

**Recommendation to Remove Stipulations for  
Fresno Pacific University  
February 2012**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda item presents a report on the progress of Fresno Pacific University to address the stipulations noted in their April 2010 Accreditation Site Visit.

**Staff Recommendation**

After review of the documentation submitted by Fresno Pacific University and subsequent phone calls and emails, staff have concluded that FPU has made, and continues to make, considerable progress in addressing the issues identified at the 2010 accreditation site visit related to Common Standard 2. As a result of a review of the documentation and the discussions, staff recommends the following:

Stipulation 2: Staff recommends removal of the stipulation.

Additional information on this recommendation is provided below.

**Background**

In April 2010, a site visit team recommended that the COA grant Accreditation with Stipulations to Fresno Pacific University base on the findings from the accreditation site visit. In addition to a Standard 2 stipulation, a stipulation was given for Standard 1 which was removed by action of the COA at its August 2011 meeting.

Stipulation 2 as approved by the Committee on Accreditation in 2010 stated:

*That the Fresno Pacific University School of Education develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes and use of that data for unit improvement. In addition, that the SOE provide evidence that assessment is being used systematically for program improvement in all programs.*

The findings that led to the COA stipulation for Standard 2 were identified in the report as follows:

○ **Common Standard 2: Not Met**

- Requires that institutions develop systematic collection, analysis, and use of data for improvement purposes. The Fresno Pacific University School of Education was in its infancy at the program level and had not begun this system at the unit level. Interviews with unit and program leaders made it clear that they recognized the need for, and importance of, using data as the basis for program improvement efforts. While each program reviewed individual candidate performance and proficiency data for the purposes of recommending credentials, ongoing and comprehensive data collection, analysis, and use of results for the purpose of program improvement was lacking in most programs.

- Requires that all programs make use of data for Biennial Report purposes. The data submitted by most programs did not reflect the specificity of focus needed to be useful. The amount, type and validity of data varied across programs and did not reflect a systematic approach to data use for program improvement.
- Requires that the unit develop an overall, comprehensive, unit-wide evaluation system for the systematic collection, analysis and use of data for program and unit improvement and that the data be collected and analyzed on a unit-wide basis and that these data serve as the basis for ongoing unit improvement. The team found that data were not yet being collected at the unit level for the purpose of ongoing unit evaluation and improvement.

### **Staff Analysis of FPU’s Progress in Addressing the Stipulations**

Below is a summary list of major concerns discussed in the accreditation team report as they relate to Common Standard 2, leading to Stipulation 2:

- Inconsistencies among programs in “ongoing and comprehensive data collection, analysis, and use of results for the purpose of program improvement”
- Lack of a coordinated, unit-wide assessment system [or process]

Below is a summary list of evidence submitted by Fresno Pacific University to demonstrate progress in addressing Stipulation 2:

- FPU developed a Compliance Matrix to document assessments for each Common Standard and candidate competencies in each approved program.
- FPU submitted a document that clearly describes the unit assessment plan. The plan addresses the Commission’s Common Standards.
- All evaluation instruments required by the Matrix have been developed, with some scheduled to be used for the first time in AY 2011-12.
- An Assessment Coordinator was hired and began work in April 2011.
- Assessment Day meetings were conducted in May 2011, during which faculty reviewed assessment data from their respective programs, analyzed those data, and formulated plans for program improvements to be implemented in AY 2011-12.
- The Dean and Assessment Coordinator developed a Program Assessment Plan template for each program to use in developing program-by-program assessment plans to identify signature assignments and other assessments to be used for evaluating candidates’ attainment of program goals and requirements. The purpose of this template was to ensure that all programs approach the development of their Program Assessment Plans in a consistent and comprehensive manner.
- The Assessment Coordinator completed an “audit” of each program to determine where it is with respect to the development of its Program Assessment Plan and to identify steps to be taken to complete this work. The Assessment Coordinator is assigned to work with each program to ensure the completion of the Program Assessment Plans for each program offered by the institution.

- University Day (first official day of academic year) included the presentation of Program Improvement Plans by each program and development of implementation plans for AY 2011-12.
- Dean plans to meet weekly with the Assessment Coordinator in AY 2011-12 to support each program in developing and implementing its Program Assessment Plan.
- Assessment calendars for each credential program have been developed.
- The Office of the Dean prepared a template for the calendar and submitted a draft to the CTC liaison in August, 2011 and received approval for the template.
- The Assessment and Student Success Coordinator began meetings with the program directors in October. Our Coordinator left his position midway through October, delaying the completion of this effort. A new Coordinator was hired to complete the process.
- The Office of the Dean reviewed all the assessment calendars, standardized the format, and ensured the completeness of the assessment calendar
- The Office of the Dean completed a meta-Assessment Calendar for assessment activities engaged in by the Unit.
- Assessment Calendars submitted to the CTC December 1, 2011.

***Rationale for Staff Recommendation***

Based on the evidence reviewed, staff believes that FPU has made significant progress toward addressing Stipulation 2. As part of the August 2011 meeting agenda item, staff proposed that FPU provide the following evidence to demonstrate that the assessment system is not only fully developed, but also being implemented by the University:

- 1) Evidence from *University Day*—first day of fall semester—on the plans for the implementation of the Unit and Program Assessment Plan in AY 2011-12.
- 2) A fully developed Program Assessment Plan for each program.

At this time, staff believes it has enough evidence to recommend removal of the Stipulation 2 and a recommendation of ***Accreditation***. Further demonstration of the implementation of the Program Assessment Plan will be evidenced in future Biennial Reports from FPU, as data from those assessments is included and further refinements of the system will be documented.