OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR) SUMMARY OF LINES OF INQUIRY GUIDE

**Directions:** This form is to be completed by the team at the conclusion of its daylong Offsite Review of the institutional report and supporting materials. The form will be sent to the institution within one week by the WSCUC liaison, and a response to section IV will be sent back from the institution eight weeks in advance of the Accreditation Visit. This form can be in a bulleted list, outline or narrative format. Please do not delete this first page, i.e., this cover page. Instead complete information as requested and submit it with the Lines of Inquiry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution under Review: California State University, Chico __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Offsite Review: 12/4/18 ___________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Chair: Barbara Sawrey ________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Offsite Review team recommends the following actions be taken:

__X_ Proceed with the Accreditation Visit scheduled in: March 2019 ____________________

___ Reschedule the Accreditation Visit to: ______________________________________

The reason(s) the Team recommends rescheduling the visit is/are:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Due date for institutional response to Section IV (specify exact date):

February 7, 2019 ___________________________________________________________
I. **Overview of the lines of inquiry.**

This document identifies 13 lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution’s report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR) that may be pursued during the visit. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section IV: “The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit.”

II. **Commendations.** The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

- Resilience: the university has pulled through a period of great challenges while prioritizing institutional morale and trust;
- Candid report: you have made strong efforts to address the areas identified in the last commission letter (student engagement, instructional effectiveness, accountability);
- Growing attention to data governance and Institutional Research, with the intention of using data to inform student success and decision-making (for example, faculty fellows program, assessment of second-language learners’ skills, and program review data);
- Academic assessment is embedded in academic programs and colleges;
- Good start in assessing student affairs’ co-curriculum, and in using student outcomes to inform student support services;
- GE Pathways program, with links to interdisciplinary minors, is impressive, serving as a foundational and common experience that anchors the quality of the undergraduate degree;
- Response to service area needs in the North State is strong and committed;
- Large portion of graduate students are integrated into research, service, and teaching;
- Laudable overall improvements in retention and graduation rates and in reducing achievement gap while increasing diversity — in part due to implementation of technology related to student success and degree progress; and
- Commendable efforts to diversify revenue.

III. **Lines of inquiry.** The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit:

1. Since the time of report’s writing, there have been many changes: local and regional, national and international (from fires to federal policies). How will these changes affect your strategic enrollment plan and faculty recruitment?
2. In response to WSCUC Component 7, how are you planning to address the changing educational environment?
3. We are interested in learning about your continued progress in the areas of institutional morale, trust, and shared governance.
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4. Help us understand how you are planning to strengthen data collection, analysis, and use to inform strategic decision-making. How is IR supporting, or how will IR support in the future, these activities?
5. What are your goals for distance education, online education, and completion programs, and how are these being assessed?
6. Strategic Planning: how will the new Academic Plan, Physical Master Plan, Financial Plan, and Strategic Plan be sequenced and integrated as you move ahead? In the Academic Master Plan, what considerations and metrics will you use to determine which programs to continue, grow, or transform?
7. Please provide examples of how Chico State is using Academic Assessment Councils to ensure the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees. How do you align the process and standards of programmatic accreditation with your own program review standards and goals?
8. What metrics are you using to determine the meaning, quality, and integrity of the graduate and credential programs?
9. GE Pathways: what implementation challenges have you identified and how will you address them while also maintaining and growing the program’s many strengths?
10. How are faculty being supported and rewarded in improving pedagogy and using classroom technology?
11. Writing requirements are changing on campus. What baseline assessment plan do you have?
12. How and why are you spending your reserves?
13. The institutional report shows negative trends on the primary reserve ratio, net operating revenues ratio, and viability ratio. How comfortable are you about these trends, and are you doing long-range forecasting? How are you planning to address current budget challenges? What examples of lean process management can you offer?

IV. Request for additional documents and information. The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information approximately one month before the Accreditation Visit:

1. Core competencies review, including benchmarks
2. Recent GE full program review
3. Breakdown of retention, graduation and time to degree rates by student profile (gender, ethnicity, income, etc.), including transfer students, full and part-time undergraduate students, and graduate students (by program)
4. New academic budget model: what is it, how is it used, how is it integrated into Academic Program review and the university’s operating budget planning.
5. In addition to Communication Design, give more examples of curriculum revision that were informed and motivated by program review.
6. CFPE (Credit for Prior Experience): provide criteria for awarding academic credit for prior experience
7. Can we have an enrollment update?
8. Can we have an update of faculty hiring and diversity plans?
9. Can we have an update on the university’s fiscal year 2020 budget projections and an operating forecast for fiscal 2019?
10. How are you measuring (and how will you address) time to degree for masters’ degrees? Please break down median and normative measures by discipline.
11. Update on capital campaign progress and goals

V. Individuals and groups to meet during the visit. The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit:

- Academic Senate leadership
- Academic Assessment Council (both university-level and college level from colleges of Natural Sciences and Behavioral and Social Sciences)
- IR staff
- Students (graduate and undergraduate, including transfer students and distance ed, and undergraduate students in degree completion programs)
- Faculty (tenure stream and adjunct)