementation, as successful execution of the plan may involve reallocation of existing resources in addition to incremental funding. Nonetheless, there is an informal funding plan using incremental revenue from tuition, gifts, and debt proceeds to fund additive aspects of the plan for the next five years. Technology usage in and out of the classroom is pervasive and well-supported based on resources allocated and evidenced in some instances by course syllabi and descriptions. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes: ArtCenter clearly has leadership that is characterized by integrity and vision as evidenced by the progress made since the last re-accreditation visit and based on the evolution of the strategic plan as well as by the administration's efforts to engage all levels of the institution's community in the operational aspects of the institution. The ArtCenter also employs a full-time CEO and CFO and has an independent board with sufficient expertise to adequately oversee the institution. (CFRs 3.6, 3.8, 3.9)

Even though sufficient framework exists for appropriate consultation with the institutional community in decision-making processes, evidence gathered through the Shared Governance Research Project and in meetings with various faculty and administration representatives indicate that fully-developed channels of communication, decision-making, and engagement have not yet developed. The team believes that this might, in part, be an unintended consequence of the use of the term “shared governance” to describe a process that is more aptly described as “broad consultation.” ArtCenter’s model does not, in fact, encompass two of the characteristics that are normally part of shared governance systems – specific delegated powers and authorities in appropriate areas, and acceptance of ownership and collective responsibility for those delegations by an elected group representative of the faculty. Accordingly, the team suggests that the president and provost follow through on their commitment to fully engage the campus community in dialogue about all the avenues in which shared governance and delegated decision-making authority should occur. The team also suggests that the faculty consider what level of engagement is appropriate for full-time faculty and for part-time faculty on faculty-run and shared governance committees. (CFR 3.10)

Institutional program reviews, though somewhat nascent, lend themselves, along with various faculty committees, to demonstrated academic leadership while analogous committees and processes on the administrative side support sustainability of the institution. Progress still needs to be made regarding the collection and use of data and information for informing the decision-making processes. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10)

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

ArtCenter has devoted significant resources to building an infrastructure to support quality assurance. An office of institutional research has been formalized and resourced. Learning outcomes and assessment plans are in place and an updated program review system has been crafted. The challenge in the coming years will be to gather longitudinal data based on these plans and then to use that data to make curricular improvements and inform program review. However, the responsibility for coordinating assessment of program learning outcomes, assessment of core competencies and program review have been assigned to different staff members, and while this was an efficient approach to starting this process, sustainability of this work will depend on a more integrated approach to assessment and program review activities. Further details about the processes and outcomes can be found in the section of the team's report on component 4. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

It is clear that ArtCenter has devoted a great deal of effort and care to developing institutional strategy and reflecting that work in strategic plans. The plans represent a significant body of work, but the current plan Create Change 2.0, has a very large number of initiatives

(sixteen large items with a total of one-hundred sub-items). It will be important going forward for ArtCenter to continue to prioritize initiatives and to closely track the funding for these initiatives. It will also be critical for the institution to continue to monitor the changing landscape of higher education and to incorporate its response to those changes into its strategic planning efforts. (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)

Review of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators:

ArtCenter has completed the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and the program learning outcomes are present and publicly available. There are people in each academic unit assigned to review and make meaning from their learning outcomes data. All programs are scheduled for program reviews, and four have recently completed reviews.

C. Component 3: Degree programs: meaning, quality and integrity of degrees

The degrees offered by ArtCenter are a reflection of the original and ongoing mission of the institution. That mission which focuses on the application of artistic history and technique to modern professional design practices in a variety of fields remains the core principal defining the ArtCenter degree. (CFRs 1.1, 1.5)

Create Change 2.0 strategic plan clearly echoes these principal goals and outlines measures that the institution hopes to take to refresh and expand its programs. All constituencies appear to be aligned behind these ideas. (CFR 1.2)

ArtCenter graduates reflect the institution's success at achieving these goals. A recent survey of graduate employment rates (for bachelor degree recipients) determined that 87% were employed full-time or part-time within one year of graduating. Create Change 2.0 outlines these and many other measures of success.

Rankings and recognitions from external professional organizations are another way to assess the quality of ArtCenter's programs, at least in terms of its reputation in the fields that it offers. A sampling of these rankings was provided in the institutional report:

- Ranked number 1 in undergraduate industrial design nine times and ranked number 1 in graduate industrial design eight times over the last eleven years in the annual DesignIntelligence survey (2016);
- Earned highest honors in Graphic Design USA's top design schools (2016);
- Ranked among the top 25 film schools in the United States by *The Hollywood Reporter* (2015);
- Achieved top 20 rankings in *U.S. News and World Report's* "Best Graduate Schools" (number 2 in Industrial Design, number 7 in Graphic (Media) Design, number 18 in Fine Arts) (2015);
- Ranked number 4 among LinkedIn's best undergraduate universities for designers (2014);
- Ranked third among the 25 colleges that add the most value by *Money* magazine (2014);
- ArtCenter alumni rank first among the top earners in Coroflot's Creative Employment Snapshot (2014).

ArtCenter has also made significant strides in the direct assessment of student learning, and these are discussed in more detail later in this report. Those efforts are a “work in progress” and, although not yet fully developed, they represent significant progress in response to the recommendations of the 2012 Special Visit. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5)

The institution has recognized the need to enhance the use of technology in many disciplines and recently hired a dedicated director of educational technology who co-founded ArtCenter’s Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning for this purpose. This represents another significant step aimed at improving educational outcomes. (CFR 3.5)

D. Component 4: Educational quality, quality assurance and improvement: program review and assessment; student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation; use of data and evidence

ArtCenter opted to combine WSCUC’s component 4 and component 6 in its institutional report. In the 2013 Commission Action Letter following the Special Visit of October 2012, the Commission noted that,

Student learning assessment and program review remain in an emergent state. The Commission expects that the institution will establish a formalized assessment system that relates student learning to program learning outcomes; expand the work of institutional research; tie program review to budgeting and planning; and integrate outcomes across institutional, program and course levels. This area should command a significant amount of effort in the ongoing development of institutional systems and processes. The Commission would note that these areas have been part of Commission Standards and expectations for well over a decade, and ArtCenter will need to demonstrate that it has fully addressed these issues as well as the new expectations in the 2013 *Standards of Accreditation*.

In this context, the team conducted its review of component 4 by looking carefully at ArtCenter's progress in the areas of assessment and program review, core competencies, and use of data and evidence.

During the Offsite Review, the team commended ArtCenter for the use of best practices in the development of systems, policies, professional development offerings, organizational infrastructure, and handbooks around program review and assessment. In recent years, ArtCenter has made significant investments in developing infrastructure to promote quality assurance and improvement by: establishing a Center for Education Effectiveness; creating an institutional Assessment and Program Review Initiative (APRI); designing an Assessment Liaison Cohort and course syllabus for the purpose of training department faculty assessment liaisons; creating an ArtCenter Academic Program Review Handbook, assessing the five WSCUC core competencies; and creating Student Learning Assessment Plans by department. (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

ArtCenter's Academic Program Review Handbook consists of forty-five pages dedicated to describing the process of program review. The handbook contains a template that programs can use to create a comprehensive self-study; a process for selecting external reviewers; a proposed timeline for completing the site visit; a description of the overall program review process; a template for external reviewers to use in identifying their findings; a form for the provost to record findings and recommendations; and an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) template that constitutes the action plan and agreement between program and administration. The program review process incorporates assessment planning and review, integrates an

examination of program learning outcomes and core competency assessments within the major, includes two-year, follow-up reports on closing the loop, and provides some opportunities for the program to engage in strategic planning. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Since the 2013 Commission action letter (CAL), ArtCenter's degree programs are in varying stages of completing their first program reviews. Three of ArtCenter's eighteen degree programs have completed the program review process and reached the stage of a MOU: BFA Graphic Design, BS Transportation Design, and BS Entertainment Design. External reviewers conducted site visits and issued reports. The MOUs for these programs are generally reflective of the external reviewers' reports and comprehensive in regard to the action plans required on the part of the program. All of the MOUs call for assessment of one to two program learning outcomes each year leading to the program's two-year, interim report required following the program review process. The provost has signed the MOUs, noting approval of the action plans and describing any resource enhancements to be negotiated at the time that the programs follow through on the action plans. No concrete resources appear to have been allocated according to these MOUs at the time of the site visit. While the team could not see first-hand evidence of the impact that the program reviews had on resource allocation processes, the completed reviews appear to have been completed using best practices typically associated with program review processes. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Seven of ArtCenter's eighteen degree programs were reported to have completed self-studies for program reviews during the 2016/17 academic year: BFA Film, MFA Film, BFA Fine Art, BFA Illustration, BFA Photography and Imaging, BS Product Design, and MS

Transportation Design. These programs are selecting or have selected external reviewers, and have completed or are expecting site visits from external reviewers in fall 2016 or spring 2017. The specific external reviewer reports for BFA Fine Art and BFA Photography and Imaging that were provided to the team indicate that a thoughtful, comprehensive review had taken place. Many areas of concern and suggestions for improvement are noted in the reports, some more serious than others. ArtCenter's General Education component, called Humanities and Sciences, and ArtCenter's Integrated Studies non-degree studio program, also fall into the in-process category for program review. Self-studies for these programs have been written, but the external reviews have not been conducted. These programs have not had site visits or received reports from external review teams at the time of this report. None of these programs have proceeded to the MOU stage. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Eight of ArtCenter's eighteen degree programs are slated for program review in 2017, 2018 or later. These programs have not yet begun the program review process.

Program reviews for six co-curricular areas have been scheduled (Study Away, Designmatters, Center for the Student Experience, Career and Professional Development, Educational Partnerships, and Academic Advising), but at the time of this writing, only one had completed a self-study (Study Away). The other co-curricular areas are scheduled for program review in 2017 (Designmatters) and 2018 (Center for the Student Experience, Career and Professional Development, Educational Partnerships, and Academic Advising). (CFR 2.11)

While the team commends ArtCenter on developing a thoughtful, new, and comprehensive program review process that reflects best practices, the team is disappointed that

this endeavor took so long. Only three of the eighteen degree programs and none of the co-curricular areas have completed a program review cycle resulting in an MOU since the 2013 Commission action letter. The number of program reviews that ArtCenter plans to undertake in the near future (seven degrees and one co-curricular area currently engaged in program review planning, in addition to the pending General Education review, with eight more degrees and five co-curricular areas waiting in the wings), now places the institution in what appears to be a very ambitious, catch-up mode given ArtCenter's size and support structure. Nonetheless, an ongoing cycle of program review is critical to demonstrating quality assurance and a commitment to continuous improvement. Program review has been an integral part of the WSCUC Standards for well over a decade. Now that good systems are in place, the team urges ArtCenter to make the completion of program reviews for all of its degree programs, General Education program, and co-curricular areas one of its highest institutional priorities.

The findings indicated by the external reviewers for the two program reviews that were provided indicated some causes for concern. Student advisement, for example, was noted as an area in need of improvement in one program. It is unclear to the team whether these issues are systemic at ArtCenter or isolated to just a few programs. The Program Review Committee that has been created for the purpose of reviewing drafts of self-studies for programs in preparation for review should also play a role in identifying the key findings, defining action plans, and drafting the MOUs. Participation both at the beginning and end of the process will enable the Program Review Committee to better understand patterns or persistent areas of concern that could be addressed more effectively at the institutional level. In every case, ArtCenter's

programs should be comprehensively reviewed and areas of concern should be addressed as soon as possible for the benefit of ArtCenter's students. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

In the area of program level assessment, ArtCenter responded to the 2013 Commission action letter by creating the Assessment and Program Review Initiative (APRI). ArtCenter's institutional report notes that this initiative resulted in the development of a faculty-led Assessment Liaison Cohort in 2015 that served the purpose of "developing and sharing assessment practices across departments." The director of faculty development, faculty mentors, and the Center for Educational Effectiveness began their work with the Graphic Design Department faculty. An Assessment Handbook was developed and a process was defined to help programs with curricular mapping, development of course and program learning outcomes (CLOs and PLOs), creating a new syllabus template that includes CLOs, discussions on how to use term reviews and capstone graduation shows as a means of capturing data and evidence of learning, and how to use assessment results to inform the new program review process. Key faculty members from each discipline were identified to participate in faculty training that took place between 2014 through 2015, but ArtCenter's institutional report acknowledges that program faculties need to "delve more fully into the alignment of learning outcomes, the development and use of term review rubrics and other activities necessary to the expansion of our assessment practices." The team concurs. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.1)

The team reviewed the Student Learning Assessment Plans by department and degree program that resulted from ArtCenter's APRI and Assessment Liaison Cohort training since the Special Visit and 2013 Commission action letter. The team found that most degree programs

have developed program learning outcome statements to define goals for student learning, but not all of the program outcome statements are well written and measurable. Further work and professional training is needed in this area. Many programs have developed comprehensive curriculum maps that show where PLOs are introduced, developed, and mastered within the curriculum, but many still do not understand the process of curriculum mapping and submitted something other than curriculum maps when requested by the team. In the cases where curriculum maps were provided, the maps did not always represent best practices. In some cases, course numbers weren't identified, levels of instructional development (introduced, developed, and mastered) weren't specified, and corresponding PLOs weren't shown. The team found that curriculum mapping is still a relatively new concept and ArtCenter's programs vary in stages of development. ArtCenter acknowledges in its institutional report that, "It should be noted that departments are in varying stages of progress on the development and mapping of outcomes..." The team supports further work in these areas, addressing weaknesses noted above. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4)

Only three programs were able to demonstrate the use of rubrics that could be used in term review evaluations of student portfolios. These programs, Illustration, Product Design, and Integrated Studies, made excellent and convincing demonstrations to the team regarding their understanding of assessment and best practices in the use of rubrics. The team recommends that the work of these programs be highlighted by the institution for the benefit of other programs who continue to struggle and make slow progress. As ArtCenter acknowledges, the development and use of rubrics is also an important next step in their developing a culture of assessment. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)

The team also reviewed several course syllabi that had been provided by ArtCenter, representing a wide sampling across many degree programs, graduate and undergraduate. While many degree programs utilized the newly developed syllabus template, there were many programs that did not. The team found too many cases where important information that students need to be successful was not included in the course syllabus (i.e., required texts and materials, methods of evaluation, course learning outcomes, etc.). The team also found that a large number of the faculty do not know how to write measurable CLO statements. In many cases, faculty inserted course catalog descriptions under the heading of Course Learning Outcomes. While clearly the institution understands the need and merits of placing course learning outcomes into syllabi, the team finds that the faculty do not understand and need more training in how to craft appropriately measurable CLO statements for their syllabi. The Assessment Liaison Cohort and the syllabus template provide a good start in this direction. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)

Because ArtCenter's program level assessment processes are still new and developing, the team was not able to observe the use of any data that had been collected and analyzed for the purpose of improving student learning. Despite the development of good systems, practices, and infrastructure to introduce assessment into ArtCenter's culture, the team observed that the majority of its programs are only just beginning to learn, understand, and practice learning outcomes assessment. Considerably more training and a greater sense of urgency will need to be created by ArtCenter's leadership in order for ArtCenter's course and program level assessment practices to produce data and evidence of student learning. To date, none of ArtCenter's programs have progressed to the point where they conduct assessments regularly or annually.

There is no system of annual assessment reporting or faculty review and feedback on program assessment findings. The team finds that ArtCenter's program learning outcome assessment practices to be Initial with only a handful of programs that could be described as Emerging. The team advises ArtCenter to continue working toward developing ongoing, mature assessment processes that produce data and evidence of student learning for every degree program, every year. (CFR 2.3, 2.6, 4.1, 4.3)

In the area of WSCUC Core Competency assessment, ArtCenter notes that it began to develop systems for measuring student achievement in 2013-2014. ArtCenter decided to measure the core competencies at the level of the major, at or near the time of graduation. They used the American Association of Colleges & Universities' VALUE rubrics as launching points to define and distinguish levels of achievement according to each competency. ArtCenter chose to assess all five core competencies instead of only the required three. Three-hundred and twenty-five seniors were assessed in 2015 across ten undergraduate programs (BFA Film was allowed to use data from its 2014 assessment). This initial assessment allowed ArtCenter to establish benchmarks that it will now use for comparison in future years' assessments.

According to ArtCenter's findings, "The assessed students met or exceeded all the benchmarks established for 3 of the 5 competencies (Information Literacy, Quantitative Reasoning and Critical Thinking)... The students met 3 of the 4 benchmarks for Written Communication." Oral Communication was the only core competency where the benchmarks were not met, although not by much. Students' scores were between two and three point nine percent below ArtCenter's expected levels of achievement. Nonetheless, ArtCenter notes that

institutions undergoing WSCUC review in 2016 must demonstrate how they have closed the loop on at least one core competency. To this end, ArtCenter began implementing curricular changes and interventions in fall 2015 to further develop students' oral communication skills. ArtCenter writes that, "Since critique, class presentations and teamwork are integral and natural parts of major programs and the institutional culture, many opportunities exist to bolster this competency. Institutional Research will work with departments and faculty to begin re-assessing the Oral Core Competency in fall 2017 to assess the impact of this and other interventions." While ArtCenter appears to have begun to close the loop on oral communication skills, there is no data yet available to demonstrate that the interventions have. (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)

In conclusion, the team examined the organizational structure that has evolved at ArtCenter over the last four years in the area of assessment. The institution has created a Center for Educational Effectiveness which is overseen by the director of academic affairs and the director for institutional research. In an effort to prepare for this review, the institution reported to the team that the director for academic affairs was assigned the task of organizing the departments for program reviews, the director for institutional research was assigned the task of organizing the institution's core competency assessment efforts, and the director of faculty development was assigned the task of training faculty and program chairs in the areas of course and program level assessment. While each of these individuals developed excellent systems and laid a solid foundation for the continuing institutionalization of these new practices into ArtCenter's culture, an ad hoc organizational structure does not seem the most effective way to approach the tasks of educational effectiveness evaluation moving forward. While the work of assessment should be shared across various stakeholders within the institution, the organization

of the tasks might be better approached in a more coherent fashion. The team found the design of the Center for Educational Effectiveness to be problematic. Relying on three administrators with other, fulltime responsibilities and workloads to oversee, coordinate, and conduct the work of institutional assessment does not appear to be a sustainable or advisable practice. The team suggests that ArtCenter reconsider the organizational structure of the Center for Educational Effectiveness. Appointing a single, dedicated director may provide greater coherence, effectiveness, vision, efficiency, and long term sustainability. (2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

E. Component 5: Student success: student learning, retention and graduation

ArtCenter defines student success as “student learning and degree completion” (p 64). ArtCenter makes use of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to provide some measures of student learning and compares its data with an arts-specific group in NSSE, the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD)). ArtCenter has seen some very favorable NSSE results. In the 2014 administration of NSSE, 94% of respondents believe that their experience at ArtCenter contributed very much or quite a bit to their ability to think critically and analytically (highest among all peer groups) and 89% of seniors believe that their experience at ArtCenter contributed very much or quite a bit to their ability to acquire job-or-work related knowledge and skills (higher than AICAD peers). (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13)

ArtCenter has a wide-ranging collection of high impact practices in which students can be engaged. These practices are deeply rooted in the institution's innovative approach to art and design education. This impressive list of opportunities includes:

- Study Away which facilitates a number of international learning experiences
- Internships
- Designmatters courses which partner with non-profit organizations to address issues of social needs locally and globally
- Sponsored Projects which provide students the opportunity to work with professionals and industry leaders on “real world” problems
- DesignStorms which are one- to three-day intensive, innovative workshops during which students and faculty collaborate with sponsoring partners to conduct research on materials technology or future market opportunities
- Student/Faculty Research which allows a student the opportunity to work one-on-one with a faculty member on a research project.
- Grad Show which is the culminating experience for seniors and provides them with an opportunity to display their work to professionals and prospective employers as well as their family and friends.

It is clear that ArtCenter is providing a rich environment where students can further develop and exercise their talents. Further information about student learning and program review can be found in the section on component 4 & component 6. (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)

The 2014 administration of NSSE also surfaced some areas of concern in the co-curricular area. In particular, only 45% of seniors reported believing that the ArtCenter emphasizes providing support for overall well-being (recreation, health care, and counseling). In addition, seniors provided disappointing ratings on some key markers of engagement: use of learning support services (33%), attending campus activities and events (23%), and attending events that address important social, economic or political issues (22%). Only 36% of seniors rated ArtCenter as doing a good job in providing opportunities for students to be involved socially.

ArtCenter has used this data as a basis for the design of institutional improvements. The Center for the Student Experience (CSE) oversees student support services, international student advising, diversity programs, student conduct, services for students with disabilities, leadership programs, campus-wide student events, clubs and organizations, and student health. The CSE has several initiatives underway to address concerns raised in the NSSE data. This includes a more robust student orientation, a broader variety of social activities and additional ways to incorporate students' families into the life of the ArtCenter community. The 2011-16 Strategic Plan called for CSE to re-energize its work in promoting health and wellness and the CSE now offers a variety of classes and seminars, access to the gym at Occidental College and stress-relieving events during exam periods. The student affairs staff reports that these interventions appear to be working effectively. (CFRs 2.13, 4.1)

ArtCenter has done an excellent job of looking at graduation and retention data within their unique context. Because of year-round admission and enrollment, ArtCenter has a limited

number of first-time freshmen entering in the fall, but it does benchmark that population's retention and graduation rates against peers from the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD) schools. Its data has been similar to the peers with the notable exception of freshman retention for the fall 2013 and fall 2014 cohorts. The Strategic Enrollment Management Committee has discussed these results, which seem to be tied, in part, to a short-term change in retention in the Illustration major. To better understand student trends and allow for disaggregation, ArtCenter also looks at graduation and retention rates for the entire pool of first time students (whether or not they are freshmen) and includes all starts (fall, spring and summer) across and academic year. The report states that disaggregating retention data has identified an opportunity for intervention aimed at African-American students; however, those interventions are not yet designed. (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14)

ArtCenter has also disaggregated retention and graduation data by major program of study. Through review of the departmental data, the college has identified opportunities for formalized programming for two departments: Transportation Design and Illustration Design. Transportation Design is working with the provost on a holistic approach to retention and graduation. Illustration Design is formally working with the director of academic advising to identify at-risk students. Because Illustration is such a large major, the department would like support in providing a research-based "invasive" model of advising and intervening with these at-risk students. Advertising, Entertainment Design, Environmental Design and Film are all seeing strong retention rates (above 80%). Perhaps there are things that can be learned from these programs. (CFRs 2.3, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

It is interesting to note that the institutional data shows that the time to degree has been increasing over the last few years. The data has been considered by a wide variety of institutional leadership and two actions have been taken:

- Provost is starting to establish retention and graduation targets for some departments undergoing program review.
- Several departments were asked to decrease the number of credits needed for an undergraduate degree.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the initial changes are making positive impacts. (CFR 2.10)

To support student success, the Student Success Task Force was convened by the provost in the spring of 2015. The charter states that the task force is to “help the College cultivate strong, consistent, and effective strategies in support of student success. To this end, the task force will identify workgroups to conduct an assessment of the College’s current practices and resources, making recommendations for changes to related policies, practices and procedures resulting from research findings.” The findings of this report have led to several key changes in the student life programming which include:

- A redesigned new student orientation process that makes use of an extensive group of peer leaders and has new students engaging with one another across ethnic, racial, and program of study boundaries.
- “Working It” which is a series of student success workshops that have been well attended. The topics of the workshops include self-awareness, leadership, cultural

awareness, and engagement with the local community in the form of field trips and neighborhood exploration.

- Solidification of the Care Team which seeks to intervene early with students facing challenges. This team is a “one stop shop” for faculty, staff, and students who want to express concern about a student who is experiencing difficulty.
- Strengthening the institutional advising system. Additional resources are being devoted to building a professional advising staff that can engage in the best practices in “invasive advising” with at risk students, particularly in large majors where the faculty advising capacity is limited by the number of students studying in the program.

Institutional discussions about the results of the report from the Student Success Task Force have also provided a vehicle for increasing knowledge about where to refer students who need assistance. The student life staff feels that this has led to an increased number of referrals of students to specific offices to access services such as counseling, help with navigating life as an adult (e.g. negotiating with a landlord), and finding co-curricular opportunities to engage with other students. (CFRs 2.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Data gathered by the institution suggests that there is additional work to be done to recruit and retain diverse students. This has led to the formation of the Recruitment Task Force which includes representatives from the admissions staff and Chairs Council. The goal of this group is to strategize ways to address some of the recruitment challenges and opportunities for building a diverse student body. Areas of focus include: access and inclusion, limited brand awareness, affordability, support programs for student success and, perceptively, the need to define their objectives. The report states “Interwoven throughout all of these challenges is also a

lingering need for a clearer institutional definition of what the future success of ArtCenter looks like in terms of diversity, such that tactics can be aligned with this vision and the outcomes of these efforts can be assessed.” Discussions around these important issues have begun and the team’s conversation with the Council for Diversity and Inclusion indicate that the group is asking important questions and making steady progress in charting a way forward for ArtCenter in this area. (CFRs 2.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Though ArtCenter’s definition of student success does not explicitly state the employment of their graduates as one of the markers of success, it is clearly assumed in the ethos of the institution whose educational programs are created to shape art and design professionals. The institution has a strong system for tracking student employment and it is clearly seeing success in that area. The most recent data shows that 88% of their graduates are employed full-time, part-time or engaged in further education and the median earnings for their bachelor’s degree students is \$51,500.

F. Component 6: Sustainability: financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

ArtCenter has a very robust strategic planning process, evidenced by the two plan documents, Create Change 1.0 and 2.0. This process seems to engage all facets of the community in robust dialogue and is supported by the executive leadership and board. Of concern is the fact that the strategic plan is arguably too comprehensive to be practically accomplished. It reads more like a tactical plan than a strategic plan. The plan does not require

100% incremental funding, and there is an informal document that lays out how it will be funded through a combination of tuition revenue, fundraising, and gifts. (CFRs 3.4, 4.3)

As evidenced by the team's meeting with the board chair and chairs of key board committees, it appears that the board of trustees is a very engaged and robust group with a good governance model that ensures the sustainability of the institution from academic, financial, and operational perspectives. There are an appropriate number of members of the board and subcommittees to ensure that oversight and guidance is sufficient, dynamic, and proactive. Information flow between management and the board and amongst the board itself seems to work well and freely.

This flow of communication is supported by the administrative structure of the institution. A clear organizational structure in both the academic and administrative areas of the organization allows for flow of information and provides adequate forums for issues to be identified, assessed, and addressed. These structures, supported by committees at all levels, seem to provide a sufficient framework for ensuring educational effectiveness and to assess learning and improvement. A potential concern, as mentioned above, is the sheer number of committees and meetings that may contribute to a higher than ideal workload amongst the faculty and staff. Certain committees, particularly those staffed by faculty, may need more full-time faculty representation to be truly effective. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

The institution's Comprehensive Accreditation Report acknowledges that shared governance is a recent development at the institution. Even so, ArtCenter has done a

commendable job of seeking to engage all members of the community in the governance process, particularly the faculty. Further, the report goes in to great detail about the number of committees engaged in shared governance, their membership, and the goals of these committees. While the report also lists accomplishments of these committees, the report fails to tie these accomplishments in with the idea of shared governance, nor comment on the effectiveness of these accomplishments in enhancing, promoting, or maintaining the current level of shared governance at the institution. While it is clear that a large number of constituents are engaged in governance, it is less clear whether the desired outcomes are being achieved and how they are being achieved. Evidence gathered by the team around shared governance including a third-party report commissioned by the institution indicated that the primary barriers to an effective shared governance model include issues of communication between the administration and the faculty as well as the lack of consistent, timely feedback on issues raised through the various shared-governance channels. (CFRs 1.7, 3.10)

In looking at the institution's budget and planning process, the institution does have sufficient capacity and resources dedicated to financial viability. There is significant progress in this area since the 2012 Special Visit, especially in the creation of the position of director, budgeting and financial planning which appears to be driving the use of objective data in the planning process. (CFR 3.4)

The process itself is robust and comprehensive using a wide variety of environmental scanning information and internal data. Though the institutional report indicates that the annual planning process is guided by and supports the strategic plan, there is minimal data to support

this assertion. The plan does not have any prioritization and budget process materials do not define or identify how they support the plan.

Of particular note is ArtCenter's statement that it will limit the rate of tuition increase to the long-term rate of inflation, or 3.4%. While an admirable position to take with regard toward student affordability, it seems short-sighted and potentially limits the school's future financial flexibility. The five-year budget planning process seems to have been an effective method of aligning enrollment with the strategic plan in terms of new programs and enrollment growth while correcting structural budget gaps with regard to financial aid. (CFRs 3.8, 4.6, 4.7)

The institutional report then mentions, in passing, compensation and compensation studies for faculty and staff, but neither describes the result of those studies, or any action taken by the institution. Evidence gathered during the site visit indicates that salary studies are used in determining faculty compensation levels and allocations to salary lines; this seems sufficient. (CFR 4.2)

The institution's facilities seem adequate for the size and nature of the programs and for the student body. Again, as a recurring theme, the institution should consider what level of continued investment in physical facilities is supported by enrollment trend data, financial metrics, and overall alignment with the strategic plan. Create Change 2.0 does a good job of emphasizing the need to have on-campus housing and physical structures that support learning and student success. The plan states a goal to have 2000 FTE students by 2020, which the

institution is on track to exceed, highlighting further the need for housing, particularly in the institution's stated goal of student access and affordability. (CFR 3.5)

Finally, this section of the team's report concludes with the institution's perspective and preparedness for the changing higher education environment. The ArtCenter report includes little specific discussion of the institution's approach to meeting this challenge other than the generic statement "ArtCenter is constantly adapting plans to accommodate new and pedagogically exciting learning models..." Specific to institutional operations, the team questions what other steps ArtCenter is taking to position itself as a viable business entity in the face of an uncertain operating and regulatory environment. To be adequately prepared, ArtCenter should address these and other similar questions specifically.

Conversely, in conversation with ArtCenter's faculty, staff, and administration, it is clear that responsiveness to a changing environment is very much a topic of conversation and at the forefront of the planning and resource allocation discussions. ArtCenter's responsiveness is evidenced by its desire to increase student access and affordability and provide student housing as well as additional student life programming for a growing traditional age student body. (CFR 4.7)

G. Component 7: Reflection and plans for improvement

The conclusion of the ArtCenter's Comprehensive WSCUC Report addresses clearly the thoughtful consideration and effort put into "the balance between rigorous review and thoughtful but nimble improvement." The team affirms that the college accurately understood and has

focused on the areas raised by the Commission for further institutional focus and development; the role of faculty in governance (shared governance) and student learning and program review. Additionally, ArtCenter has devoted considerable energy on issues identified as essential to successfully mapping its way forward: strategic planning, faculty compensation, diversity and inclusion, and the board of trustees.

The team concludes that ArtCenter took preparation of WSCUC Accreditation Report as an opportunity to meaningfully engage in the above-mentioned areas and to act on them with an eye toward institutional improvement.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations:

1. The team commends ArtCenter for devoting significant time to the development and fulfillment of its strategic plan Create Change 1.0 as well as the recently adopted Create Change 2.0.
2. Best practices have informed ArtCenter’s development of systems, policies, professional development offerings, and handbooks relating to program review and assessment. The amount of work the institution has committed to building systems for learning outcomes assessment and program review is impressive.
3. ArtCenter is dynamic, focused on the future, and keenly aware of developments and trends in the disciplines the institution offers. The institution maintains a programmatic focus on professionalism and fosters strong industry connections.
4. ArtCenter has effectively re-energized, re-populated and re-engaged the board of trustees.
5. The institution is financially healthy and finances are well managed.
6. The team commends the ArtCenter for its earnest engagement with the challenges of diversity, accessibility and affordability.
7. ArtCenter is commended for its efforts to regularize faculty ranks, compensation, and reappointment procedures.

Recommendations:

1. Assessment of Learning Outcomes and Program Review

The team believes that ArtCenter has put significant effort into developing systems for program review and assessment; however, it is critical for these processes to be implemented throughout the institution. Therefore, the team recommends that:

- ArtCenter attend to completing the program reviews for all of its degree programs, General Education program, and co-curricular areas with greater urgency.
- The institution strengthen course and program level assessment practices that produce data and evidence of student learning for every degree program.
- The organizational structure for the functions of educational effectiveness be consolidated for greater coherence.
- ArtCenter provide considerably more faculty training to ensure course and program level assessment processes reflect best practices which produce data and evidence of student learning

2. Shared Governance

The team believes that the relatively new shared governance model at ArtCenter is in an evolutionary stage requiring additional development to help it fully mature. Additionally, there does not appear to be a shared understanding of this governance model. The team therefore recommends that:

- The faculty and administration further discuss the meaning of shared governance in the ArtCenter context and the role that faculty, in particular, play in institutional decision-making. A common statement summarizing the conclusions of these discussions should be developed and widely shared.

- The effectiveness of the shared governance model, as currently constructed, be further evaluated, especially as it pertains to faculty. The results of the recent shared governance study may be a useful starting-point for review of the model's effectiveness.
- ArtCenter consider further how the contract-based faculty model, in particular the reliance on part-time faculty to populate key faculty governance groups, allows for stability and effective governance ownership.
- ArtCenter consider the role that faculty have in shared governance and institutional decision-making.

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms

1. Credit Hour Review

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Faculty Handbook and online catalog
	Comments: The policy is available in the Faculty Handbook, and appears in the Student Handbook on pages 13-14. It is also available at http://www.artcenter.edu/about/get-to-know-artcenter/policies-and-disclosures/enrollment-guidelines.html
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The provost reviews all new course proposals and syllabi of courses to be offered each term, often conferring with the department chair prior to their approval. While his review and approval are primarily qualitative in nature he also reviews whether the credit hour assignments are

	<p>appropriate to the course. His knowledge of the fields and experiences with faculty allow him to understand the disciplines' expectation, time requirements, etc. In this art design environment the time students spend in laboratories, studios, etc. almost universally exceed the minimum credit hour expectations. Given the inconsistencies found in reviewing sample syllabi, review of all courses offered by ArtCenter should be undertaken to address issues noted in the body of the visiting team report.</p>
<p>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</p>	<p>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</p> <p>X <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: ArtCenter courses are predominantly studio and lab based. Three -unit courses meet 37.5 hours per 15 week semester. Out of class work in the studio or lab are expected to be considerable, well beyond the typical 1 hour in class and two hours out of class expectations for each credit awarded. Syllabi reviewed were not consistent in showing in-class and out-of-class hour expectations. This should be corrected.</p>
<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses</p> <p><i>Please review at least 1 -</i></p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A</p> <p>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?</p> <p>What degree level(s)?</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</p>

<p>2 from each degree level.</p>	<p>hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>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)</p> <p>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? 17</p> <p>What kinds of courses? On ground courses for the majors (programs), most of which include laboratory and/or studio time</p> <p>What degree level(s)? undergraduate and graduate</p> <p>What discipline(s)? Entertainment Design, Graduate Film, Humanities & Sciences, Graduate Industrial Design, Integrated Studies/Product Design, Graduate Environmental Design, Industrial Design (undergraduate), Product Design, Film, Photography, Graduate Transportation and Systems Design, Art (graduate and undergraduate), Illustration</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X <input type="checkbox"/> YES (general) <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Syllabi include an 'INSTRUCTION/HOMEWORK' section which provides the amount of time weekly expected to be spent in lecture/discussion, instruction/demonstration, critique, studio time and laboratory. Expectations for hours spent in in-class and out-of-class activities ranged from very clear to incomplete so it was not possible to assess whether and how credit hour expectations are being met. In some instances out-of-class homework time expectations were too low for 3 unit courses. Not all syllabi identified which elements of class time including lecture/discussion, instruction/demonstration/video, critique, studio/lab time, and/or fieldwork were part of that course. All syllabi reviews should address any required information that is lacking.</p>
<p>Sample program</p>	<p>How many programs were reviewed? 11</p>

information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Film, Environmental Design, Advertising, Transportation Design, Graduate Industrial Design, Illustration, Graphic Design, Fine Arts, Photography and Imaging, Art, Media Design Practices, Interaction Design
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate and graduate
	What discipline(s)? NA
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES (generally) <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p>Comments: Each academic program has its own web page which describes the course of study, course descriptions and learning outcomes. In most instances the specific length of each program is shown in the number of terms (3 full terms per academic year) and units required for the degree.</p> <p>However, in some cases, required courses and credit awarded are provided without a description of the length of the program or total units required for the degree. Program information reviewed in the catalog does not address program length per se although it can be calculated based on term-by-term course requirements and units to complete the degree.</p>

Review Completed By: Brenda Barham Hill

Date: March 28, 2017

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

<p>Material Reviewed</p>	<p>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</p>
<p>**Federal regulations</p>	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Comments:</p> <p>All recruiting staff is paid a fixed salary. ArtCenter does not work with any outside or foreign recruiters. Their recruiting team engages in a large number of outreach activities (425 school visits per year). They also work with local partners in the arts. The recruiting staff travels to international locations to recruit spending a few weeks each year in locations that include: Asia (China and South Korea), Western Europe, and South America (Brazil). They also recruit in Mexico and Canada.</p>
<p>Degree completion and cost</p>	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Basic information about per term costs readily available on the ArtCenter website (http://www.artcenter.edu/admissions/tuition-and-aid/estimate-of-additional-costs.html). For each major the number of units to degree is also readily available so it is simple for student to estimate time to degree and total cost. Because the institution runs year-round, students can take up to three terms of coursework per year if that is what they desire.</p>
<p>Careers and employment</p>	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input type="checkbox"/> X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>All of this information is readily available on their website and in printed promotional material.</p>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Maria Zack

Date: March 28, 2017

3. Student Complaints Review

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Available in the online Student Handbook.</p> <p>Comments: The ArtCenter Student Code of conduct located in the online Student Handbook addresses student grievance policies and procedures.</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p>

	<p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Student Handbook provides a detailed process for responding to student complaints in several areas, including sexual misconduct, intellectual property, academic concerns and conduct-related procedures.</p>
<p>Records</p>	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? The general student complaint records including conducted-related procedures are maintained in the Center for the Student Experience. Records relating to academic concerns are maintained by the Office of the Provost.</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>The assistant dean of students is the student grievance officer. She has served in this role for many years and follows a clearly defined procedure for both academic and student conduct grievances.</p> <p>The dean of students monitors the nature of student grievances as they arise and over time. There does not appear to be an inordinate number of grievances and the nature of those</p>

	<p>grievances falls within a range of issues that would be expected at any institution of higher education.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>A record of student grievances is maintained by Student Grievance Officer even when a grievance has been passed to a more appropriate office (e.g. academic department chair, HR). Where a student a grievance is handed off to another office at ArtCenter the Student Grievance Officer is informed that the matter has been resolved, addressed, etc. The dean of students office maintains records for a minimum of six years, per WSCUC policy.</p>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Brenda Barham Hill

Date: March 29, 2017

4. Transfer Policy Review

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

<p>Material Reviewed</p>	<p>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</p>
<p>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</p>	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? The policy is in the online catalog for ArtCenter.</p> <hr/> <p>Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Transfer credit for Humanities & Sciences (general studies) is assessed by an experienced member of the Registrar's staff who consults with department chairs as appropriate.</p> <p>Transfer credit for academic program is reviewed and approved by department chair to ensure equivalence with departmental courses.</p>
--	---

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Brenda Hill

Date: March 29, 2017

B. Off-Campus Locations, as appropriate

Not applicable.

C. Distance Education, as appropriate

Not applicable.