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Institutional Overview

City University of Seattle is one of the largest private, not-for-profit, postsecondary educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest. It occupies an important and unique position in the higher education marketplace—a nontraditional university that was conceived and developed for the primary purpose of providing educational opportunities to underserved working adults in the Pacific Northwest; it now brings similar opportunities to students around the world. CityU currently enrolls over six thousand students worldwide, and confers more than 1,200 associate’s, bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees each year.

CityU’s mission permeates every decision and action of the institution: “[t]o change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.” The mission captures CityU’s belief that a student’s potential is not circumscribed by his or her past performance; the mission also guides a consistent commitment to expand access to educational programs to those with the basic qualifications necessary to enter, while removing unnecessary barriers to entry. These attributes are reflected in the institution’s Core Themes.

Once admitted, students are held to high performance expectations by faculty who apply consistent academic standards and incorporate relevant real-life experiences and knowledge. Courses are designed to require students to produce evidence that demonstrates their ability to meet the real-world demands of today’s professional environments. CityU gives students, whose paths to higher education might include long periods of time away from school, the chance to show what they can do in class and in practice. The majority of students who are admitted to the university are required to demonstrate learning through capstones, major projects, internships, examinations, and other assessments to ensure they exit with the requisite skills, capabilities, and knowledge.

The design and delivery of its programs are driven by the values that CityU holds. It is flexible in both the design and delivery of programs and services to be convenient to students. It is accessible by providing educational opportunities to anyone, anywhere. It is innovative through continually creating new educational opportunities. It is relevant, ensuring what is taught today can be applied tomorrow. And it is global in the access it provides, the integration of its programs worldwide, and the opportunities that students are provided to study abroad.

CityU concentrates its offerings in fields that lead directly to employment and/or certifications. Its programs are in the disciplines of management, technology, education, counseling and psychology, and leadership. This range of offerings allows CityU to be simultaneously inclusive in the fields in which it provides degrees while focused on the particular fields that its community sees as providing opportunities for advancement and certification.

CityU implements its educational model through its practitioner-oriented educational delivery structure. In the 2017–2018 academic year, CityU employed over 492 Associate Faculty worldwide, each of whom was screened at the outset to ensure excellence in academic credentials (many have terminal degrees or doctorates) and relevant current experience in the field of practice related to the subject matter they teach. The Associate Faculty are, by and large, working professionals — accountants, teachers, principals, counselors, project managers, IT security directors, school district superintendents — with multiple years of progressive experience in their fields. On average they have taught at City University of Seattle for over five years. CityU’s hiring protocol includes a rigorous initial interview and teaching demonstration. Faculty selected for hire participate in a New Faculty Orientation, which includes a familiarization with the university’s goals, operations, and policies; its approach to teaching and learning; training on the use of its online learning management platform to support instruction; and mentoring in the first quarter of teaching. Each quarter students have the opportunity to rate the quality of instruction and the curriculum via the university’s systematic course evaluation protocol. Faculty undergo a comprehensive evaluation after four years of service if not sooner. For policies regarding Associate Faculty evaluations, see Appendix 21.D.

Teaching faculty are identified and supervised by a cohort of Academic Program Directors and Associate Program Directors, collectively known as the Administrative Faculty. The Administrative Faculty are generally full-time, though some are part time. Each academic degree program is overseen by a designated Program Director, often supported by Associate Program Directors, who are collectively responsible for ensuring the staffing of the courses and managing the curriculum.
INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

CityU uses a common curriculum regardless of where the course is offered or the mode in which it is offered -- in-class, online, or mixed mode. Learning outcomes, at the program and course levels, are consistent; yet learning activities and resources can be customized to meet the needs of specific student groups, with an emphasis on consistent evidence of student achievement. The use of Blackboard, an online Learning Management System (LMS), supports this consistency by ensuring all students have access to a common set of course documents and reference materials. Faculty may add material and make the course their own, within the standards established by the program. This model also supports regional variations, which is especially important given CityU’s global reach. For example, business and management classes in Europe incorporate information about the European Union’s legal system to a greater extent than in the United States.

All programs also incorporate the University’s six Learning Goals, which provide that all CityU graduates will:

1. Exhibit professional competency and a sense of professional identity, bring to the workplace the knowledge and skills intrinsic to professional success, understand the basic values and mission of the fields in which they are working, use technology to facilitate their work, understand basic technical concepts, and demonstrate understanding through practical application.

2. Employ strong communication and interpersonal skills, communicate effectively both orally and in writing, interact and work with others in a collaborative manner, negotiate difficult interpersonal situations to bring about solutions to problems that benefit all involved.

3. Demonstrate critical thinking and information literacy, think critically and creatively; reflect upon their own work and the larger context in which it takes place; find, access, evaluate, and use information to solve problems, and consider the complex implications of actions they take and decisions they make.

4. Make a strong commitment to ethical practice and service in their professions and communities, take responsibility for their own actions and exhibit high standards of conduct in their professional lives; be aware of the ethical expectations of their profession and hold themselves accountable to those standards, be active contributors to their professional communities and associations, and informed and socially responsible citizens of their communities, as well as of the world.

5. Embrace diverse and global perspectives; work collaboratively with individuals from a variety of backgrounds, learn from the beliefs, values, and cultures of others, realize that varied viewpoints bring strength and richness to the workplace; and demonstrate an awareness of the interrelation of diverse components of a project or situation.

6. Commit to lifelong learning, becoming self-directed and information-literate in seeking out ways to continue learning throughout their lifetimes.

The full CityU Academic Model can be found in Appendix 6.

Core Themes

The mission, vision, and values of CityU provide the foundation for its Core Themes. The University has established objectives, indicators and associated measures to achieve its mission through the execution of its Core Themes.

CityU’s four Core Themes are:

- **Core Theme 1**: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education;
- **Core Theme 2**: Ensure Student Access and Success;
- **Core Theme 3**: Strengthen Global Connections;
- **Core Theme 4**: Foster Lifelong Learning.

CityU tracks its Core Themes, as well as the associated objectives, indicators and measures through a dynamically updated dashboard built upon Microsoft’s Power Business Intelligence platform. Progress on the objectives, indicators, and measures is tracked and made easily available through this platform. Analyzing this data informs program assessment, performance management, and strategic decision making/planning.
Assessment of Learning

All CityU faculty are actively engaged in assessing student learning related to the six CityU Learning Goals and the specific program learning outcomes that are defined by each program. Through the use of secondary rubrics, Program Directors gather and analyze direct evidence of student learning and apply the lessons learned to program improvement. The diagram to the right provides an overview of the assessment process, each step of which is described in the narrative that follows.

Program Design – As new programs are designed, or existing programs undergo substantial revision, a set of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are identified and established that are aligned with industry needs. These Program Learning Outcomes are the behaviors and knowledge that graduates should be able to demonstrate upon completion of the program. Additionally, all CityU programs are designed to integrate all six of the City University Learning Goals (CULGs). The alignment of these goals with the program outcomes is determined in this Program Design stage.

Course and Shell Design – Once the Program Learning Outcomes are established and aligned to the CityU Learning Goals, a series of courses are developed that comprise the program. Each course has a series of course level outcomes that, again, specify what the student will be able to do upon successful completion of that course. The course outcomes are aligned with and support the Program Learning Outcomes. A curriculum map is used to ensure that all Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals have been sufficiently accounted for across the courses. This map indicates where specific assessments are used to assess student performance at the course, program and/or learning goal level. When the course documents are completed, they are translated into a Blackboard shell in the LMS that captures the design of each course and its alignment with the Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals.

Primary Rubric Assessments – As each course's Blackboard shell is created, a rubric for every major assessment is designed to facilitate useful and timely feedback from the instructor to the student. Instructors are expected to make comments on, and complete a rubric for, every assignment in each course.

Secondary Rubric Assessments – Once all of the courses in a program are completed, the curriculum map is used to determine the incorporation of secondary rubrics. These secondary rubrics are used to track student performance on CityU's Program Learning Outcomes and/or CityU Learning Goals. When there is a major assessment that can provide insight on the student’s progress relative to a program outcome or a learning goal, that assessment will have a secondary rubric attached to it. The instructor evaluates this assessment twice. The first assessment is to provide feedback to the student. The second time is to indicate how well the student demonstrates competence on the program outcome or learning goal. Throughout the program, instructors complete both a primary and a secondary rubric for every assessment that has both rubrics.

This secondary rubric data is gathered and assessed in aggregate to determine the percentage of students who are performing “at standard” or “above standard” on each Program Learning Outcome and each CityU Learning Goal. Over the life of the program, there are a sufficient number of secondary rubrics to assess each program outcome and learning goal to properly and comprehensively assess the student performance in the program.

Similarly, the secondary rubric data includes the percentage of students performing “below standard,” which provides an opportunity for program level assessment of why some students may be struggling with particular Program Learning Outcomes or CityU Learning Goals.

Furthermore, secondary rubric data is gathered and stored in CityU’s data warehouse so that it can be displayed and analyzed in a Microsoft Power BI dashboard. This dashboard allows both faculty and administrators to view...
results by program for specific Program Learning Outcomes and / or CityU Learning Goals. It becomes very simple and clear to determine if student performance is meeting or exceeding the 80% goal of being “at standard” or “above standard” that the CityU has set for itself. This secondary rubric data can also be displayed and analyzed across the University allowing faculty and administrators to see the performance of students university-wide on all of the CityU Learning Goals. An example of the Secondary Rubric dashboard can be found in Appendix 5.

**Academic Program Assessment Process** – Each year, every academic program is required to go through the academic assessment process. In preparation for this process, each Academic Program Director works with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to prepare an Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR). A key part of this report evidences the program’s performance on secondary rubrics. Program Directors are expected to evaluate the performance of their programs relative to student performance, instructor evaluations, enrollments, and other key performance indicators. Where there is a clear need to improve, the Program Director must formulate an improvement plan for the coming year including any changes that need to be made to the program’s design to improve performance on secondary rubrics.

APAR results have been systematically captured in CityU’s data warehouse, again allowing both faculty and administrators to see and analyze program performance for quality assurance and continuous improvement. A description of the APAR process can be found in Appendix 7.

**Academics Overview**

City University of Seattle consists of four schools and one institute as well as Canadian Operations and the Washington Academy of Languages. The four schools and one institute are:

- The Albright School of Education
- The School of Applied Leadership
- The School of Arts and Sciences
- The School of Management
- The Technology Institute

Each academic program may have a number of specializations that students can choose from. The major academic program areas are distributed across the four schools as follows:

**The Albright School of Education**

Dean: Dr. Kelly Flores  
Associate Dean: Dr. Vicki Butler  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Program Area</th>
<th>Program Director(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Education</td>
<td>Dr. Bryan Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Teaching</td>
<td>Steve Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education</td>
<td>Sharon Hartung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The School of Applied Leadership**

Dean: Dr. Kelly Flores  
Associate Dean: Greg Price  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Program Area</th>
<th>Program Director(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Leadership</td>
<td>Dr. Pressley Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education in Adult Education</td>
<td>Dr. Jan Lüdert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s in Education in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Dr. Marge Chow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education in Leadership</td>
<td>Dr. Joel Domingo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Arts and Sciences
Dean: Dr. Kelly Flores
Associate Dean: Dr. Ellen Carruth

Major Program Area                          Program Director(s)
Associate of Science in General Studies .................................... Cindy Singleton
Bachelor of Science in General Studies ......................................... Cindy Singleton
Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology ...................................... Anna Cholewinska
Bachelor of Arts in Human Services .......................................... Anna Cholewinska
Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice .................................. Dr. Vincenzo Sainato
Master of Education in Professional School Counseling ............... Karen Toler
Master of Arts in Counseling .................................................. Dr. Ellen Carruth

The School of Management
Dean: Tom Cary, JD
Associate Dean: Dr. Laura Williamson

Major Program Area                          Program Director(s)
Associate of Science in Business ....................... Dr. Payam Sadat
Bachelor of Arts in Management ....................................... Jodey Lingg
Bachelor of Arts in Management – Performance Based .................. Corrine Holden
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration ................. Dr. Payam Sadat
Bachelor of Science in Health Care Administration ............. Christine Malone
Bachelor of Science in Project Management ...................... Linh Luong
Master of Business Administration (MBA) ..................... Dr. Laura Williamson
Master of Science in Project Management ..................... Linh Luong
Master of Health Care Administration ......................... Christine Malone
Master of Professional Accounting ......................... Christina Gerke
Doctor of Business Administration ....................... Dr. David Griffin

The Technology Institute
Dean: Tom Cary
Associate Dean: Dr. Simon Cleveland

Major Program Area                          Program Director(s)
Bachelor of Science in Information Systems ................. Dr. Bill Kaghan
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology ................. Dr. Bill Kaghan
Bachelor of Science in Applied Computing .................. Dr. Bill Kaghan
Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity and Information Assurance .................. Open position
Master of Science in Computer Science ...................... Dr. Simon Cleveland
Master of Science in Information Security .................. Open position

Canadian Programs
Vice President of Canadian Operations: Dr. Arden Henley

Major Program Area                          Program Director(s)
Bachelor of Arts in Management ......................... Dr. Tom Culham
Master of Education in Leadership ....................... Dr. Jill Taggart
Master of Education in School Counselling ................ Dr. Jill Taggart
Master of Counselling .................................................. Dr. Steve Conway
Washington Academy of Languages

Washington Academy of Languages (WAL), a Seattle based non-profit organization founded in 1980 and acquired by City University of Seattle in January 2012, provides academic English language programming, teacher training for English language instruction, and foreign language study. A key function of WAL is to assess international students upon arrival and provide English Language Programs (ELP) to those students who cannot meet CityU’s requirements for English language proficiency. WAL also provides language training classes in a number of languages and oversees a TESOL certificate program.

Accreditation

City University of Seattle was accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) in 1978 and continues to work with the Commission to meet the requirements necessary for sustaining its accreditation. CityU’s mission statement, with its strong focus on high quality and relevancy and its vision of educational access worldwide, requires a constant process of assessment and innovation, which frequently results in the development of new programs and new locations of operation. These changes require frequent communication with the Commission.

In addition to regional accreditation, CityU has pursued and earned the following program / discipline specific accreditations since the last full NWCCU team visit:

- Accrediting Body for Engineering and Technology (ABET) – Bachelor of Science in Information Systems
- Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) – Business programs
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP) – Master of Arts in Counseling
- Global Accreditation Commission of the Project Management Institute (GAC) – Master of Science in Project Management
- National Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Defense Education – Master of Science in Information Security
- Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) – All Teacher Certification Programs

Our Canadian programs must undergo a rigorous peer-review process that is specific to the province. CityU’s programs in British Columbia have been approved by the Degree Quality Assurance Board (DQAB). The programs in Alberta are approved by the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC).

Student Satisfaction

CityU completed its most recent annual Student Satisfaction Survey in the fall of 2017. This provided another collection of longitudinal data on questions that the University has used in student surveys for the past several years. Three key question that CityU tracks as indicators of overall quality and satisfaction are Return on Investment (ROI), overall satisfaction, and willingness to recommend. The percentage of students who agreed or strongly agreed with these statements is shown below:

Key Student Satisfaction Survey Results = 1,110

Question: .............................................................. Agree or Strongly Agree

I believe there will be a return on the investment I make in my CityU education........93.2%
I am satisfied with my experience at CityU.........................................................84.1%
I would recommend CityU to others.................................................................84.2%

The 2017 satisfaction survey results also indicate that the majority of students have a positive perception of the extent to which their studies would help them achieve the CityU Learning Goals. The percentage that felt their studies were going to have a positive influence ranged from 87.0% for “Foster Lifelong Learning” to 93.7% for “Professional Competency.” Among the goals with the highest positive ratings were those items related to critical
thinking and information literacy. This evidences the strong emphasis that has been placed on building these skills into the curriculum in all programs over the last several years, including the incorporation of librarians on curriculum design teams.

A key metric that CityU tracks in its Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) is the responses to eight questions that are also used for the End of Course Evaluations (EOCE). At the end of a course, these eight questions evidence students’ estimation of the quality of their courses. By using these same eight questions in the Student Satisfaction Survey, CityU can derive a more comprehensive understanding of students’ perception of their experience overall. Here, too, the results are generally positive with each of the questions receiving a score indicating over 80.0% of respondents either “agree” or “strongly agree” with the qualitative statements about their experience in their program. The scores ranged from 80.0% for “Prompt and Useful Feedback” to 94.3% for “Encouraged to Take an Active Role in Their Education.” The dual focus on these eight factors of instruction have helped CityU achieve an increase in positive scores on all measures over the past few years. A report on the 2017 Student Satisfaction Survey can be found in Appendix 1.

International Education

A unique feature of City University of Seattle is its international dimension. Each year, the institution serves over five hundred international students at its Seattle campus who come to CityU to complete their bachelor’s degree or earn a graduate degree. These students are served by CityU’s International Student Office (ISO) which recruits, admits, and supports them.

CityU also carries its mission to offer access to a high quality, relevant US style degree to those in other countries. In the early 1980s, CityU expanded its academic offerings to an underserved adult learner population in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Since then, CityU responded to several other regions seeking US accredited programs and expanded its global presence to include three continents and eleven countries. While some international sites have closed since the 2010 site visit, CityU currently offers programs in Canada, China, the Czech Republic, Mexico, Slovakia, Switzerland, and Vietnam.

Integral to CityU’s vision is an expanding network of international higher education partners who share CityU’s mission and values and whose own capabilities to serve students are enhanced because of the partnership. With local advocates and champions of the mission and values, CityU uses its partners’ knowledge and capacity to help create access for students and fill such unmet needs. By developing a global network of partnerships, CityU offers students in all its locations enhanced access and opportunities to acquire a genuinely international education. Importantly, the same quality of education is provided at all locations. CityU complies with all local regulations and standards governing higher education institutions in each jurisdiction in which it operates. It gains all necessary governmental and/or legal approvals before accepting students into its programs and courses.

All of CityU’s program offerings fit within its mission and scope; they use common curricula, assessments of student learning, assessments of instruction, and are included in regular quality control processes, including program reviews. All students admitted to a course or program carrying CityU credit are considered to be, for the duration of their time in that course or program, “CityU students.” All CityU students are provided with consistent levels of quality and service. Academic standards and policies are applied equitably at all locations. These policies are constructed to uphold CityU’s responsibilities to its internal and external constituencies, including students, faculty, and communities, and to align with accreditation, national, provincial, and/or state regulatory requirements.

CityU’s two program offerings in Europe are the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and the Master of Business Administration. Considering the large number of multinational corporations that operate in Europe, the demand for educated professionals who can speak English and understand international business orientations makes CityU students a top choice for many employers. CityU’s partner in Slovakia, Vysoká Škola Manažmentu, is rated among the best colleges in the region.

In China, City University of Seattle has offered the Master of Business Administration for nearly thirteen years. Since 2003, in partnership with Boeing and the Chinese government, CityU has provided graduate management degree programs to the Chinese aviation industry. Its long standing operation in China has produced more than
fourteen hundred alumni. In recent years, CityU shifted its Chinese partnership to the University of International Business and Economics, a highly prestigious institution in Beijing. The MBA is now offered to mid-career level professionals in all industries. In addition, CityU has also partnered with Shenzhen Polytechnic in Shenzhen since 2011. In Vietnam, CityU’s partner is the Banking Academy of Vietnam (BAV). CityU and BAV collaborate to offer a double degree opportunity for students to earn CityU’s Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and BAV’s undergraduate degree in finance.

City University of Seattle has four education partners and has been offering programs in Mexico since 2005. The University’s first Mexican partner was Centro de Enseñanza Técnica y Superior (CETYS) Universidad located in Baja California. CETYS is a private, non-profit, multi-campus university system with campuses in Mexicali, Tijuana, and Ensenada. In 2010, CityU expanded its operations in Mexico by partnering with three additional institutions: two public and a private institution. These partners are: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo Leon (UANL) in Monterrey; Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosi (UASLP) in San Luis Potosi; and Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla (UPAEP) in Puebla.

The primary programs offered through CityU’s Mexican partners are the Bachelor of Arts in Management, the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, and the Bachelor of Arts in Applied psychology. These programs are offered as dual degrees where the student completes part of the degree through the home institution and the remainder through CityU. The CityU portion of these programs are offered online or in hybrid mode with the US based instructors traveling to the Mexican institution twice during the quarter.

In Canada, CityU specializes in graduate education, offering a Master of Counselling in two provinces, British Columbia and Alberta, and a Master of Education in both British Columbia and Alberta as well.

CityU’s international programs are continuous reminders of the importance of strengthening global connections, which is CityU’s third Core Theme. CityU has also established a student mobility program that offers students the opportunity to complete one quarter of study at any CityU location, while paying the same tuition as they would at their home institution. An added benefit of the focus on strengthening global connections is the opportunity for non-traditional adult learners studying in the US to have more interactions with international students (either studying full time in the US or mobility students that are here for a short time). This is a value-added example of the many benefits garnered from CityU’s commitment to its Core Themes. The common curriculum, which is taught in English no matter where the program is offered, makes this type of mobility possible, without causing students to lose progress toward completing their degrees. It is a signature feature of CityU’s commitment to becoming a leading, globally connected university, and one that is of significant benefit to the students who participate.

Finance and Facilities

As an institution with the vast majority of its revenues derived from tuition, City University of Seattle requires great fiscal discipline and solid financial planning to maintain its viability. The 2016–2017 fiscal year, City University had revenues of more than $38 million, and had excess revenues and other support over expenses before non-operating expenses of more than $2 million. (Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization, if in a for-profit context.) As of June 30, 2017, the University’s unrestricted net assets were $19,698,856. The institution is on sound financial ground and is building its reserves. The Board of Trustees adopts a July 1/June 30 fiscal year budget at its meeting each May, quarterly results are reviewed with the Board of Trustees.

These reviews include a comparison of results versus the budget as well as projected results through the end of the year. The heavy dependency on tuition revenue makes it critical to forecast correctly to best utilize available resources. Tuition revenue is forecast with participation by Enrollment, the Office of the Provost, Deans, and Academic Program Directors to ensure proper input in the process. Adjustments are made if the projected results are not achieving the operating plan for the year.

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) uses a Financial Responsibility Test, or composite score, to calculate the overall financial health of college and universities for purposes of determining Title IV financial aid eligibility. The composite is score based on three ratios (Primary Reserves, Equity, and Net Income). The fiscal year ending 2017 audit by the DOE was completed as of January 19, 2018, and CityU currently has a composite score of 2.8. A score of 1.5 is required to maintain full participation in the Title IV Financial Student Aid program.
In 2013, CityU leased a new main campus building in downtown Seattle. Applying generally accepted accounting principles, CityU amortized tenant improvement (TI) costs across the 15-year building lease thus counting the amount as long-term debt when calculating the primary reserve ratio. The DOE calculation of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 composite score ratio did not categorize the TI costs as a long-term liability, resulting in a 0.8 composite score ratio. CityU appealed the calculation with the Department of Education, and in November of 2015 the Department of Education denied the appeal.

In fiscal year 2017, CityU took a loan out against the TIs, and combined with its strong financial performance in fiscal year 2017 in terms of excess before non-operating expenses of more than $2 million, achieved a strong composite score.

CityU is driven to provide excellent educational programs to its students around the world at an affordable price. The University held tuition rate increases to an average of less than two percent for the 2016–2017 fiscal year. CityU assures students they will get the courses they require when they need them in order to ensure that they complete in a timely manner without institutionally caused delays due course unavailability.

CityU’s focus on accessibility is evident in the number of Washington State sites where students can complete a degree. The five sites that make up CityU in Washington are Vancouver, Tacoma, Renton, Seattle and Everett. Students at these sites have classrooms, technology and connectivity to all systems at the Seattle headquarters. In the past, CityU operated smaller locations through community college partnerships but many of those have closed due to students migrating to online programs. All four locations in Canada operate as CityU sites with the same furnishings, signage, and facilities as the US sites.

In 2013, CityU moved from it former headquarters in Bellevue, WA, to a new site in Seattle’s Belltown neighborhood. The University invested heavily in the new location by building out seventeen classrooms, faculty and staff facilities, a new library, and two computer labs. In 2015, the CityU entered into an agreement with Cornish College of the Arts to rent space in their newly constructed twenty-story dorm. Currently, CityU has rooms on four floors with 108 beds that it can offer to its students.

**Conclusion**

Over the past eight years, CityU has focused on enhancing the student experience. This has been done in a number of ways including qualitative academic improvements, increases in enrollments, retention, and graduation rates, as well as a focus on providing an excellent student experience from application to graduation. There is a true student-focused culture at the institution that permeates so much of what CityU does.

In 2011, for the first time, the University selected a set of Core Themes. The selection of each these Core Themes was intentional as they truly represented the qualities that CityU had pursued and focused on in years past; these qualities were also what the institution intended to focus on going forward. As CityU concludes this seven year evaluation cycle, the institution can now look back at the ways these Core Themes have played a key role in helping the University achieve its mission.

The sections that follow demonstrate how CityU has used its Core Themes to fulfill its mission, establish and pursue key strategic objectives, and create operational plans – all in an effort to ensure an excellent student experience.
Basic Institutional Data

Institution: City University of Seattle (CityU)
Address: 521 Wall Street, Suite 100
City, State, ZIP: Seattle, WA 98121

Degree Levels Offered:  ☑ Doctorate  ☑ Masters  ☑ Baccalaureate  ☑ Associate  ☐ Other
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Specialized/Programmatic accreditation: List program or school, degree level(s) and date of last accreditation by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or School</th>
<th>Degree Level(s)</th>
<th>Recognized Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Master of Business Administration, Master of Science in Project Management, Bachelor of Arts in Management, Associate of Science Business, Doctor of Business Administration</td>
<td>Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management – Technology Institute</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science Information Systems</td>
<td>Accrediting Body for Engineering and Technology (ABET)</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>Master of Science in Project Management</td>
<td>Project Management Institute – Global Accreditation</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management – Technology Institute</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, Master of Science Information Security</td>
<td>National Centers of Academic Excellence</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Master of Arts in Counseling</td>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Sciences / Albright School of Education in Canada</td>
<td>Master of Arts in Counselling, Master of Education</td>
<td>Accredited by the respective ministries of Education in both Alberta and British Columbia</td>
<td>2009/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright School of Education</td>
<td>Bachelors and Masters Teacher Certification Programs</td>
<td>Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment

Official Fall 2017 (most recent year) FTE Student Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1433.5</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1424.25</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>203.25</td>
<td>179.25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all levels</td>
<td>3238.75</td>
<td>3158.5</td>
<td>3968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Unduplicated Headcount Enrollment. (Count of students enrolled in credit courses only.)

Official Fall 2017 (most recent year) Student Headcount Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total all levels</td>
<td>6756</td>
<td>6637</td>
<td>6344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of Full-Time and Part-Time Instructional and Research Faculty & Staff and Numbers of Full-Time (only) Instructional and Research Faculty & Staff by Highest Degree Earned.
Include only professional personnel who are primarily assigned to instruction or research.

Number of Full Time (only) Faculty and Staff by Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Less than Associate</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Program Director</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Salaries and Mean Years of Service of Full-Time Instructional and Research Faculty and Staff.
Include only full-time personnel with professional status who are primarily assigned to instruction or research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Salary</th>
<th>Mean Years of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Director</td>
<td>$85,065</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Program Director</td>
<td>$73,881</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>$75,744</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>$95,732</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fiscal year of the institution: FY 15 – FY 17
Reporting of income: Accrual Basis ______________________ Accrual Basis ______________________
Reporting of expenses: Accrual Basis ______________________ Accrual Basis ______________________

BALANCE SHEET DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/17</th>
<th>One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/16</th>
<th>Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>18,967,936</td>
<td>9,427,244</td>
<td>11,781,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>18,333,479</td>
<td>8,954,356</td>
<td>9,903,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,422,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable gross</td>
<td>854,784</td>
<td>1,030,088</td>
<td>862,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less allowance for bad debts</td>
<td>(220,327)</td>
<td>(557,200)</td>
<td>(407,849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and deferred charges</td>
<td>730,920</td>
<td>690,408</td>
<td>955,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td>19,698,856</td>
<td>10,117,652</td>
<td>12,737,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>3,934,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted</strong></td>
<td>3,934,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>23,633,272</td>
<td>10,117,652</td>
<td>12,737,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANT FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unexpended</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,798,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,174,506</td>
<td>2,049,381</td>
<td>2,438,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other (identify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,229,701</td>
<td>5,879,716</td>
<td>6,187,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total investments in plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,404,207</td>
<td>7,929,097</td>
<td>11,788,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Due from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other plant funds (identify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL PLANT FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER ASSETS (IDENTIFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,981,798</td>
<td>2,094,837</td>
<td>878,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL OTHER ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,981,798</td>
<td>2,094,837</td>
<td>878,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,019,277</td>
<td>20,141,586</td>
<td>25,403,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT FUNDS

#### Unrestricted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>434,589</td>
<td>379,170</td>
<td>793,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued liabilities</td>
<td>1,739,078</td>
<td>2,404,815</td>
<td>2,877,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ deposits</td>
<td>2,509,215</td>
<td>1,751,963</td>
<td>2,987,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred credits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities (identify)</td>
<td>391,278</td>
<td>646,220</td>
<td>521,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to</td>
<td>2,048,311</td>
<td>705,503</td>
<td>47,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Unrestricted</strong></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,122,471</td>
<td>5,887,671</td>
<td>7,226,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Restricted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Restricted</strong></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS</strong></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,122,471</td>
<td>5,887,671</td>
<td>7,226,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS

#### Restricted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-endowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOTAL ENDOWMENT AND SIMILAR FUNDS</strong></th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PLANT FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpended</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unexpended</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment in Plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other plant fund liabilities (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INVESTMENTS IN PLANT FUND</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER LIABILITIES (IDENTIFY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes payable, excluding current portion</td>
<td>6,080,360</td>
<td>110,096</td>
<td>375,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>348,642</td>
<td>374,948</td>
<td>403,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Rent</td>
<td>2,329,577</td>
<td>1,962,420</td>
<td>1,297,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financed leasehold improvement payable</td>
<td>3,952,802</td>
<td>4,341,989</td>
<td>5,233,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$12,711,381</td>
<td>$6,789,453</td>
<td>$7,309,026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUND BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,185,425</td>
<td>7,464,462</td>
<td>10,868,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT FUNDS, REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND OTHER CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Completed FY Dates: 7/1/16 – 6/30/17</th>
<th>One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 7/1/15 – 6/30/16</th>
<th>Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 7/1/14 – 6/30/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>37,311,775</td>
<td>37,725,200</td>
<td>36,487,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal appropriations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local appropriations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>4,386,636</td>
<td>697,717</td>
<td>5,985,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Auxiliary enterprises
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>380,794</td>
<td>1,078,445</td>
<td>841,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE & MANDATORY TRANSFERS
#### Educational and General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>14,951,477</td>
<td>15,259,448</td>
<td>15,885,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>2,657,928</td>
<td>4,012,912</td>
<td>4,231,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>8,807,511</td>
<td>9,004,982</td>
<td>7,627,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>10,021,659</td>
<td>12,237,910</td>
<td>13,436,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory transfers for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and interest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal and replacements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan fund matching grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Educational and General</strong></td>
<td>36,438,575</td>
<td>40,515,252</td>
<td>41,181,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auxiliary Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditure & Mandatory Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational and General</td>
<td>36,438,575</td>
<td>40,515,252</td>
<td>41,181,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER TRANSFERS AND ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>41,871</td>
<td>(2,557,913)</td>
<td>(1,841,475)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXCESS [deficiency of revenues over expenditures and mandatory transfers (net change in fund balances)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (identify)</td>
<td>5,720,963</td>
<td>(3,403,602)</td>
<td>376,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INSTITUTIONAL INDEBTEDNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/17</th>
<th>One Year Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/2016</th>
<th>Two Years Prior to Last Completed FY Dates: 6/30/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Capital Outlay</td>
<td>6,141,446</td>
<td>516,623</td>
<td>740,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Operations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Domestic Off-Campus Degree Programs and Academic Credit Sites: Report information for off-campus sites within the United States where degree programs and academic coursework is offered. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Degree Programs – list the names of degree programs that can be completed at the site.
Academic Credit Courses – report the total number of academic credit courses offered at the site.
Student Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of students currently enrolled in programs at the site.
Faculty Headcount – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of faculty (full-time and part-time) teaching at the site.

PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT OFFERED AT OFF-CAMPUS SITES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES (FY 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Site Name</th>
<th>City, State, ZIP</th>
<th>Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Credit Courses</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityU Everett</td>
<td>1000 SE Everett Mall Way Suite 101 Everett, WA 98208</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Education; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in General Studies; Master in Teaching; Master of Business Administration; Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling; Master of Education in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Full-Time: 1.5 FTE Associate: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Renton</td>
<td>555 S Renton Village Place, Suite 300 Renton, WA 98057</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration; Bachelor of Science in General Studies; Master of Business Administration; Master of Science in Project Management</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Tacoma</td>
<td>1145 Broadway, Suite 600 Tacoma, WA 98402</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Education; Master in Teaching; Master of Business Administration; Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling; Master of Education in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Full-Time: 3 FTE Associate: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBLM</td>
<td>6242 Colorado Avenue, Suite A202 JBLM, WA 98433</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Human Services; Bachelor of Science in Healthcare Administration; Master of Healthcare Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Vancouver</td>
<td>12500 SE 2nd Circle, Suite 200 Vancouver, WA 98684</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Education; Master in Teaching; Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling; Master of Education in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Full-Time: 2.5 FTE Associate: 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs and Academic Courses Offered at Sites Outside the United States. Report information for sites outside the United States where degree programs and academic credit courses are offered, including study abroad programs and educational operations on military bases. (Add additional pages if necessary.)

Degree Programs – list the names of degree programs that can be completed at the site.
Academic Credit Courses – report the total number of academic credit courses offered at the site.
**Student Headcount** – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of students currently enrolled in programs at the site.

**Faculty Headcount** – report the total number (unduplicated headcount) of faculty (full-time and part-time) teaching at the site.

### PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT COURSES OFFERED AT SITES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Site Name City, State, ZIP</th>
<th>Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Credit Courses</th>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th>Faculty Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityU Vancouver 789 W. Pender Street, Suite 310 Vancouver, B.C. V6C 1H2</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Management; Master of Education in Education Leadership; Master of Education in School Counselling; Master of Counselling</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Full-Time: 7.5 FTE Associate: 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Victoria 305 877 Goldstream Ave. Langford, B.C. V9B 2X8</td>
<td>Master of Education in School Counselling; Master of Counselling</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Full-Time: .5 FTE Associate: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Calgary 1040 7th Ave SW Suite 120 Calgary, AB T2P 3G9</td>
<td>Master of Education in Education Leadership; Master of Counselling</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Full-Time: 3 FTE Associate: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Edmonton 100 – 10010 106 St NW Edmonton AB T5J 1G1</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Full-Time: 1 FTE Associate: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Alberta 100 College Blvd, Red Deer AB T4N 5H5</td>
<td>Master of Counselling; Master of Education in Education Leadership</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicali, B.C. Mexico Partnership with CETYS Universidad Col. Rivera, Mexicali B.C. Mexico C.P. 21259</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijuana, B.C. Mexico Partnership with CETYS Universidad Av. CETYS Universidad No. 4 Fracc. El Lago, B.C. Mexico, C.P. 22210</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensenada, B.C., Mexico Partnership with CETYS Universidad Km. 1 camino a Microonada Trinidad, s/n Ensenada, B.C. Mexico 22860</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Program Offered</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Associate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterrey, Mexico</td>
<td>Monterrey, Mexico</td>
<td>Avenida Universitaria s/n San Nicolas de los Garza, Nuevo Leon, 66451</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration; Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puebla, Mexico</td>
<td>Puebla, Mexico</td>
<td>21 sur 1103 Barrio Santiago C.P. 72410, Puebla Mexico</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Autonoma de San Luis Potosi (UASLP)</td>
<td>Puebla, Mexico</td>
<td>21 Sur #1103, Barrio de Santiago, Puebla, Puebla, 72410</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology; Bachelor of Arts in Management; Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of International Business and Economics (UIBE)</td>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>Room 206 Boyayuan MBA Office, Huixin Dongjie, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenzhen Polytechnic</td>
<td>Shenzhen, China</td>
<td>2190 Liuxian Ave, Nanshan District, Shenzhen, China</td>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate: General Studies and Management in Information Systems; Undergraduate Certificate: General Studies and Management in International Logistics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Academy of Vietnam Hoc Vien Ngan</td>
<td>Hanoi, Vietnam</td>
<td>Hang No 12 Chua Boc St, Dong Da District, Hanoi, Vietnam</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vysoka Skola Manazmentu (VSM, Bratislava)</td>
<td>Bratislava, Slovakia</td>
<td>Panonska cesta 17 851 04 Bratislava, Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration; Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vysoka Skola Manazmentu (VSM, Trencin)</td>
<td>Trencin, Slovakia</td>
<td>Bezucova 64 911 01 Trencin, Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration; Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vysoka Skola Financni a Spravni Estonska</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>500, 101 00 Prague 10, Czech Republic</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science Business Administration; Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Hotel Management School</td>
<td>Lucerne, Switzerland</td>
<td>Baselstrasse 57, CH-6003 Lucerne, Switzerland</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 14
Full-time: 0 FTE Associate: 5
Full-time: 0 FTE Associate: 10
Full-time: 0 FTE Associate: 10
Full-time: 0 FTE Associate: 11
Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 15
Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 24
Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 13
Full-Time: 0 FTE Associate: 21
Full-Time: 0 FTE Part-time: 15
Update on Institutional Changes Since Last Report
Since the Year Five Report was submitted in March 2015, CityU changed in several important ways.

Addition of Housing
In 2015 CityU contracted four floors of campus housing in the building constructed for Cornish College of the Arts. These housing options allows the university to offer 108 beds to international and domestic students. They are also available to groups of students who come to Seattle for short-term study over the summer. The campus housing is located at:

2025 Terry Avenue
Seattle, WA 98121

Leadership Changes
• Randy Frisch was selected by the CityU Board of Trustees to succeed Richard Carter as CityU’s President. Mr. Frisch assumed the presidency on October 1, 2016 and comes to City University from the National University System (NUS) where he served as the Chief Financial Officer for the System.
• Dr. Kurt Kirstein assumed the role of Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on December 18, 2015 upon the retirement of Dr. Steven Olswang. Dr. Kirstein formerly served as CityU’s Dean of the School of Management from 2007-2015.
• Chris Bryan, CPA was named Director of Finance and is currently acting as the interim Chief Financial Officer.
• Matt Hanusa assumed the role of Vice President of Marketing and Enrollment Management in November 2015 upon the departure of Marianne Fingado. Mr. Hanusa came to CityU from Colorado Christian University and prior to that he served as the Site Director/President of Devry University’s campus in Portland. In January of 2018 Mr. Hanusa left CityU and a search is underway for a replacement.
• Tom Cary was named Interim Dean of the School of Management on January 1, 2016 upon the promotion of Dr. Kurt Kirstein to Provost. Effective October 1, 2016 Mr. Cary’s position was made permanent. Mr. Cary previously served as Associate Dean of the School of Management since 2008.
• Dr. Laura Williamson was named Interim Associate Dean of the School of Management on January 1, 2016 upon the promotion of Tom Cary. On October 1, 2016 her position as Associate Dean was made permanent. Dr. Williamson previously served as the Master of Business Administration Program Director from 2012-2016.
• Dr. Simon Cleveland was promoted to the Associate Dean of the Technology Institute in January of 2018.
• Dr. Kelly Flores was named Dean of the Schools of Arts and Sciences and the Albright School of Education in April 2017. This is in addition to her duties as the Dean of the School of Applied Leadership, a school that she founded in 2013. Her oversight of three schools is a temporary measure allowing her to identify and develop future leaders of the Schools of Education and Arts and Sciences.
• Dr. Ellen Carruth was named Associate Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences in 2018.
• Greg Price was named Associate Dean of the School of Applied Leadership in 2017.
• Dr. Vicki Butler was named Associate Dean of the Albright School of Education in 2018.

A full organizational chart can be found in Appendix 8.

President’s Executive Team (PET)
In July 2016, then Interim President Randy Frisch, expanded his executive team. It now includes all Vice Presidents, Deans, as well as the Directors of Human Resources, Information Technology, Finance, and Enrollment Management.
Program Location Changes
The following changes were made to the locations where CityU offers its programs:

- The partnerships with Grays Harbor and Centralia Colleges were terminated in late winter of 2016 due to continued low enrollments.
- CityU decided to end its partnership with City Unity College in Athens, Greece. City Unity was told to not admit any new students in the fall of 2015 and was officially notified that the partnership would be ending. The teach-out plan was scheduled for three academic years concluding on June 30, 2018 but concluded early as the last remaining students have now completed their degrees.
- When CityU moved to Seattle, the CityU Bellevue site was retained to finish cohorts in the Master of Arts in Counseling program. Those cohorts are finished now and classes are no longer being offered at that site. CityU no longer has a location in Bellevue, but subleases the space for the duration of its lease.

New Academic Programs
Since the Year Five Report, CityU has approved and launched several new programs which include:

- Master of Professional Accounting
- Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity and Information Assurance
- Bachelor of Science in Applied Computing
- Doctor of Business Administration
- Master of Science in Health Care Administration

The following programs were started in recent years but have been put on “hold” pending an assessment of their financial viability and whether they serve CityU’s mission and values:

- Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
- Master of Integrated Supply Chain Management

During the completion of the Seven Year Report, a number of new programs have been submitted to the NWCCU commission for approval. These include:

- Master of Science in Management and Leadership
- Doctor of Health Care Administration
- Doctor of Criminal Justice Administration
- Doctor of Information Technology
- Doctor of Philosophy in Counselor Education and Supervision

Response to Topics Previously Requested by the Commission
In its Year Three Report, the Commission made four recommendations. In the Year Five response, recommendation #2 was satisfied and removed from consideration leaving the following three recommendations to be addressed in the Year Seven report:

Recommendation #1 – Financial Solvency
Since the spring 2013 visit, CityU has engaged in a number of strategies to stabilize its financial solvency.

- Affiliation with the National University System (NUS) resulted in $10 million of investment monies targeted for new program development, marketing and outreach, increased faculty positions, and salary improvements.
- Affiliation with the NUS has resulted in reduced costs due to shared services for health care benefits and retirement funds.
- Affiliation with the NUS has resulted in reduced costs for shared licenses for Blackboard, the Finance system, the HR and Payroll systems, as well as library databases. Work during FY 2018/19 will result in further reductions in license costs associated with the Student Administration system and attendant future upgrades.
• US Core enrollment (US students taking courses in any mode) at the institution has increased by 4.8% since Academic Year 2016 to 2017.

• CityU improved its cash position by $7 million since 2013.

• CityU divested itself of its property holdings in Slovakia, reducing both expense and risk – further contributing to the revised Department of Education composite score.

• University management and administration has maintained a dedicated focus on expense control to ensure responsible resource use.

As a result of these efforts, the University’s FY 2017 Department of Education composite score ratio is a 2.8 of possible 3.0.

Recommendation #2 – Graduate Admissions and Retention Policies

All graduate programs at the University require candidates to hold a bachelor’s degree prior to entry for study. Graduate programs, with the exclusion of the Master of Arts in Leadership, Master of Education in Adult Education, and Master of Science in Project Management, have additional entry requirements designed to ensure students are prepared for the rigor of their program of study as well as personal fit.

• Professional preparation programs at the graduate level in education (leadership, counseling, teaching) require portfolios, faculty interviews, and in some cases state entry tests.

• Professional counseling programs, in addition to portfolio and faculty interviews, students are required to have completed specific preparation content courses in the field prior to entry.

• Computer Science and Information Security programs require specific technical breadth in programming prior to entry.

• The MBA program requires a bachelor’s degree in business, finance, accounting or a related business oriented degree prior to entry. Students lacking the appropriate business preparation are required to complete a pre-requisite course and demonstrate undergraduate level knowledge in a variety of business common professional competencies before being permitted to continue.

Programs that do not have specific entry requirements are designed so that students complete one or more foundational courses built into the program of study requirements to ensure appropriate preparation for completion of the degree.

Recommendation #3 – University Governance and Sustainability

The institution has achieved financial sustainability, with excess of revenue after expenses in Fiscal Year 2017, and excess revenue after expenses in the first seven months of Fiscal Year 2018. As mentioned above, City University of Seattle secured a loan to offset its Tenant Improvements and more than met the Department of Education Financial Responsibility test of Composite Score in the most recent test dated June 30, 2017. CityU’s Composite score was 2.8 out of a possible 3.0. Again, as previously mentioned, CityU failure on this test in Fiscal Year 2014, and subsequent 18-month appeal, was caused by how the Department of Education treated Tenant Improvements (TIs). Contrary to GAAP, the Department did not consider the TIs long-term debt.

Affiliation with the NUS in 2013 resulted in initial investment of more than $10 million. Effective fiscal year 2016, CityU has received no additional investment funds for operations. New funds received by the University from the NUS are limited to grants awarded for improvement initiatives as part of a system wide affiliate application process. The NUS Board of Trustees has also sponsored affiliate initiatives that result in gains across multiple institutions, for example pathways – creating mechanisms for students to leverage courses and programs at various affiliates.

Significant strides have been made in the past four years solidifying City University of Seattle’s role as an affiliate in the National University System and managing the institutional changes resulting from the affiliation. While seeking alignment with NUS level initiatives, CityU maintains independence and control of achieving and delivering its mission, values and Core Themes, which guides overall institutional and strategic planning. City University of Seattle Board Chairman Tom Clevinger and President Frisch jointly develop the agenda for Board meetings, and work together to make Board time productive for Trustees.
ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS
Eligibility Requirements

2. Authority

The institution is authorized to operate and award degrees as a higher education institution by the appropriate governmental organization, agency, or governing board as required by the jurisdiction in which it operates.

City University of Seattle is a not-for-profit corporation established under the laws of the State of Washington. It is recognized as a Continuously Exempt Institution by the Washington Student Achievement Council. These qualifying institutions have met the criteria as outlined in state law and rules for continuous exemption. CityU programs are exempt from state authorization and review so long as the University continues to meet the criteria established for exemption. CityU has Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws that vest the governance of the institution in the hands of a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees has, in turn, adopted operational policies and procedures that describe and operationalize the governance structure of the University.

3. Mission and Core Themes

The institution’s mission and core themes are clearly defined and adopted by its governing board(s) consistent with its legal authorization, and are appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The institution’s purpose is to serve the educational interests of its students and its principal programs lead to recognized degrees. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its resources to support its educational mission and core themes.

Throughout its history, City University of Seattle has had a consistent mission to provide educational access to those traditionally underserved. Its mission statement captures its history and purpose: “[t]o change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.” CityU publishes its mission statement in its annual catalog. The mission statement also appears on the University’s website.

City University of Seattle’s mission statement provides the basis for its vision of “education access worldwide (via a network of partners and programs on-site and/or online).” CityU subscribes to a set of values that express the way in which it fulfills its mission and works toward achieving its vision. In its values, CityU determines to be:

- **Flexible**: design and deliver programs and services convenient to students;
- **Accessible**: provide educational opportunities to anyone, anywhere;
- **Innovative**: continually create new educational opportunities;
- **Relevant**: teaching today what can be applied tomorrow;
- **Global**: act locally while thinking globally.

The mission, vision, and values of CityU provide the foundation for constructing its Core Themes. CityU has established key indicators, measures and targets for each Core Theme to track progress toward the achievement of its mission. CityU’s four Core Themes are to:

- **Core Theme 1**: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education;
- **Core Theme 2**: Ensure Student Access and Success;
- **Core Theme 3**: Strengthen Global Connections;
- **Core Theme 4**: Foster Lifelong Learning.

All of CityU’s resources are devoted to support the success of its academic programs and students.

4. Operational Focus and Independence

The institution’s programs and services are predominantly concerned with higher education. The institution has sufficient organizational and operational independence to be held accountable and responsible for meeting the Commission’s standards and eligibility requirements.

The business of CityU is higher education. CityU is an independent nonprofit corporation organized under Washington State nonprofit corporation law dedicated to providing educational access to anyone with a desire to learn. As an affiliate of the National University System, CityU gains access to additional resources to further its mission, while continuing to decide independently its mission, courses, program offerings, and academic policies.
The Board of Trustees is accountable for compliance with all of the Standards and Eligibility requirements of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

5. Non-Discrimination

The institution is governed and administered with respect for the individual in a nondiscriminatory manner while responding to the educational needs and legitimate claims of the constituencies it serves as determined by its charter, its mission, and its core themes.

City University of Seattle policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, color, creed, national or ethnic origin, marital status, sexual orientation, status as a Vietnam-era or disabled veteran, or physical, mental or sensory disability, in the recruitment and admission of students; the recruitment, employment, and retention of faculty and staff; and the operation of all University programs, scholarships, loans, activities, and services.

Nondiscrimination in the working environment is addressed in the University’s Ethics Policy, the Human Resources Policy “Equal Opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment and education policy,” and the HR Policy “Anti-Harassment.” Appendix 11. City University of Seattle is an equal opportunity employer and is committed to maintaining a professional working environment that is free from discrimination and unlawful harassment. Human Resources has guidelines and procedures in place to support this commitment and made site visits to all teaching locations to reemphasize those practices. All materials pertaining to the recruitment and employment process were updated and expanded for the use of all hiring managers in the United States and Canada.

CityU policies pertain to all employment actions, including but not limited to recruitment, hiring, upgrading, promotion, transfer, demotion, layoff, termination, all forms of compensation, selection for training, education or tuition assistance, leave of absence, or any other terms or conditions of employment. CityU prepares/updates an Affirmative Action Plan each year. It formalizes and documents our philosophy as it relates to equal treatment of employees and applicants, and delineates action steps that contribute to making equal opportunity work. The Affirmative Action Plan defines specific assignments for responsible staff members, including Equal Employment Opportunity management by the Human Resources Director and line management responsibilities for each manager and/or supervisor. All employees are charged with equal opportunity and nondiscrimination in all aspects of the employment relationship.

Based on that plan, the Human Resources Office has developed a variety of responses in the areas of management awareness, recruitment, selection, employee development and retention, as well as the overall area of diversity programs and employee support. Human Resources department policies are reviewed on a regular schedule and updated as needed when laws or processes change.

6. Institutional Integrity

The institution establishes and adheres to ethical standards in all of its operations and relationships.

City University of Seattle establishes and adheres to ethical standards in all of its operations and relationships. The institution recognizes and welcomes its obligation to its students, faculty and staff with which it works, and communities where it operates to maintain the highest ethical standards. These standards embrace principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, and leadership. In addition, an important part of the education offered by CityU is its ability to be an example of adherence to high ethical standards as it helps students acquire a sense of professional and personal ethics in their work.

The City University of Seattle Catalog includes information about its mission, vision, values, and goals; its admissions requirements and procedures; its academic and student policies; its academic offerings, programs and courses, and degree requirements; tuition, fees, and refund information; procedures for grade grievance, scholastic honesty, and other student rights and responsibilities. All catalog and student policies are reviewed on an annual basis by the Registrar and Office of the Provost with recommended changes submitted for review and approval at the Academic Affairs Council.

The University contracts with EthicsPoint, an independent reporting service to enable employees to confidentially file complaints of any nature, and to expect an appropriate administrative response. All such complaints are submitted to the Board of Trustees’ audit committee for evaluation. This committee is responsible for processing/responding to all complaints and what their process may involve on the part of CityU staff and/or faculty.
7. Governing Board
The institution has a functioning governing board responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and for each unit within a multiple-unit institution to ensure that the institution’s mission and core themes are being achieved. The governing board has at least five voting members, a majority of whom have no contractual or employment relationship or personal financial interest with the institution.

CityU’s Board of Trustee bylaws specify that the board must comprise not less than fifteen and not more than twenty five members. Currently, the Board of Trustees consists of twenty two regular members all of whom are independent of the institution in terms of salary or income, one Ex Officio Trustee - the Chancellor of the National University System, and the President of the University. Board bylaws allow for not more than 49% of members to have an interested person status with the institution, which includes compensation, independent contract status, or relative relationship with an employee. See Appendix 21.A.

The Board policies and the statutes of the State of Washington clearly delineate the role of the Board, including the selection of the President, approval of the budget, and approval over all new degree offerings. The President, who serves as the chief executive officer of the University, works with the Board chair to establish its agendas.

As a result of the Affiliation, the members of the Board of Trustees of City University of Seattle also serve on the Board of Trustees of the National University System, but the responsibilities of the Board under the laws of the State of Washington remain unchanged. The governing board remains responsible for the quality and integrity of the institution and ensures that the institution’s mission and core themes are being achieved. The Board of Trustees ensures its duty of oversight with a minimum of three meetings each year.

The relationship of CityU as an affiliate of the National University System (NUS) is contractual, not hierarchical. The Board of each affiliate institution has fiduciary responsibilities specific to that institution and is mandated to oversee the educational missions of said institution. The System Board governs the support organization created to support the mission of each affiliate institution. As all are nonprofit corporations, there is no ownership structure.

8. Chief Executive Officer
The institution employs a chief executive officer who is appointed by the governing board and whose full-time responsibility is to the institution. Neither the chief executive officer nor an executive officer of the institution chairs the institution’s governing board.

The Board delegates to the President, whose full time responsibility is to implement and administer institutional policies, as well as to carry out the mission of City University of Seattle – according to CityU’s Bylaws. The President reports directly to the Board of Trustees and the Board evaluates the President.

City University of Seattle is an affiliate university of the National University System, along with National University and John F. Kennedy University, among others. The President is responsible for overseeing CityU’s role in System collaboration, working with the National University System (NUS) Chancellor. The President works collaboratively with the Board and the CityU community to articulate a vision for the University, and to provide strategic leadership through defining institutional goals, establishing priorities, and developing strategic and operational plans. The President represents the University to the local and regional relationships.

9. Administration
In addition to a chief executive officer, the institution employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators who provide effective leadership and management for the institution’s major support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution’s mission and achievement of its core themes.

In addition to the President, the President’s Executive Team (PET) – comprised of the Provost, Deans, Vice Presidents and other functional directors lead and manage the institution. The institution has a Provost, who is the Chief Academic Officer, responsible for oversight of the schools, library, international operations, E-learning, registration, and institutional effectiveness. CityU also has a Chief Financial Officer who oversees the budget and finances. The institution has a Vice President for Student Services who is the senior student affairs...
officer. In addition, there is a Vice President for Marketing and Enrollment who oversees recruiting, admissions, enrollment management, and student advising. These individuals, together with the Deans, Human Resources, and Information Technology, comprise the President’s Executive Team (PET), which meets weekly to discuss the operations of the University.

10. Faculty

Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution employs and regularly evaluates the performance of appropriately qualified faculty sufficient in number to achieve its educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever offered and however delivered.

CityU boasts a well-qualified cadre of faculty. By design, CityU employs instructors who are actively engaged in practicing their profession or are retired after many years of dedicated commitment to their chosen discipline. During the 2017-18 academic year, CityU employed 492 Teaching Faculty worldwide, many of whom have earned doctorates. Each instructor is screened at the outset to ensure excellence in academic credentials and relevant current experience in the field of practice related to the subject matter they teach. On average they have taught at CityU for over five years. CityU’s hiring protocol includes a rigorous initial interview and teaching demonstration.

These faculty are identified and supervised by a cohort of primarily full-time Program Directors and Associate Program Directors — the Administrative Faculty. Each academic degree program is overseen by a designated Program Director who is responsible for ensuring the staffing of the courses and managing the curriculum.

Program Directors and Associate Program Directors are directly involved in governance, and this is delineated in their current job descriptions. These faculty leaders serve on the curriculum committees of each of the schools and make up the memberships of the four primary academic governance subcommittees of the Academic Affairs Council (AAC). The Teaching Faculty participate in governance through the Associate Faculty Advisory Board, which meets monthly with the Provost to review institutional policies related to appointment and privileges of the Teaching Faculty. This committee also provides a forum for Teaching Faculty to voice their experiences and concerns and share suggestions for continuous improvement.

The Faculty Standards and Development Committee is tasked with key initiatives to promote the orientation, development, evaluation, recognition, and retention of faculty. CityU provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness, continuous improvement, and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. All faculty members worldwide employed by and/or with teaching appointments from CityU receive a periodic comprehensive evaluation of their performance. Administrative Faculty receive annual performance reviews.

11. Educational Program

The institution provides one or more educational programs which include appropriate content and rigor consistent with its mission and core themes. The educational program(s) culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes, and lead to collegiate-level degree(s) with degree designation consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

City University of Seattle is, first and foremost, a teaching institution. CityU concentrates its offerings in fields that lead directly to employment and/or certifications. Its programs are in the disciplines of management, technology, education, counseling, leadership, and psychology. This range of offerings allows CityU to be simultaneously inclusive in the fields in which it provides degrees while focused on the particular fields that its community sees as providing opportunity for advancement and certification. Each degree program is designed to be of sufficient length, quality, and rigor appropriate to the degree level. A description of all degree programs is included in the University’s catalog and on its website.

CityU’s Academic Model includes major components that align with CityU’s mission and describe the dimensions of a CityU education: a focus on student learning, the use of professional-practitioner faculty, and ensuring curricular relevance to the workplace, service to students, accessibility, and responsiveness. The Academic Model provides a framework for ensuring that learning experiences are designed to support clearly articulated
outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. Educational experiences are carefully designed by faculty to encourage self-directed learning within an appropriately defined structure of expectations. With the focus on applying theory to practical experience, learning activities form explicit links among the crucial abilities of an educated professional: critical thinking, reflection, and ethical practice. Multiple paths to demonstrating each competency are available to learners as appropriate. Students are actively encouraged to define and take responsibility for their own contributions to the learning process, with the understanding that their engagement is critical for substantive learning to take place. Library services are designed to support CityU’s learning and teaching model, with web-based access to multiple types of resources aligned with program content, in addition, librarians work closely with faculty on curriculum design and identification of course resources.

12. General Education and Related Instruction

The institution’s baccalaureate degree programs and/or academic or transfer associate degree programs require a substantial and coherent component of general education as a prerequisite to or an essential element of the programs offered. All other associate degree programs (e.g., applied, specialized, or technical) and programs of study of either 30 semester or 45 quarter credits or more for which certificates are granted contain a recognizable core of related instruction or general education with identified outcomes in the areas of communication, computation, and human relations that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes. Bachelor and graduate degree programs also require a planned program of major specialization or concentration.

CityU recognizes the importance of general education for any student earning an undergraduate degree at the institution. CityU adopted a standard approach, used by many universities, to provide for a broad exposure to general education. Students are required to complete five credits of college mathematics, five credits of college composition, and fifteen credits in each of the three categories of humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. CityU has a suite of General Education courses that span the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, mathematics, and English composition. These courses are managed centrally in Seattle by the School of Arts and Sciences. There are two main student needs that are addressed by the General Education requirement. The first is to ensure that students are engaged in learning about a broad range of topics in the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and mathematics. The second is to ensure that students develop requisite skills to become more effective learners in upper division study.

13. Library and Information Resources

Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution maintains and/or provides access to library and information resources with an appropriate level of currency, depth, and breadth to support the institution’s programs and services wherever offered and however delivered.

City University of Seattle’s Dr. Vi Tasler Library and Learning Resource Center, located in Seattle, Washington, supports the University’s mission “to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.” The library aligns its work with the University’s Core Themes and goals to deliver high quality, relevant education, ensure student access, strengthen global connections, and foster lifelong learning. Library resources, services, and information-literacy instruction are coordinated through the Seattle location, providing academic support for students and faculty whenever and wherever they are learning and teaching. To this end, the library has focused its work on providing a core set of resources, services, and instruction accessible online to students and faculty in a just-in-time model at their point of need.

CityU librarians reach well beyond reference support as engaged participants in course design and delivery, working closely with faculty as courses are developed to ensure inclusion of resources and instruction supporting the University’s commitment to information literacy. The level and quality of involvement between skilled reference librarians and faculty is a significant strength of CityU’s approach.

In addition, the Library and Learning Resource Center has made it a central tenet of its contribution to CityU to seek ways to provide resources students need to be successful while limiting the cost of those resources wherever possible. Consequently, the Library has expanded its holdings while not passing those costs on to CityU’s students.
14. Physical and Technological Infrastructure

The institution provides the physical and technological infrastructure necessary to achieve its mission and core themes.

The University’s teaching locations worldwide are sufficient to achieve the University’s mission of providing relevant and accessible education to working adults. All University teaching locations have a minimum standard configuration whether directly managed by the University or provided contractually by a partner institution. These standards are reflective of a largely commuter population who access University services for limited durations and predominantly around designated classroom attendance requirements.

University instructional requirements are established by the Academic Affairs Council and reviewed on an annual basis. These standards drive both instructional technology as well as facility planning. Current standards reflect the type of instructional programs delivered by the University in business, education, and counseling. Periodic rental from local K-12 facilities by the School of Education provide future teachers exposure to relevant instructional environments in the most cost effective manner possible.

CityU Classrooms are equipped with whiteboards, a projection surface, LCD projectors, DVD players, and instructor computer/server access. CityU managed facilities in the US and Canada provide wireless internet access to all students. Classrooms are assigned on a priority basis with instructional needs taking precedence, followed by other institutional uses (meetings, rentals, staff training, etc.). Assignment of rooms, where furniture is largely standardized except for seating capacity, are based upon class-size and table configuration needs ranging from rows, to u-shape, to group-pod structures.

15. Academic Freedom

The institution maintains an atmosphere in which intellectual freedom and independence exist. Faculty and students are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.

CityU promotes faculty exploration in teaching and in research. CityU’s policy on Academic Freedom, which was adapted from the 1940 resolution of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges reads:

Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and that freedom applies to teaching, research, and learning, so long as that freedom is exercised in a manner that meets a faculty member’s professional and ethical obligations to students and to the University and that does not damage the University or its reputation. See Appendix 21.B.

16. Admissions

The institution publishes its student admission policy which specifies the characteristics and qualifications appropriate for its programs, and it adheres to that policy in its admissions procedures and practices.

Admissions criteria for programs, academic sequencing, and prerequisite requirements are developed by the faculty of the individual programs and schools. The admissions and advising staff enforce the policies set forth by the schools. Admissions policies are reviewed on an annual basis by the Catalog Policy Committee and disseminated through the City University of Seattle Catalog. The University maintains an open enrollment philosophy for most programs. Admissions criteria are consistent by program worldwide.

17. Public Information

The institution publishes in a catalog and/or on a website current and accurate information regarding its mission and core themes; admission requirements and procedures; grading policy; information on academic programs and courses; names, titles and academic credentials of administrators and faculty; rules and regulations for student conduct; rights and responsibilities of students; tuition, fees, and other program costs; refund policies and procedures; opportunities and requirements for financial aid; and the academic calendar.
The City University of Seattle Catalog includes information about its mission, vision, values, and goals; its admissions requirements and procedures; its academic and student policies; its academic offerings, programs and course calendar, and degree requirements; tuition, fee, financial aid, and refund information; procedures for grade grievance, scholastic honesty, and other student rights and responsibilities. The University catalog is published annually and is made available electronically on the City University of Seattle public website (www.CityU.edu), the Student Portal (my.CityU.edu), and in print version upon request.

18. Financial Resources
The institution demonstrates financial stability with sufficient cash flow and, as appropriate, reserves to support its programs and services. Financial planning reflects available funds, realistic development of financial resources, and appropriate risk management to ensure short-term solvency and long-term financial sustainability.

As mentioned previously, City University of Seattle has achieved financial stability, and is currently producing excess revenue after expenses. To maintain that sustainability, CityU prepares annual operating and capital budgets. The budget and the preparation processes are driven by the mission and vision statements of the University. The Board of Trustees meets annually for a strategy and planning session to determine overall strategies in preparation for the upcoming budget process. Financial goals and expectations are outlined for the process.

19. Financial Accountability
For each year of operation, the institution undergoes an annual external financial audit by professionally qualified personnel in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The audit is to be completed no later than nine months after the end of the fiscal year. Results from the audit, including findings and management letter recommendations, are considered annually in an appropriate and comprehensive manner by the administration and the governing board.

The University is audited annually by the independent certified public accounting firm Moss Adams. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards (and standards established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board). The audit report is reviewed and accepted by the Board of Trustees. The audit includes a management letter when appropriate. A summary of the latest audited financial statements is made available to the public. All funds for financial aid are audited annually by an independent certified public accounting firm, and a management letter is issued if deemed necessary. The University has no other specific programs that are subject to audit.

20. Disclosure
The institution accurately discloses to the Commission all information the Commission may require to carry out its evaluation and accreditation functions.

CityU responds to every request from NWCCU for information and complies with all required disclosures in a timely manner. CityU's mission statement, with its strong focus on high quality and relevancy and its vision of educational access worldwide, requires a constant process of assessment and innovation, which frequently results in the development of new programs and new locations of operation. These changes require frequent communication with the Commission.

21. Relationship with the Accreditation Commission
The institution accepts the standards and related policies of the Commission and agrees to comply with these standards and policies as currently stated or as modified in accordance with Commission policy. Further, the institution agrees that the Commission may, at its discretion, make known the nature of any action, positive or negative, regarding the institution's status with the Commission to any agency or members of the public requesting such information.
The institution accepts the standards and related policies of the Commission and agrees to comply with these standards and policies as currently stated or as modified in accordance with Commission policy. Further, CityU agrees that the Commission may, at its discretion, make known the nature of any action, positive or negative, regarding the institution’s status with the Commission to any agency or members of the public requesting such information.

CityU accepts the standards and policies of the Commission and agrees to comply with them. CityU specifically agrees to the Commission’s policy regarding sharing information about its status by the Commission.

22. Student Achievement

The institution identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. The institution engages in regular and ongoing assessment to validate student achievement of these learning outcomes.

CityU identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. It publishes these outcomes on the public page of each program page in the student portal (my.cityu.edu). Faculty, using secondary rubrics, assess program and institutional outcomes in their courses.

Each program’s outcomes are assessed as part of CityU’s annual and peer reviewed Academic Program Assessment and Review process, which is managed by the Academic Assessment Committee. The Academic Assessment Committee consists of faculty Program Directors representing each school. Results of the learning outcomes assessment inform program planning and revision.

23. Institutional Effectiveness

The institution systematically applies clearly defined evaluation and planning procedures, assesses the extent to which it achieves its mission and core themes, uses the results of assessment to effect institutional improvement, and periodically publishes the results to its constituencies. Through these processes it regularly monitors its internal and external environments to determine how and to what degree changing circumstances may impact the institution and its ability to ensure its viability and sustainability.

CityU measures its Core Themes via a dashboard, consisting of Core Theme objectives, indicators, and measures — which compares baselines to targets. It uses the results to inform strategic and operational planning. The dashboard is a formalization of this ongoing process. CityU uses these results for further planning and specific actionable improvements. On a regular basis, the institution monitors its external environment to ensure that its program offerings are in alignment with the needs of its key student populations. All new programs and major program revisions require external analysis. The institution publishes and shares its results via annual meetings to internal and external constituents.

24. Scale and Sustainability

The institution demonstrates that its operational scale (e.g., enrollment, human and financial resources and institutional infrastructure) is sufficient to fulfill its mission and achieve its core themes in the present and will be sufficient to do so in the foreseeable future.

As a small and cohesive university, CityU maintains a balance of operational scale and resources to ensure the fulfillment of its mission. The Board and President are committed to the fulfillment of the mission, while providing effective institutional leadership. The faculty and staff are committed to meeting the needs of CityU’s students in the present and in the foreseeable future. This balance is achieved via regular reviews of strategic and operational planning, as well as integrating financial analysis, zero-based budgeting, and external environmental analysis. These regular analyses and reviews justify that CityU has the resources to both fulfill its mission and achieve its Core Themes for the future.
MISSION, CORE THEMES, AND EXPECTATIONS

CHAPTER ONE: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

Standard 1.A Mission

The institution articulates its purpose in a mission statement, and identifies core themes that comprise essential elements of that mission. In an examination of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations, the institution defines the parameters for mission fulfillment. Guided by that definition, it identifies an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

1.A.1 The institution has a widely published mission statement—approved by its governing board—that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.

1.A.2 The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

Mission, Vision and Values

The Mission statement for City University of Seattle is:

To change lives for good by offering high quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.

City University of Seattle’s mission statement provides the basis for its overarching vision which is: education access worldwide, via a network of partners and programs on-site and/or online. CityU articulates a set of values that express the way in which it fulfills its mission and works toward achieving its vision. Requisite to achieving CityU’s mission is its values which are to be:

- **Flexible:** designs and delivers programs and services to be convenient to students;
- **Accessible:** provides educational opportunities to anyone, anywhere;
- **Innovative:** continually creates new educational opportunities;
- **Relevant:** what is taught today can be applied tomorrow;
- **Global:** acts locally and thinks globally.

CityU’s mission and values also serve as the main drivers to move the institution to its strategic vision, which is included in the CityU 2020 Strategic Plan. The strategic vision is:

To be the destination of choice for accessible, career-focused graduate education in the Pacific Northwest.

Together, the mission, vision, and values of CityU provided the foundation for its 2020 Strategic Plan. See Appendix 15 from the full strategic plan.

This plan produced Objectives that, along with the Core Themes, will drive the strategy for CityU through 2020. These four Strategic Objectives are:

- **Strategic Objective 1:** Sustained Enrollment Growth
- **Strategic Objective 2:** Create One New Graduate Program per Year
- **Strategic Objective 3:** Grow the Number of International Students Who Study in Seattle
- **Strategic Objective 4:** Increase Collaboration with the National University System

Later, a fifth strategic objective of Operational Efficiency was added to round out the current five Strategic Objectives that guide the institution.
Core Themes

In its strategic plan, the University establishes goals and associated metrics to make progress toward its mission centered around its Core Themes. CityU’s four Core Themes are:

- **Core Theme 1:** Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education;
- **Core Theme 2:** Ensure Student Access and Success;
- **Core Theme 3:** Strengthen Global Connections;
- **Core Theme 4:** Foster Lifelong Learning.

Since the 2013 Year Three Report, Core Themes 2 and 3 have had slight edits to their wording, the purpose of which was to better focus their meaning – as opposed to changing their meaning. Core Theme 2 was changed from “Ensure Student Access” to “Ensure Student Access and Success” to focus CityU on the whole student experience from entry to graduation or completion. CityU changed Core Theme 3 from “Broaden Global Connections” to “Strengthen Global Connections.” University administrators agreed that “Strengthen Global Connections” defined Core Theme 3 more accurately in supporting CityU’s mission from a quality standpoint.

The mission, Core Themes, values and Strategic Objectives are detailed and reviewed with CityU’s stakeholders and constituents. Examples include CityU’s “All-Hands” meetings, faculty and staff development events, and conferences. Because of CityU’s regionalized nature, both locally and internationally, these sessions are available to remote stakeholders and constituents via live internet connection, recorded sessions, and supporting materials.

CityU evaluates mission fulfillment by achieving an acceptable threshold for the measures of its Core Theme indicators. Most indicators have a set target. For example, the institution uses metrics of 80 percent as a target for outcomes assessment and many measures in the Student Satisfaction Survey. For growth measures, CityU established a four percent growth target. To illustrate, Figure 1 is a snapshot of CityU’s Core Themes dashboard. It shows the objective, indicators, measures, and targets, for Core Theme 1: Deliver High Quality Relevant Education; Objective 1A. It is in this manner that measures are matched to targets allowing Core Theme assessments to be tracked.

The institution judges its extent of mission fulfillment by examining the baselines and targets and determining its strengths and areas for improvement. It does this through dialogue and holistic evaluation with stakeholders. As the institution is continuously evolving, this assessment reveals areas of both strengths and weaknesses, which inform planning. It is also done within the process of a continuous self-reflection and improvement cycle. In Chapter Four of this Seven Year Self Study, in which all four Core Themes are assessed individually, it is clear that some measures are not achieved and this will inform future plans and the continuous improvement process.

Figure 1. Example of the Core Themes Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A1. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</td>
<td>1A1a. Student attainment of program learning outcomes</td>
<td>PLOs Achieved</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A2. CityU Learning Goals (CULGs)</td>
<td>1A2a. Student attainment of CityU learning goals by academic program</td>
<td>CULGs Achieved</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.B.1 The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.

1.B.2 The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes.

Established in 2011, CityU's Core Themes are:

- **Core Theme 1:** Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education
- **Core Theme 2:** Ensure Student Access and Success
- **Core Theme 3:** Strengthen Global Connections
- **Core Theme 4:** Foster Lifelong Learning

City University of Seattle serves a variety of students, of which there are two main categories. In its US and Canadian locations, CityU mainly serves returning adult students – which benefit from multiple locations, evening, weekend, and online offerings. Core Theme Two is vital for this population.

CityU’s international student population is made up of students who are seeking the value of a US bachelor’s or master’s degree. These students study both in the US and at their home institutions through degree partnerships and collaborative delivery. Core Theme Three is particularly significant to this population.

Core Themes One and Four apply to both populations mentioned above. Most importantly, CityU believes that each of its Core Themes applies to every single student it serves and strives to ensure the incorporation of its Core Themes in everything it does.

**Objectives, Indicators and Measures**

Each Core Theme is aligned with one to three objectives, each of which has one or more indicators of achievement. The indicators of achievement are constructs of how the Core Theme objective is evaluated or measured. Each indicator has one or two measures. Measures are the specific evaluations of the indicators of achievement. The organization of the objectives, indicators, and measures for each Core Theme are described in the following sections.

**Core Theme 1: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education**

Synthesized directly from the University’s Academic Model, three specific tenets shape CityU’s approach to delivering high quality and relevant education. These are: 1) a distinct focus on achievement of student learning; 2) utilization of highly effective practitioner faculty; and 3) curriculum relevance. Achievement in each of these areas is measured annually by a series of metrics and is supplemented by key student satisfaction statistics both at the existing and alumni student levels. CityU’s Academic Model is available in Appendix 6 and the most recent graduate survey results can be found in Appendix 2.

Core Theme One is broken out into three objectives:

- **Objective 1A:** CityU supports the achievement of student learning outcomes.
- **Objective 1B:** CityU champions effective and innovative teaching.
- **Objective 1C:** CityU delivers relevant education that positively impacts students’ careers.

These objectives and their alignment with attendant indicators and measures are shown in Table 1 below.
Table 1. Core Theme 1: Objectives, Indicators of Achievement, and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme 1: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1A: CityU supports the achievement of student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1B: CityU champions effective and innovative teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1C: CityU delivers relevant education that positively impacts students’ careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: Connection of Indicators to Core Theme One Objectives

In Objective 1A, which addresses achievement of Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals, CityU embraces and puts into practice the continuous improvement process of learning outcomes assessment. It functions as an integral part of program assessment and evaluation as a result of the direct measurement of student learning and instructional quality.

To evaluate Objective 1B, student perspectives of instructional quality are measured via two methods: the Student Satisfaction Survey and End of Course Evaluations. These measures are invaluable in academic quality assurance and continuous improvement.

Finally, survey questions on income, job placement, professional advancement and return on investment garnered from CityU educational degrees and certificates indicates relevance with respect to advancing students’ careers. These measures support Objective 1C and further demonstrate the relevance aspect of Core Theme 1.

Core Theme 2: Ensure Student Access and Success

Building upon the fifth aspect of CityU’s Academic Model “Accessibility and Responsiveness,” CityU is committed to making high quality learning opportunities as accessible and responsive to the needs of a diverse student population as possible. This includes maintaining affordability and fiscal stability, developing new programs to attract students worldwide, removing unnecessary barriers to entry, utilizing innovation in both design and delivery of programs, and providing a high touch student support environment that enables them to be successful.

See the full Academic Model [https://www.cityu.edu/discover-cityu/about-cityu/](https://www.cityu.edu/discover-cityu/about-cityu/).

Core Theme two is broken out into three objectives:

- **Objective 2A**: CityU is committed to educational success.
- **Objective 2B**: CityU is committed to offering affordable academic programs suited to adult learners.
- **Objective 2C**: CityU creates pathways that facilitate the transition into higher education.

These objectives and their alignment with attendant indicators and measures are shown in Table 2 below.
Table 2. Core Theme 2: Objectives, Indicators of Achievement, and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme 2: Ensure Student Access and Success</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2A:</strong> CityU is committed to educational success.</td>
<td>2A1. Enrollments</td>
<td>2A1a. Enrollments by location and delivery mode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2A1b. Unduplicated headcount by program and location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A2. Retention</td>
<td>2A2a. Year to year retention for new students by school and program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2A3. Graduation</td>
<td>2A3a. Completion rates by program – with 100, 150 and 200 percent time to completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2B:</strong> CityU is committed to offering affordable academic programs suited to adult learners.</td>
<td>2B1. Affordability</td>
<td>2B1a. Average student loan amounts, % of U.S. students borrowing and loan default rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2B2b. Student’s perceptions of flexibility by school as reported on student and alumni surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2C:</strong> CityU creates pathways that facilitate the transition into higher education.</td>
<td>2C1. Community and Technical College Transfers</td>
<td>2C1a. Transfer credits by institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C2. Continuing Education</td>
<td>2C2a. Students enrolled in continuing education and Washington Academy of Languages (WAL) courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C3. Military and Partner Transfers</td>
<td>2C3a. Military and veteran enrollments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale: Connection of Indicators to Core Theme Two Objectives**

By conducting a holistic evaluation of the measures with respect to their baselines and targets, the Core Theme of ensuring student access and success can be assessed. CityU measures access by examining the indicators of enrollment, affordability, and flexibility. Also, community and technical college transfers help show the access pipeline by examining a large segment of the US student population, in which transfer-in students with credits position these students for a shorter time to completion – thus, contributing to both student access and success. Military/veteran enrollment and Continuing Education enrollments help CityU serve at non-traditional access areas, which compliment both student access and its mission of supporting all students with a desire to learn.

The indicators of retention and graduation measure student success, with completion the key metric. Retention serves as a benchmark for an in progress measure of student success. These measures at the Core Theme level are high-level summative metrics, the Core Themes dashboard provides the capability to drill down to the program and location level, which reveals actionable data at a more specific level.
Core Theme 3: Strengthen Global Connections

With students at multiple locations in eight countries, as well as students online worldwide, diversity defines CityU as a global university. As part of its mission, CityU is committed to building stronger communities worldwide through educational programs that provide global reach, have embedded global perspectives, and promote mobility of both students and faculty.

Core Theme 3 is broken out into two objectives:

- **Objective 3A**: CityU develops diverse and globally competent learners.
- **Objective 3B**: CityU fosters mutually beneficial global alliances.

These objectives and their alignment with attendant indicators and measures are shown in Table 3 below.

*Table 3. Core Theme 3: Objectives, Indicators of Achievement, and Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3A</strong>: CityU develops diverse and globally competent learners.</td>
<td>3A1. Global and Multicultural Learning</td>
<td>3A1a. Attainment of global and multicultural perspectives as reported on student and alumni surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3A1b. Mastery level achievement of CityU Learning Goal 5 - Diverse and Global Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3A2. Domestic Student Diversity</td>
<td>3A2a. Minority and nontraditional student enrollments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3B</strong>: CityU fosters mutually beneficial global alliances.</td>
<td>3B1. International Student Success</td>
<td>3B1a. Number of international students and enrollments by global partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3B2. International Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>3B2a. Student satisfaction comparison by country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale: Connection of Indicators to Core Theme Three Objectives**

The indicators of achievement of Core Theme 3 measure the objectives in three ways. First, through the enrollment indicators, CityU can assess domestic (US) diversity holistically compared with international enrollment. Second, the institution can analyze all students’ perspectives of global and multicultural learning by comparing international and domestic students’ survey results for questions addressing this topic – as well as student and alumni perspectives on whether their CityU education gave or is giving them global and diverse perspectives. Finally, measuring student mastery of CityU Learning Goal 5 – Diverse and Global Perspectives – is a direct indicator of student learning fulfilling this Core Theme.
Core Theme 4: Foster Lifelong Learning

In a world where knowledge and skills must be constantly updated, City University of Seattle graduates, faculty and staff seek out ways to continue their learning throughout their lifetimes, and remain current in their fields of employment.

Core Theme 4 is broken out into two objectives:

Objective 4A: CityU provides a positive educational experience.

Objective 4B: CityU promotes the continuation of education.

These objectives and their alignment with attendant indicators and measures are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Core Theme 4: Objectives, Indicators of Achievement, and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4A: CityU provides a positive educational experience.</td>
<td>4A1. Student Experience and Satisfaction</td>
<td>4A1a. Trended student experience and overall satisfaction as reported on student and alumni surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4A1b. Mastery of CityU Learning Goal 6 - Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4B: CityU promotes the continuation of education.</td>
<td>4B1. Students pursue additional education</td>
<td>4B1a. CityU alumni completing additional education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale: Connection of Indicators to Core Theme Four Objectives

This Core Theme is measured using relevant questions from both Alumni and Student Satisfaction Surveys. The goal is to find out how students perceive their CityU experience, as well as gauge their attitude towards further education after leaving CityU. For Objective 4A, a positive experience has a higher likelihood of leading to further education. Finally, mastery of CityU Learning Goal 6 directly measures students’ readiness to engage in lifelong learning.
CHAPTER TWO: Resources and Capacity

Standard 2.A Governance

2.A.1 The institution demonstrates an effective and widely understood system of governance with clearly defined authority, roles, and responsibilities. Its decision-making structures and processes make provision for the consideration of the views of faculty, staff, administrators, and students on matters in which they have a direct and reasonable interest.

City University of Seattle is a not for profit corporation created under the laws of the State of Washington. It is governed by a Board of Trustees having legal and fiduciary responsibility for the quality and integrity of the institution. The Board selects a Chief Executive Officer (President), approves and monitors the implementation of the mission of the institution, establishes institutional policies, approves all new academic programs, adopts the University budget, and exercises oversight to ensure compliance with policies. The Board delegates to the President the responsibility to implement and administer institutional policies as well as to carry out the mission of the institution. The President reports to the Board of Trustees.

CityU is an affiliate of the National University System (NUS), with National University and John F. Kennedy University. The President is responsible for System collaboration, working with the National University System Chancellor, and is evaluated by the Chancellor and the Board annually. The President works collaboratively with the Board and the University community to articulate a vision for the University, and to provide strategic leadership through defining institutional goals, establishing priorities, and developing strategic plans.

The President’s Executive Team (PET), comprised of the Provost, Chief Financial Officer, Deans, Directors of Information Technology and Human Resources, and Vice Presidents of Enrollment and Student Services, meets weekly and is responsible for developing and implementing strategic and operational plans and for administrative oversight of the institution. Reporting to the President, the Directors in administrative roles meet monthly to address operational activities across CityU. The Directors also participate in strategic planning initiatives.

The Provost reports directly to the President and is responsible for oversight of the quality and operations of all Academic Affairs. Reporting to the Provost are the Deans, academic operational units including the Library and Learning Resource Center, the Division of E-Learning, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the University Registrar, and the Office of International Operations. The Academic Deans and VP of Canadian Programs supervise experienced Administrative Faculty who in turn identify, recommend for appointment, and supervise almost 500 Associate (Teaching) Faculty worldwide. Programs offered in Europe and Asia are supervised by appropriate Directors who ensure academic quality and provide daily operational oversight.

City University of Seattle’s faculty are vital to the University’s educational mission. Faculty oversee curricula through participation in school curriculum committees which review and recommend all new or revised programs and courses. In addition, both administrative staff and faculty participate in an inclusive academic governance structure through representation on cross-departmental committees and councils. The Academic Affairs Council, chaired by the Provost, is the primary academic governance body for Academic Affairs. It reviews and recommends new programs, substantial program revisions, new partnerships, and academic policies. An Associate Faculty Advisory Board meets periodically with the Provost to discuss matters relevant to the Associate Faculty. All Faculty are encouraged to participate in policy or governance discussions and decisions by providing written and/or oral input through Administrative faculty, Deans, and the Provost.

City University of Seattle is a student-centered institution of higher education. Every effort is made to actively solicit student input into the University’s planning and decision-making. Student input is collected through regular surveys and evaluations of instruction and course quality. Academic program advisory committees, which provide industry feedback to the programs, include students in their membership. Students may at any time provide feedback and suggestions through their advisors, or by taking advantage of an open-door policy of all faculty and administrators, including the Provost and the President.

2.A.2 In a multi-unit governance system, the division of authority and responsibility between the system and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered.
City University of Seattle is an affiliate of the National University System (NUS), and is governed by a Board of Trustees. All members of the City University of Seattle Board of Trustees also serve as members of the National University System Board of Trustees. Each Board retains its own Board Chair. Each university affiliate has an independent President who reports to the Board and serves as the general manager and chief executive officer of the University. The President has, subject to the control of the Board, general supervision, direction and control of the business and officers of the University, and the President is the conduit for all official communications from the Board to University employees, and vice versa.

Per Board Policy (Appendix 21.A) the Board may delegate the management of the activities of the University to any person or persons, a management company or committees, however composed, provided that the activities and affairs of the University shall be managed and exercised under the ultimate direction of the Board.

The National University System Board delegates day-to-day management of System policy and procedures to a Chancellor, who is also tasked with coordinating with the affiliate Presidents.

2.A.3 The institution monitors its compliance with the Commission’s Standards for Accreditation, including the impact of collective bargaining agreements, legislative actions, and external mandates.

The University complies with the Commission’s Standards for Accreditation and regularly monitors and adjusts as necessary its policies and procedures to remain compliant with the standards. The Provost is tasked as the liaison to the Commission, and ensures that standards are met both domestically and internationally.

The University has no unions or collective bargaining agreements.

Governing Board

2.A.4 The institution has a functioning governing board consisting of at least five voting members, a majority of whom have no contractual, employment, or financial interest in the institution. If the institution is governed by a hierarchical structure of multiple boards, the roles, responsibilities, and authority of each board—as they relate to the institution—are clearly defined, widely communicated, and broadly understood.

The City University of Seattle Board of Trustees consists of no less than fifteen and no more than twenty five voting trustees. See Appendix 10 for the full list of Board of Trustees. Not more than 49% of Trustees may be interested persons, and Section 4.7 and 4.8 of the Board by-laws define “interested persons” as well as transactions in which Trustees may be considered to have “personal interest.”

The National University System Board is responsible for the strategic direction of the System, comprised of affiliated university and educational entities. The members of the City University of Seattle’s Board of Trustees are also members of the National University System Board of Trustees but each affiliate has a designated and separate board member who serves as Board Chair for the institution. The University’s Board of Trustees, led by the CityU Board Chair, has the authority to govern the institution.

In addition to the Board of Trustees, City University of Seattle has an Institutional Advisory Board comprised of local and regional business leaders. A member of the City University of Seattle Board of Trustees serves as a liaison to the Advisory Board. The purpose of the Advisory Board is to guide the institution as it considers new programs and initiatives. The members of the Advisory Board are leaders and professionals representing organizations located in the Pacific Northwest. They bring a regional understanding of the State of Washington market along with its political environment and growth trends and advise the institution from regionally knowledgeable perspective.

2.A.5 The board acts only as a committee of the whole; no member or subcommittee of the board acts on behalf of the board except by formal delegation of authority by the governing board as a whole.

The Board has established standing committees: Academic Affairs; Audit; Compensation; Executive; Finance and Business Operations; Governance; and Marketing, Development and Public Affairs. Board by-laws section 4.24 limit the authority of the committees, and articulate those items which require governing board action as a whole. The Board requires a quorum, consisting of a majority of the Trustees serving, for all actions of the whole.

2.A.6 The board establishes, reviews regularly, revises as necessary, and exercises broad oversight of institutional policies, including those regarding its own organization and operation.
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City University of Seattle polices require approval of the Board prior to publication. University policies governing students are reviewed annually, and policies governing employment and business operations are reviewed and updated as needed.

2.A.7 The board selects and evaluates regularly a chief executive officer who is accountable for the operation of the institution. It delegates authority and responsibility to the CEO to implement and administer board-approved policies related to the operation of the institution.

The Board of Trustees, per section 4.2(f) of the by-laws, is responsible for “hiring, evaluating, and terminating the President and establishing clear procedures in connection with the same.” The President has general supervision, direction and control of the business and officers of the University, and the President is the conduit for all official communications from the Board to University employees, and vice versa. The President is evaluated on an annual basis.

The President is a member of the City University of Seattle Board of Trustees, attending all annual and regularly scheduled meetings of the Board. In addition to formal meetings, the President, from time to time, may meet locally with Board of Trustee members who represent the Northwest Region to the Board of Trustees of the National University System.

2.A.8 The board regularly evaluates its performance to ensure its duties and responsibilities are fulfilled in an effective and efficient manner.

The CityU Board of Trustees undergoes a full evaluation every two years or as needed. The last evaluation of the CityU Board of Trustees was completed by AGB Consulting in August 2017. The Board also evaluates its own performance on a regular basis. A copy of the evaluation forms for the CityU Board of Trustees can be found in Appendix 21.AA.

Leadership and Management

2.A.9 The institution has an effective system of leadership, staffed by qualified administrators, with appropriate levels of responsibility and accountability, who are charged with planning, organizing, and managing the institution and assessing its achievements and effectiveness.

The leaders of CityU all serve on the President’s Executive Team (PET). These individuals include:

- President Randy Frisch, J.D.
- Provost and VP of Academics Dr. Kurt Kirstein, Ed.D.
- Chief Financial Officer (Interim Appointment of Chris Bryan)
- Dean Dr. Kelly Flores, Ed.D.
- Dean Tom Cary, J.D.
- Information Technology Director Kevin Brown
- Human Resources Director Janet O’Leary
- Vice President Student Services Dr. Melissa Mecham, Ed.D.
- Vice President Marketing and Enrollment – Vacant

These leaders are accountable for the performance of their units and each has a clear set of operational objectives that they and their teams are charged with meeting.

Each of these leaders has a number of directors, managers and employees, all of whom have authority and accountability for the performance of their units or areas. All directors and managers have submitted their operational goals for the year to document their key objectives. Please see Appendix 13 for a full accounting of the institution’s current operational goals. Their teams have been involved in the generation of these operational goals and are aware of how progress on the goals will be assessed.

From an academics standpoint, the Deans have established operational goals for each of the schools but they also track student satisfaction and academic achievement. Through a number of quality metrics, each academic unit pays close attention to ensuring an excellent student experience.
The leaders that have been chosen for CityU have undergone careful review to ensure that they can bring effective leadership to their units and ensure that operational goals are achieved.

2.A.10 The institution employs an appropriately qualified chief executive officer with full-time responsibility to the institution. The chief executive officer may serve as an ex officio member of the governing board, but may not serve as its chair.

President Randy Frisch began his position on October 1, 2016 and serves full time as CityU’s president. His primary responsibility is to see to the advancement of CityU’s mission. President Frisch serves as a member of the Board of Trustees, but not as its chair. President Frisch also represents CityU on the NUS Chancellor’s Cabinet where he advocates the institution’s interests and ensures that CityU operates as a separate but integral part of the National University System.

2.A.11 The institution employs a sufficient number of qualified administrators who provide effective leadership and management for the institution’s major support and operational functions and work collaboratively across institutional functions and units to foster fulfillment of the institution’s mission and accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

The President’s Executive Team (PET) consists of Directors and Vice Presidents, each of whom leads a key part of the organization. This team meets weekly to discuss progress on major university initiatives that align with the institution’s strategic objectives and core themes. The next level of leadership consists of the departmental directors who were selected for and charged with oversight of their specific area. All of these directors report through PET members, except for the Directors of Human Resources, Finance and Information Technology, who serve directly on the PET.

All non-academic directors at CityU meet as a separate group on a monthly basis to foster communication among themselves and to cover major initiatives that are likely to have impacts throughout the university. Minutes from this meeting are available to the PET.

To ensure mission fulfillment, all executive members and directors have completed departmental operational plans that are aligned to CityU’s strategic objectives and core themes. These plans were then aggregated into a system wide document that shows a collection of operational initiatives for each core theme and strategic objective. The 2017-2018 list of operational goals for the University can be found in Appendix 13.

Policies and Procedures

Academics

2.A.12 Academic policies—including those related to teaching, service, scholarship, research, and artistic creation—are clearly communicated to students and faculty and to administrators and staff with responsibilities related to these areas.

The University General Catalog is the primary method of communicating academic policies to CityU students. That document is available in print and electronically. There is also a Student Portal that is utilized to post policies impacting students.

For Administrative Faculty and staff, the university maintains a set of academic policies that are readily available on the University’s home page on its SharePoint system. There are policies that govern teaching, scholarship, research and ownership of intellectual property as well as parameters governing academic freedom. The Academic Freedom Policy is posted on the University’s public website and can also be accessed in Appendix 21.B.

2.A.13 Policies regarding access to and use of library and information resources—regardless of format, location, and delivery method—are documented, published, and enforced.

Policies regarding access to and use of library and information resources are published on the library website in the “About Us” menu (http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/location-and-hours/). Most information is found in the Circulation Policy, with the Interlibrary Loan Policy, Canadian Services, and Alumni Services pages providing additional details to students, faculty, staff, and alumni. Students will also find a general overview of library resources and services in the University General Catalog, and each new student receives a welcome email from their program’s instructional librarian with a brief overview of the resources and services available to them.
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2.A.14 The institution develops, publishes widely, and follows an effective and clearly stated transfer-of-credit policy that maintains the integrity of its programs while facilitating efficient mobility of students between institutions in completing their educational programs.

In alignment with its mission, transfer policies are developed to maintain the integrity of programs yet allow for the greatest movement between institutions. As primarily a degree completion institution at the undergraduate level, associate and bachelor degree programs are designed to acknowledge and facilitate student’s prior earned credits from a variety of sources, including but not limited to traditional academic learning, prior learning, and approved credit earned through recognized testing programs. CityU works closely with State of Washington community and technical colleges, in accordance with the Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA), to effect smooth transfer processes. The institution also provides eligible students opportunities for community college transfer scholarships. Graduate and doctoral programs also recognize, when appropriate, prior earned academic credit. See Appendix 21.E and F for attendant policies. In addition, the Registrar works with Program Directors during the initial design and revision of programs, as well in the establishment of admission policy, to ensure opportunity for transfer while maintaining the academic integrity of programs.

Transfer credit policies are published and made available via the University General Catalog (p. 20 – 23) and maintained by the Office of the Registrar. The Registrar’s Office is responsible for transcript evaluation worldwide, and upon evaluation, communicates the award of transfer credit type (general education, pre-requisite, elective, or direct equivalency) to both the student and the student’s Enrollment Advisor or Student Success Advisor via the student program plan, and through posting to the student’s official transcript. On a case-by-case basis, students may petition for transfer or direct equivalency credit to be recognized through a formal petition to the Program Director and/or Dean. Review of such petitions are done in consultation between the Registrar and the Program Director/Dean.

Students

2.A.15 Policies and procedures regarding students’ rights and responsibilities—including academic honesty, appeals, grievances, and accommodations for persons with disabilities—are clearly stated, readily available, and administered in a fair and consistent manner.

Policy related to academic honesty are available both in the University General Catalog (p. 43), my.cityu.edu portal under the Office of the Registrar, and stated in all course syllabi. Governed by the Office of the Provost, an Academic Honesty Board is appointed each year to review all cases involving scholastic honesty violations. See policy in Appendix 21.G.

Policy related to grade appeals are available both in the University General Catalog (p. 51), my.cityu.edu portal under the Office of the Registrar, and stated in all course syllabi. Students are required to first discuss grade concerns with the instructional faculty member, and then the Program Director. If mutual resolution does not occur, the student may file a formal grade appeal. Governed by the Office of the Provost, a Grade Appeals Committee is appointed each year to review all cases involving formal grade appeals. See policy in Appendix 21.H.

Grievance policy and procedures related to non-discrimination are documented in the University General Catalog (pp. 50-51) and fall under the responsibility of the Vice President of Student Services. See policy in Appendix 21.I.

Policies and procedure related to disability services are stated and available in the University General Catalog (pp.50), posted in course syllabi, in the Blackboard main page, and on the my.cityu.edu student portal. Disability support is administered by the Disability Support Services Office located in the Counseling Center. See policy in Appendix 21.J. Every effort is made to administer policies in a fair and consistent manner.

2.A.16 The institution adopts and adheres to admission and placement policies that guide the enrollment of students in courses and programs through an evaluation of prerequisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to assure a reasonable probability of student success at a level commensurate with the institution’s expectations. Its policy regarding continuation in and termination from its educational programs—including its appeals process and readmission policy—are clearly defined, widely published, and administered in a fair and timely manner.

CityU is an open enrollment university for many of its programs. Part of its mission is to offer high quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. At the undergraduate level, students must hold the equivalent of a high school diploma and international students must prove proficiency in English through one of the adopted university standard methods.
There are a number of degree programs at the university that require applicants to undergo additional screening before they will be admitted to the program. CityU’s two doctoral programs require writing samples, interviews, and references. Several of the master’s programs require that prospective students undergo a screening process to ensure likely academic success and to conform to state and specialized accreditation standards. Students who enter the Master of Business Administration without sufficient background in business must take a business skills course that covers twelve key competencies to ensure a minimum level of awareness in those areas prior to graduate study.

Students are required to make satisfactory academic progress in the degree and/or certificate program in which they have enrolled. Satisfactory academic progress is defined as meeting minimum cumulative grade point average (GPA) requirements in addition to program-specific performance requirements related to internships, project, and/or theses. Undergraduate students must maintain a 2.0 cumulative GPA throughout their enrollment at CityU. Master’s, graduate certificate and doctoral students must maintain a 3.0 cumulative GPA throughout their enrollment at CityU.

Throughout their enrollment at CityU, students are expected to maintain Good Standing. If they do not, they may be subjected to one of the following actions:

- **Academic Probation** – If Students’ Cumulative GPA falls below the appropriate level for their degree type, they are placed on academic probation. This status does not prevent students from enrolling in future courses. They are advised by their Student Success Advisor to enroll in courses that enable them to bring up their GPA and resolve their negative academic standing.

- **Academic Suspension** – If the student remains on academic probation for three quarters, he/she will be placed on academic suspension. While on academic suspension, the student is blocked from enrolling in any additional courses. To be removed from academic suspension, the student must request provisional readmission from the Readmission Committee, Office of the Registrar. The Readmission Committee decides if the student is to be provisionally readmitted and establishes the conditions for their readmittance.

- **Provisional Readmission** – If a student is readmitted following suspension, he/she is issued a letter outlining the conditions under which they may continue. If those conditions are not met, the student may be dismissed from their program by the Registrar.

Academic performance standards are articulated and made available in the University General Catalog (pp.46-17). The Office of the Registrar administers academic performance policies related to required grade achievement, program suspension and appeals for readmission. See Appendix 21.K, L and M for attendant policies.

2.A.17 The institution maintains and publishes policies that clearly state its relationship to co-curricular activities and the roles and responsibilities of students and the institution for those activities, including student publications and other student media, if offered.

The University has no student publications or student media. It does permit the creation of Student Clubs as defined in its Student Services Chartered Student Clubs Policies and Procedures (see Appendix 21.N) articulating the relationship between the club and CityU as well as the requirements for continued approval. Chartered clubs must clearly demonstrate how they will build community and contribute to the overall student experience.

**Human Resources**

2.A.18 The institution maintains and publishes its human resources policies and procedures and regularly reviews them to ensure they are consistent, fair, and equitably applied to its employees and students.

CityU’s policies and procedures are available online under the Human Resource department’s SharePoint page. New faculty members are given access to this page as part of their New Faculty Orientation. It covers key policies that new faculty members need to know to comply with university policies. The Employee Handbook is provided in an electronic format and is accessible to all employees. These materials are updated biennially. Please see Appendix 12 for the Employee Handbook.

The University provides a process for employees, students, and faculty to anonymously raise any concerns over the fair, consistent, and equitable application of policies and procedures. This service is provided through an external source, EthicsPoint. Every inquiry is thoroughly investigated by the Board’s Audit Committee with documented results.
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2.A.19 Employees are apprised of their conditions of employment, work assignments, rights and responsibilities, and criteria and procedures for evaluation, retention, promotion, and termination.

Prior to the first day, new hire documents are sent to employees to complete in advance by Human Resources. This includes their job description, legal documents, personal data sheets, etc. Upon receipt of the completed documentation HR sends out an email to the manager/supervisor, and the IT department to configure the email account, network access, and security clearance ahead of time so the new staff member can feel welcome and prepared on their first day. Facilities is notified to set up the new employee’s assigned workstation. This way their new workspace is set up and equipped with their laptop/desktop and any other equipment they’ll need immediately to perform their assigned job responsibilities and feel a part of the team.

Staff orientation and onboarding is conducted by Human Resource personnel on the first day of employment. Onboarding includes a comprehensive process by which new employees are introduced to our culture, in addition to being oriented to their specific job tasks and associated work expectations. Employee orientation includes a review of policies and procedures, benefits, payroll, and introduction to our mandatory compliance training program. The required compliance modules are hosted by LawRoom. Those modules are:

- Preventing Sexual Harassment/Title IX
- Accommodating Disabilities (CA)
- FERPA
- Injury & Illness Prevention

New employees have 30 days to complete the required training. In addition, new employees are provided the Ethics Policy and required to sign an acknowledgement form confirming he/she has read, understood and agreed to the policy. Employees are further advised that CityU has instituted a confidential reporting system, developed and managed by EthicsPoint, Inc. EthicsPoint provides a mechanism for staff and faculty to confidentially report concerns about ethics compliance. It delivers a simple and risk-free method for anonymously reporting actions or behaviors that may violate local, state or federal laws or institutional policy.

Once orientation is completed, the hiring manager or their designee will take the new employee on a tour to orient them to the facility. Hiring managers will meet with their new employee to discuss the first week’s schedule. In addition, they will walk them through important procedures and standards, the rules and processes for internet usage, email communication, breaks, etc. and start familiarizing them with the technology they will be using daily for their job.

After giving the new hire time to get used to the office, workspace and their trainer, managers are encouraged to follow up at the end of the week to ensure they are comfortable and picking things up at an appropriate pace.

After 90 days, new hires are subject to a review. At this point, their supervisor, assessing their strengths and weaknesses, evaluates the employee as to whether or not they are fit to continue as a regular employee.

2.A.20 The institution ensures the security and appropriate confidentiality of human resources records.

CityU utilizes PeopleSoft as the Human Resource Information System and Automatic Data Processing (ADP) for payroll. Both systems contain confidential employee data. The HR and Payroll departments work closely together to assure the safety and security of employee data. Only human resources, payroll personnel and select employees working in Information Technology who assist with programming, troubleshooting and enhancements to the PeopleSoft system, are able to access the PeopleSoft database. Confidential employee records are kept in file cabinets in a secured room within the HR department. Employee files are not allowed out of the HR department and can only be accessed by the employee or their manager. Nothing can be removed from the files, however employees may request copies of their file.

Institutional Integrity

2.A.21 The institution represents itself clearly, accurately, and consistently through its announcements, statements, and publications. It communicates its academic intentions, programs, and services to students and to the public and demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. It regularly reviews its publications to assure integrity in all representations about its mission, programs, and services.
The two primary mechanisms for communicating details about CityU are the University General Catalog and the public website. The institution’s academic policies and model are covered either in the catalog or on the website (oftentimes both). All information sources need to be consistent in content and format, a responsibility that is overseen by the CityU’s Marketing and Communications staff who closely monitor and review all communication from the University.

CityU maintains a high level of transparency through the public website which includes facts about the University including enrollment figures, retention and completion rates, as well as other relevant demographic facts. The public website also includes the Core Themes, the academic model, and the current strategic plan. All of these documents must be consistently aligned for the University to effectively pursue its mission.

Recently, the Chronicle of Higher Education released a study in which CityU received recognition for being the institution with the highest percentage of its students that finish their program of study each year in the State of Washington. This points to the fact that CityU’s academic offerings are structured to make it possible for students to finish in a reasonable amount of time. The University has turned this recognition into a marketing campaign indicating that CityU is “All About the Finish.” To support that assertion, program revisions take into account how well their design is aligned with students being able to finish on their own schedule.

The University strictly adheres to a policy of never posting or offering an academic program until all approvals have been received from internal constituents, its Board of Trustees, and its accreditors in compliance with NWCCU standards.

2.A.22 The institution advocates, subscribes to, and exemplifies high ethical standards in managing and operating the institution, including its dealings with the public, the Commission, and external organizations, and in the fair and equitable treatment of students, faculty, administrators, staff, and other constituencies. It ensures complaints and grievances are addressed in a fair and timely manner.

City University of Seattle is committed to the highest standards of educational quality, including the highest standards of legal and ethical conduct in its business practices. The continued success and strong public image of City University of Seattle is dependent upon the ethical conduct of its Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff. This Code of Ethics contains principles articulating the policy of the University and standards, which are intended to provide additional guidance. All members of the University community are responsible to ensure that their behavior and activity is consistent with this Code of Ethics, as well as University policies and procedures, and applicable federal, state, provincial, and local laws, and regulations.

CityU uses EthicsPoint, an independent, third-party provider of anonymous internet and telephone hotline services. EthicsPoint acts as the confidential recipient for concerns relating to compliance violations, unethical conduct or other allegations of fraud or unethical behavior concerning academic affairs, conflicts of interest, environmental health and safety, financial matters, and student safety. Upon hire new employees are provided with a brochure about EthicsPoint so that should the need arise they can access the program anonymously. EthicsPoint helps CityU’s leadership to work together with members of the University community to address fraud, misconduct and other ethical issues. Every inquiry is thoroughly investigated by the Board of Trustee’s Audit Committee with documented results.

2.A.23 The institution adheres to a clearly defined policy that prohibits conflict of interest on the part of members of the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff. Even when supported by or affiliated with social, political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. If it requires its constituencies to conform to specific codes of conduct or seeks to instill specific beliefs or world views, it gives clear prior notice of such codes and/or policies in its publications.

City University is a stand-alone, non-profit institution that has no alignment or affiliation with any organizations that profess religious or political ideology. Its mission is to offer education to anyone with the desire to learn and its Core Themes are focused on delivering high quality, relevant education with open access, leading to student success and fostering lifelong learning.

Board Policies address conflict of interest in Appendix 21.O. Additionally, the executive leaders of CityU complete and sign an annual questionnaire that tracks any potential conflicts of interest through corporate, organizational or academic affiliations. The institution maintains clear limitations on such affiliations.
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2.A.24 The institution maintains clearly defined policies with respect to ownership, copyright, control, compensation, and revenue derived from the creation and production of intellectual property.

In principle, CityU faculty, staff, and students retain all rights to copyrightable materials that they create, including the ability to freely distribute the materials in the form and fashion they choose, except when copyrightable materials are prepared by faculty and staff within the scope of their instructional services with CityU (in which ownership is provided under the work-for-hire provisions of the Copyright Act of 1976, as amended, 14 U.S.C § 101 et seq.).

Examples of works-for-hire include syllabi, case studies, course outlines, online course materials, simulation, exercises, tests, and other course materials. CityU retains all ownership rights to such instructional and administrative materials and grants faculty and staff an irrevocable, nonexclusive, royalty-free license to use such works in the course of their employment.

CityU course materials, modules, and works derived from these materials are the copyrighted property of the university and can only be used in programs sponsored by the University. The intellectual property / copyright policy can be found in Appendix 21.P.

2.A.25 The institution accurately represents its current accreditation status and avoids speculation on future accreditation actions or status. It uses the terms “Accreditation” and “Candidacy” (and related terms) only when such status is conferred by an accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

The University takes great care to accurately reflect its accreditation status both for regional accreditation and for discipline-specific accreditations. No program will be listed, on the website or in the catalog, until CityU has received the approval letter from NWCCU. For discipline-specific accreditations (ACBSP, CACREP, ABET, NSA), programs can be listed as a candidate but are never indicated as accredited until the official notification has been received.

2.A.26 If the institution enters into contractual agreements with external entities for products or services performed on its behalf, the scope of work for those products or services— with clearly defined roles and responsibilities—is stipulated in a written and approved agreement that contains provisions to maintain the integrity of the institution. In such cases, the institution ensures the scope of the agreement is consistent with the mission and goals of the institution, adheres to institutional policies and procedures, and complies with the Commission’s Standards for Accreditation.

CityU has the advantage of having a number of attorneys that work for the University; President Frisch is an attorney. All contracts and agreements with external entities are reviewed by President Frisch and will not be approved if they do not respect the interests of the University and its mission. The University uses a great deal of caution in striking any agreements with external entities or educational partners to ensure that any such partnerships will not compromise the educational standards of the University and that they comply with the Commission’s standards for accreditation.

Academic Freedom

2.A.27 The institution publishes and adheres to policies, approved by its governing board, regarding academic freedom and responsibility that protect its constituencies from inappropriate internal and external influences, pressures, and harassment.

CityU uses a centrally designed and controlled curriculum. Courses are designed by Program Directors / Course Managers and are distributed to the Associate (Teaching) Faculty members who are asked to follow minimum standards to ensure uniformity of outcomes and assessments regardless of wherever or however the course is taught.

Despite this central design, there is respect for academic freedom built into most courses. A percentage of the course is left open for the instructor to utilize as he/she sees fit. This section of the course can be dedicated to an additional assignment, classroom activities, or other activities intended to support the topics taught in the class. The section of the class that is reserved for academic freedom is referred to as Instructor-Designed Activities. Also, our centrally designed curriculum is intended to be a baseline to determine course outcomes yet the instructor is free to decide how to conduct the instruction in their classes as long as their students continue to meet quality standards and course level outcomes.
CityU does not impose any ideology on its instructors nor does it pressure instructors to teach their classes in a fixed manner apart from ensuring that students will meet the course, and ultimately, the program and institutional outcomes. Instructors often ask if they can change assignments and if the assignment in question is not one that is tied to a program or institutional learning outcome, they are generally allowed to do so.

2.A.28 Within the context of its mission, core themes, and values, the institution defines and actively promotes an environment that supports independent thought in the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. It affirms the freedom of faculty, staff, administrators, and students to share their scholarship and reasoned conclusions with others. While the institution and individuals within the institution may hold to a particular personal, social, or religious philosophy, its constituencies are intellectually free to examine thought, reason, and perspectives of truth. Moreover, they allow others the freedom to do the same.

CityU, as an institution, does not hold to a particular political, social, or religious philosophy. We recognize that our administrators, faculty, staff and students hold individual opinions and thoughts and, to the extent that it is possible, the institution supports independent thought in teaching and learning.

Faculty members who engage in scholarship have no limits placed on their work except in cases where the institution is funding the research. In such cases, the institution seeks research that can be used to support student learning by expanding the knowledge bases of the Administrative or Associate Faculty members. There is no political, social, or religious ideology that is applied as a criterion for the university’s support of faculty research. Once completed, faculty are free to share the findings of their research with students as they see fit and to the extent that it is relevant to the theme of the course.

2.A.29 Individuals with teaching responsibilities present scholarship fairly, accurately, and objectively. Derivative scholarship acknowledges the source of intellectual property, and personal views, beliefs, and opinions are identified as such.

Faculty who engage in scholarship that is related to their appointment with City University, must submit their proposals to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure that the research design follows all standard ethical protocols. When they include their research in their courses, they are expected to present their findings accurately and fairly.

The institution follows the American Psychological Association (APA) standards and places a heavy emphasis on the proper citation of work from which faculty will derive their ideas. The use of APA and proper citations is covered in all degree levels but is particularly emphasized at the doctoral level where the most rigorous standards are applied. Faculty are expected to use, teach and reinforce the use of APA formatting and citing practices as they relate to the content taught in their courses.

Finance

2.A.30 The institution has clearly defined policies, approved by its governing board, regarding oversight and management of financial resources—including financial planning, board approval and monitoring of operating and capital budgets, reserves, investments, fundraising, cash management, debt management, and transfers and borrowings between funds.

The Board of Trustees has oversight of the University’s financial resources (see Appendix 21.A for Board by-laws 4.1.F). CityU’s annual operating and capital budgets, aligned with Board approved long-term and short-term strategic goals, are prepared annually by management, reviewed by the President and submitted to the Board for approval.

Development of the annual operating and capital budgets involve all department managers who prepare department level budgets. After department budgets are complete, the business office consolidates all budgets for review by the Director of Finance, Provost and the President to ensure University and System goals have been achieved.

As part of the budgeting process, annual tuition revenue and enrollment projections are developed and reviewed collaboratively by the Vice President of Enrollment Management, Vice President of Student Services, the Provost, Deans and the Director of Finance. Proposed tuition increases are prepared and presented with the budget to the Board of Trustees for approval.
The Board of Trustees Finance Committee receives budget performance reports throughout the fiscal year. The full Board of Trustees is responsible for overseeing debt management, investments, and approval of all short and long term lines of credit. The Trustees also oversee fundraising efforts for the University (See Appendix 21.A for Board Bylaws 4.1.D and 4.1.E).

**Standard 2.B Human Resources**

*2.B.1 The institution employs a sufficient number of qualified personnel to maintain its support and operations functions. Criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel are clearly and publicly stated. Job descriptions accurately reflect duties, responsibilities, and authority of the position.*

The annual budgeting process allows leadership to evaluate status against budget forecasts and assess personnel needs. As needs arise, a position requisition process is followed that requires justification and further review and approval by the department manager and the president. Once approved, the Human Resources recruiter meets with hiring managers to assist them through all steps in the recruitment to process.

CityU maintains a database of approved job descriptions for all existing positions – which accurately reflect the duties, responsibilities and authority of the respective position(s). Job postings and advertisements define the minimum qualifications for each vacancy. CityU evaluates qualifications for teaching faculty and/or staff to ensure appropriate academic/employment background, degrees and/or professional experience to carry out their assignments. CityU utilizes Interview Exchange, an applicant tracking system to assist in processing job applications and to better manage the hiring process.

*2.B.2 Administrators and staff are evaluated regularly with regard to performance of work duties and responsibilities.*

CityU administrative personnel and staff are evaluated annually. CityU utilizes SuccessFactors, as the tool to conduct evaluations. The process integrates a review of each employee’s job description to assure that work duties and responsibilities remain current and accurate. Performance is evaluated against standard job duties and responsibilities, specific annual goals, position competencies, and training and development activities.

*2.B.3 The institution provides faculty, staff, administrators, and other employees with appropriate opportunities and support for professional growth and development to enhance their effectiveness in fulfilling their roles, duties, and responsibilities.*

There is a line item in the departmental budgets designated for the training and development of employees. The budget can be used to support employee’s growth and development by attending local conferences and seminars, or their involvement with professional groups.

The University has also set aside funds to support faculty research. Doctoral faculty have priority but funds are available to all faculty members who wish to engage in research that supports their courses. This includes research in subject matter and/or teaching methods to enhance delivery.

*2.B.4 Consistent with its mission, core themes, programs, services, and characteristics, the institution employs appropriately qualified faculty sufficient in number to achieve its educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and assure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs, wherever offered and however delivered.*

CityU’s Administrative Faculty hold assignments either as an Academic Program Director or as an Associate Program Director. Both positions have teaching requirements of at least three classes per year. Even while teaching, both Academic and Associate Program Directors oversee courses taught by Associate (Teaching) Faculty members. They must ensure that the courses are properly designed and prepared and oversee the performance of the Associate (Teaching) Faculty members who they have selected to teach these courses.

Academic Program Directors oversee the delivery and quality of an at least one academic program; they are responsible for the program at all domestic and international locations. It is their responsibility to ensure that their programs are designed, delivered, and assessed to ensure a top quality student experience in alignment with CityU’s mission and Core Themes. Academic Program Directors are selected for their expertise in the discipline covered by their programs.
Associate Program Directors oversee the design and delivery of a series of courses that are part of a program. They are selected for their expertise and are assigned courses that match that expertise. There can be several Associate Program Directors that support an academic program and work directly for said program's Director. The number of Associate Program Directors dedicated to any single program is determined by the size of the program and the locations where it is taught.

Currently, CityU, in the US and Canada, employs 21 Academic Program Directors and 27 Associate Program Directors to oversee its 38 degree programs and 16 certificate programs. Courses that are not taught by CityU’s full time Academic and Associate Program Directors are taught by Associate (Teaching) Faculty who hold a part time appointment with the institution. Currently, there are 492 Associate Faculty, distributed across four schools, each of whom teaches a varying number of courses per year depending on need and student headcount.

2.8.5 Faculty responsibilities and workloads are commensurate with the institution’s expectations for teaching, service, scholarship, research, and/or artistic creation.

Administrative Faculty are expected to teach three regular courses each academic year. They spend the rest of their time administering courses and overseeing Associate (Teaching) Faculty to ensure academic quality – evaluating and improving curriculum to achieve CityU’s mission and Core Themes as well Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. The majority of the courses are taught by the 492 Associate Faculty, many of whom have been with the university for several years. Associate Faculty are offered the opportunity to teach classes in their area of discipline but must choose to accept them. There is no minimum workload requirement for an Associate Faculty member.

CityU’s current staff of 48 Administrative Faculty, described above, is sufficient to oversee all programs and courses running both domestically and at our international locations. Addition of Administrative Faculty members occurs when new programs or specializations are added.

Scholarship for the Administrative Faculty is encouraged, and supported, but is only required by CityU for Administrative Faculty members in the doctoral programs. Each doctoral faculty member must pursue a research project and disseminate their findings every year in a way that generates knowledge that can be used to augment the content or delivery of courses.

2.8.6 All faculty are evaluated in a regular, systematic, substantive, and collegial manner at least once within every five-year period of service. The evaluation process specifies the timeline and criteria by which faculty are evaluated; utilizes multiple indices of effectiveness, each of which is directly related to the faculty member’s roles and responsibilities, including evidence of teaching effectiveness for faculty with teaching responsibilities; contains a provision to address concerns that may emerge between regularly scheduled evaluations; and provides for administrative access to all primary evaluation data. Where areas for improvement are identified, the institution works with the faculty member to develop and implement a plan to address identified areas of concern.

Associate Faculty performance is evaluated quarterly through regular course evaluations. The schools have designated individuals to go into the Blackboard shells for all courses and evaluate them against a rubric to determine the extent to which the instructor is meeting stated requirements for quality teaching and engagement. The results of these examinations are shared with the instructors. When a deficiency is found, the Academic Program Director or Associate Program Director, responsible for the instructor, is required to explain the deficiency and what must be done to rectify it. All courses are checked at least once during the quarter.

Currently, there are two instructor evaluation rubrics being used. Because it was the first to implement regular faculty evaluations, the School of Management has a metric that evaluates key indices such as discussion board engagement, quality of course announcements, quality and timeliness of feedback, and the effectiveness of the gradebook. The secondary rubric represents the future of quality assessment at CityU. It is based on the University’s new exemplary standards. These standards include the indices above but are reviewed multiple times in each course, are used to govern how courses and Blackboard shells are designed. They are also being used to assess the quality of instruction. Secondary rubrics are currently used in the Schools of Education, Applied Leadership, and Arts and Sciences and will be incorporated into the School of Management’s course assessment process in the coming year.
Associate Faculty members are evaluated on a rotational basis every four years. A number of key metrics are used to inform the evaluation including end of course evaluations, student comments, and the results of course observations, either live or online.

Academic Program Directors and Associate Program Directors undergo a formal evaluation annually as part of the standard CityU employee review and merit process.

**Standard 2.C Education Resources**

*2.C.1* The institution provides programs, wherever offered and however delivered, with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission; culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes; and lead to collegiate-level degrees or certificates with designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

The program design process at CityU is consistent across the university. It is a centralized process that is founded on three levels of outcomes. For each program, there is a list of demonstrable, action-oriented Program Learning Outcomes that indicate what the student should be able to “do” upon successful completion of the program. These action-oriented outcomes also incorporate and are founded upon theory-based knowledge that is integral to the successful demonstration of program skills. The second set of outcomes, on which all university programs are founded, are the six institutional learning outcomes known as the City University Learning Goals (CULGs). Every successful graduate, regardless of his/her program emphasis, should be able to demonstrate competence relative to these six outcomes. Lastly, each program is broken into a number of courses all of which are also outcomes-based. The third level of outcomes includes the course level outcomes and in each course students are provided opportunities to demonstrate competence on those outcomes. The course level outcomes are also a mix of demonstrable skills founded upon theory-based knowledge.

The program/course design process begins by identifying industry experts and faculty with subject matter expertise who can pinpoint the skills that graduates will need in order to demonstrate competence or mastery of industry standards in their chosen field(s). The consultation with industry experts and faculty members results in a list of skills that are used to draft the program and course level outcomes. As it is developed, every new or revised program must go through a rigorous approval process that starts with the key administrators and includes both school-based and university-wide approval committees. It is the goal of these approval committees to ensure that courses and programs follow the mission of the institution, are academically rigorous, and are aligned with the needs of graduates seeking knowledge and career advancement in specific industries.

*2.C.2* The institution identifies and publishes expected course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Expected student learning outcomes for courses, wherever offered and however delivered, are provided in written form to enrolled students.

As programs and courses are designed, they are entered into CityU’s Curriculum Development System (CDS). The CDS is a centralized database that houses all syllabi and course documents. From the start of the course / program design process, CDS is utilized as a design tool and each outcome, assessment, and rubric is built using this tool. The end result is that all program, institutional and course-level outcomes are housed in the CDS as part of a full suite of documents relating to a course or program.

In addition, the Student Portal (my.cityu.edu) provides students access to documents that list the outcomes for any course that the CityU offers.

*2.C.3* Credit and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, are based on documented student achievement and awarded in a manner consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted learning outcomes, norms, or equivalencies in higher education.

Every course at City University of Seattle is designed with a number of assessments that require the student to demonstrate competence relative to the course outcomes. These assessments are evaluated using a rubric that is specifically designed to provide the instructor with a normed, standardized way of evaluating a students’ work in his/her class. The rubrics provide clarity to students regarding what is expected in each assignment and they also provide an objective way of evaluating student progress. Rubrics are created as each course is written and entered into the Curriculum Design System (CDS) and courses are not approved until the rubrics are completed and approved.
The rubrics allow the instructor to grade all student work using the same rigorous standards. This leads to student grades that adhere to the standard, University defined grading scale. Also, as indicated above, every student who successfully completes a CityU degree, regardless of his/her field will have demonstrated competence in the institution’s Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. Students completing an undergraduate degree will also have provided evidence of competency regarding the CityU’s general education standards.

In certain fields such as education, project management, technology, counseling and business, course and program outcomes are designed with consideration of the specific requirements of discipline specific accreditations.

2.C.4 Degree programs, wherever offered and however delivered, demonstrate a coherent design with appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, and synthesis of learning. Admission and graduation requirements are clearly defined and widely published.

As indicated above, all of CityU’s programs and courses are designed using the Curriculum Design System (CDS). This tool facilitates a universal format and design. The various school and institution level committees approve the program design, the sequence of the courses, and the prerequisite requirements which lead to a logical progression of learning. CityU’s outcomes assessment process considers course placement within a program and aligns secondary rubrics within courses where students have had the opportunity to master program and institutional learning outcomes. This further supports a logical progression of courses within a program.

Admission requirements are clearly specified in the University General Catalog, as are graduation requirements.

2.C.5 Faculty, through well-defined structures and processes with clearly defined authority and responsibilities, exercise a major role in the design, approval, implementation, and revision of the curriculum, and have an active role in the selection of new faculty. Faculty with teaching responsibilities take collective responsibility for fostering and assessing student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

CityU employs both Administrative and Associate Faculty in the curriculum design process. Each Administrative Faculty member holds a title of either Program Director or Associate Program Director and every program is overseen by a Program Director. Within each program, each course is assigned to an Administrative Faculty member who works with Associate (Teaching) Faculty and representatives from the library as the course is designed, managed, and periodically revised.

All new courses or major revisions are completed by a collaborative team that includes the course manager, industry experts, subject matter experts, faculty, and representatives from the library. As each course is taught, the instructor has the opportunity to provide feedback regarding how effectively the course design functioned or any changes that should be considered. This feedback is gathered both on an as-needed and systematic basis. Instructors can discuss issues with the Program Director as they arise and there is now a process built into Blackboard that gives instructors an opportunity to provide feedback on each course that they teach.

The first line of assessment is the instructors who grade the work of the students using primary rubrics tied to the assignments. Periodically, instructors also provide feedback regarding student performance on Program Learning Outcomes or CityU Learning Goals through the use of secondary rubrics. Both primary and secondary rubrics combine to provide a clear picture of student performance at all levels in the program. Analysis at all levels is used to make annual recommendations regarding any actions that can be taken to improve specific courses or the program overall.

All programs are required to undergo an annual assessment process through the CityU’s Academic Assessment Committee. In addition to annual reviews, programs undergo major reviews and revisions every five years unless there is a reason to do it more frequently as is often the case with the technology program.

2.C.6 Faculty with teaching responsibilities, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.

The curriculum design process at CityU effectively utilizes the resources of the library. Each program has a library representative assigned to help find relevant books and resources to support the learning objectives of both the program and its courses. The curriculum approval process for each of the schools has a library representative
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One of the functions of the CDS is to list the required and optional materials for each course and these records are maintained by the library personnel. Additionally, CityU's library staff members are responsible for the implementation and support of learning technologies which represent an increasingly important part of each course. The library is an integral part of all course development and this relationship is becoming stronger as the university continues to provide technology enabled learning opportunities to all students in in-person, hybrid and online classes around the world.

2.C.7 Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution's regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students' transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution's review process.

CityU awards prior learning credit according to its policies which state that prior learning credits are 1) awarded only at the undergraduate level, 2) per policy 2100.21 Transfer Policies for Undergraduate and Certificate Programs, do not exceed 45 credits for a bachelor's degree or 25 credits for an associate's degree, 3) can only be awarded for documented work that the student has completed that is equivalent to the outcomes of a course that is an expected part of the student's program, 4) are granted only after a full evaluation by a faculty member who is a subject matter expert in the topic for which credit is being considered, and 5) are granted in place of a course that is a part of the CityU program. All prior learning credits are clearly indicated on the student's transcript. See Appendix 21.E.

Students enroll in a Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) course that teaches them how to gather artifacts and assemble their portfolios. For each course where the student is attempting to get PLA credit, he/she must complete a substantial essay explaining why credit should be awarded. In addition to the essay, the student must provide relevant documentation of training or experience to support the case for awarding credit.

2.C.8 The final judgment in accepting transfer credit is the responsibility of the receiving institution. Transfer credit is accepted according to procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality, relevance to the students’ programs, and integrity of the receiving institution's degrees. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that the credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic quality, and level to credit it offers. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements between the institutions.

Any transfer credits must be assessed by the Registrar’s office to establish that the credits are relevant to a requirement within the student’s program and that they are at the appropriate level (2100.18 Transfer Credit Toward Advance Standing; 2100.21 Transfer Policies for Undergraduate and Certificate Programs, 2100.22 Transfer Policies for Graduate Degree and Certificate). See Appendices 21.C, E and F.

Trained evaluators make a determination on transferability of credits based upon a number of details including but not limited to course title, course description, course syllabi, and established institutional articulation agreements. Transfer credit at the undergraduate level must be earned at a 2.0 or better and at the graduate level at a 3.0 or better. If the Registrar is unable to make the determination of relevance, the Academic Program Director's subject matter expertise will be utilized to achieve a solution. Often, a copy of the syllabus from the transferring institution is required to assess the rigor.

All transfer credits must be of an equal level. Lower division transfers in only as lower division and cannot substitute for upper division course or credit requirements.

CityU has a number of articulation agreements with community colleges and other schools including the state of Washington's Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA) which guides transfer policies between the state’s 34 Community and Technical Colleges and other institutions where students can be guaranteed that if they have taken a specific
sequence of courses at a transferring institution, they will be recognized by CityU. Such agreements are put in place only after the courses have been assessed and determined to be at the appropriate rigor level to meet the CityU program requirements.

**Undergraduate Programs**

2.C.9 The General Education component of undergraduate programs (if offered) demonstrates an integrated course of study that helps students develop the breadth and depth of intellect to become more effective learners and to prepare them for a productive life of work, citizenship, and personal fulfillment. Baccalaureate degree programs and transfer associate degree programs include a recognizable core of general education that represents an integration of basic knowledge and methodology of the humanities and fine arts, mathematical and natural sciences, and social sciences. Applied undergraduate degree and certificate programs of thirty (30) semester credits or forty-five (45) quarter credits in length contain a recognizable core of related instruction or general education with identified outcomes in the areas of communication, computation, and human relations that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes.

General education credits are assessed on two levels. Recently, the institution assessed its CityU Learning Goals and adjusted them so that they would be in alignment with general education standards as determined by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU). As part of this alignment, CityU added some additional requirements to its institutional learning goals to ensure that all of the key general education goals and skills are covered. Presently, the University is adjusting the Program Design Guides of all undergraduate programs to ensure that they are properly aligned with, and that they account for, the AACU general education goals.

Furthermore, each student who completes an undergraduate degree must complete 55 credits of general education requirements. This requires: 15 credits of natural science/mathematics, 15 credits of social sciences, 15 credits of humanities, 5 credits of college level English composition, and 5 credits of college mathematics. Students typically complete these general education requirements at the lower division level but may also complete their general education requirements through upper division work.

2.C.10 The institution demonstrates that the General Education components of its baccalaureate degree programs (if offered) and transfer associate degree programs (if offered) have identifiable and assessable learning outcomes that are stated in relation to the institution’s mission and learning outcomes for those programs.

Every course that CityU offers, including its general education courses, have at least two sets of outcomes associated with them. The first are the course outcomes which indicate what the student will be able to do with the knowledge he/she has learned in the course. Such outcomes may need to be adjusted in the case of general education courses to reflect how the student might put general knowledge of science, humanities, or social science to use. The second set of outcomes contains the six CityU Learning Goals that are associated with every course and every program. Nearly every course that is part of a program, including the general education courses, are linked to at least one of these six institutional learning goals further evidencing CityU’s commitment to its overall mission.

2.C.11 The related instruction components of applied degree and certificate programs (if offered) have identifiable and assessable learning outcomes that align with and support program goals or intended outcomes. Related instruction components may be embedded within program curricula or taught in blocks of specialized instruction, but each approach must have clearly identified content and be taught or monitored by teaching faculty who are appropriately qualified in those areas.

All courses for which credit is awarded, including any that might be taught as part of a certificate program, have at least two sets of outcomes associated with them. In the case of full degrees or certificates, there is likely to be a third level, program level outcomes, as well.

The quality of the students’ experience in these programs is assessed in the same manner – through the use of secondary rubrics. Program outcomes, CityU Learning Goals, general education outcomes, and course outcomes can all be assessed through the use of either primary or secondary rubrics.
Graduate Programs

2.C.12 Graduate programs are consistent with the institution’s mission; are in keeping with the expectations of their respective disciplines and professions; and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. They differ from undergraduate programs by requiring greater depth of study and increased demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.

CityU offers a number of graduate programs in business, technology, education, and psychology at the master’s level. The institution offers doctoral programs in leadership and business administration. The master’s programs are an opportunity to study specific disciplines in depth. Many of the master’s programs are associated with external accreditations or credentials that place specific discipline requirements on the outcomes of the programs.

For example, business programs are nationally accredited by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) which drives additional expectations of the curriculum and students beyond the rigor that would normally be included. The same can be said for the programs in project management with Project Management Institute – Global Accreditation (PMI – GAC) to its credit. The Technology Institute achieved the prestigious accolade from the Accrediting Body for Engineering and Technology (ABET) for its Bachelor of Science in Information Systems program as well as National Centers for Academic Excellence (NSA) for the Master of Science in Information Security and Bachelor of Science in Information Technology. CityU’s education programs must conform to Washington State mandated standards and are approved through the Washington State Office of Superintendent and Public Instruction (OSPI). The graduate level counseling program is also being driven by high standards required by its Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accreditation.

The process for designing graduate programs follows the requirements listed above. Industry experts and/or external factors drive the program level outcomes. These outcomes are tied to the institutional learning goals which ensure that the graduate programs conform to the requirements of the institution’s academic model. Then, the courses are designed each having a set of course level outcomes that link to and support the program level outcomes. As students proceed through their respective program(s), they will produce artifacts that are assessed against expected outcomes and this leads to program assessment and revision on an as-needed basis.

The doctoral programs in leadership and business have been created using the standard program development process as well but with far more rigorous expectations regarding the performance of graduates and the work that they are able to produce. Separate doctoral program teams have been assembled to oversee these programs and these committees make all decisions regarding curriculum, policies, exams, instruction, and research.

Some of the key differences for the doctoral programs are the research requirements. Both programs required an applied dissertation, one that asks students to identify a problem in their field and conduct a rigorous, primary research study to solve or reduce the impact of chosen problem. Students must take five doctoral level research courses to prepare them for their dissertations. They are assigned to a committee of three faculty members, one of whom serves as the chair and oversees the student as they develop the prospectus, proposal, and final dissertation. Completed dissertations require the approval of all committee members, the dissertation director and the school’s Dean.

2.C.13 Graduate admission and retention policies ensure that student qualifications and expectations are compatible with the institution’s mission and the program’s requirements. Transfer of credit is evaluated according to clearly defined policies by faculty with a major commitment to graduate education or by a representative body of faculty responsible for the degree program at the receiving institution.

The criteria for admission to graduate programs is established by the faculty. There are general rules for admission to the master’s programs which include a completed bachelor’s degree and, for international students, proof of English language proficiency. Specific programs have additional requirements:

- The Master of Business Administration (MBA) requires sufficient background in 12 core business related competencies – students who do not have this background must take MBA 11 at the start of their program which fulfills this identified deficiency in core competencies.
• The Master of Science (MS) in Computer Science has prerequisite courses that must be completed prior to program admission.
• The graduate education programs have a number of State requirements, including OSPI mandated tests that the student must meet prior to program admission.
• Applicants to the doctoral programs must hold master’s degrees; Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) applicants must hold a master’s degree in a business-related field. Applicants must also provide a CV, a writing sample, and three references. Admission to doctoral programs is also dependent on a successful interview by the faculty.

In alignment with CityU’s mission, graduate programs are designed to be relevant to students’ careers. Most graduate programs have low barriers to entry so that the university can provide educational opportunities to anyone with the desire to learn. Despite the open enrollment mission of the university, the graduate programs are rigorous and students will be challenged throughout their studies. Also in alignment with CityU’s mission, the programs are high quality and are evaluated regularly for continuous quality improvement through the University’s Academic Assessment Process.

Retaining graduate students requires them to remain in good standing throughout their programs. To this end, CityU has a number of support systems in place to ensure that students have what they need as they complete their program. A significant part of what helps graduate students to be successful is the flexible nature of CityU’s programs. Graduate programs are offered in a manner that best facilitates program completion. Students have the choice of modality and the flexibility of taking courses on their own schedule. The graduate programs provide a full support team (faculty, Program Director, Student Success Advisor) that intervene should a student go off track. Doctoral students have even more resources to support them including doctoral-level writing support, coaching by the faculty, assistance with advising and registration, and the support of the dissertation committee chairs.

Transfer Credit for Master’s or Doctoral Programs
Depending on a student’s prior academic preparation and the program in which the student has enrolled, students who have previously completed graduate-level course work at recognized institutions may transfer a maximum of 12 approved quarter credits toward a CityU master’s degree program, depending on the program. The 12 credits may be through substitution, direct equivalency, or waiver, and must be equivalent to courses, as determined by similar course numbers, titles, or content. Transfer course credits must reflect grades of 3.0 (B grade) or better. Doctoral students may also transfer in up to 12 quarter credits but there are restrictions on the types of courses that can be transferred in; doctoral students may not substitute transfer credits for core program or research courses without program approval. Policies and/or decisions about the nature of transfer credits and what can be transferred into each graduate program are set by the program’s faculty. Credit transfer rules may be set at the beginning of the program with exceptions handled by the program’s faculty or the faculty may have to approve each request for credit transfer, as is the case with the doctoral programs.

2.C.14 Graduate credit may be granted for internships, field experiences, and clinical practices that are an integral part of the graduate degree program. Credit toward graduate degrees may not be granted for experiential learning that occurred prior to matriculation into the graduate degree program. Unless the institution structures the graduate learning experience, monitors that learning, and assesses learning achievements, graduate credit is not granted for learning experiences external to the students’ formal graduate programs.

In its graduate programs, CityU offers a limited number of internships and field experience opportunities. In the business programs, graduate students have the option of completing a for-credit internship and must complete all additional work requirements and documentation to clearly describe what they accomplished during the internship. The education programs have student teaching assignments/field experiences that are closely overseen by field supervisors. The graduate psychology programs have internship options that are also closely supervised by faculty. No credit is awarded for any experiential learning conducted before or outside the graduate programs.

Internships play a critical role in the Masters of Teaching, Educational Leadership, and Professional School Counseling programs. Professional preparation in these fields necessitates practice in the field. Consistent with CityU’s philosophy that learning be relevant and active.
2.C.15 Graduate programs intended to prepare students for research, professional practice, scholarship, or artistic creation are characterized by a high level of expertise, originality, and critical analysis. Programs intended to prepare students for artistic creation are directed toward developing personal expressions of original concepts, interpretations, imagination, thoughts, or feelings. Graduate programs intended to prepare students for research or scholarship are directed toward advancing the frontiers of knowledge by constructing and/or revising theories and creating or applying knowledge. Graduate programs intended to prepare students for professional practice are directed toward developing high levels of knowledge and performance skills directly related to effective practice within the profession.

Graduate programs at CityU are intended to prepare students for professional practice. Thus, they are designed with the intention of helping the students develop high levels of demonstrable skills that will be applicable to their professional fields. All major capstones in the graduate programs are focused on measuring the extent to which the student has developed relevant, real-world, marketable skills that are founded upon and tied to the theory needed to ensure that the student has the background and critical skills necessary to grow in his or her profession.

The doctoral programs in leadership and business focus both on applied skills as well as on research and scholarship. The programs are divided into three sections. The first is a collection of foundational courses in leadership or business combined with a research core to teach students how to make data-driven, research-based decisions. The second part of these programs is the student’s chosen area of specialization which also combines real-world, relevant skills with research and scholarship. In the last section of the programs, the students complete their research, write their dissertations, defend the conclusions, and are expected to disseminate their work by presenting at a conference or publishing in a journal. The doctoral programs focus on creating scholars who can advance the field of leadership or business and this is evident throughout the design of these programs.

Continuing Education and Non-Credit Programs

2.C.16 Credit and non-credit continuing education programs and other special programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals.

CityU offers a very small number of continuing education options. It offers courses to prepare students for the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) exams and a number of financial courses to help students as they prepare for Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and other financial exams. On occasion, CityU has partnered with a company that has a training need to provide instruction intended for a specific purpose.

CityU does offer a number of for-credit certificate programs and the design of each is based upon the same academic model and institutional learning outcomes that are used to drive the design of its degree programs. Many of these certificate programs were created using the specialization courses that make up an emphasis area for one of the degrees. For example, students can earn a degree in business administration with an emphasis in project management or they can earn a certificate in project management. All courses that make up CityU’s certificate programs are created using the process described earlier and are housed in the CDS.

Continuing Education courses support degree and specialties taught in the various schools. Courses are focused in management, technology, education, and counseling. The purpose of all Continuing Education offerings are to enhance skills in their relevant professions.

Continuing Education courses offered in the Washington Academy of Languages support the acquisition of foreign language skills for a range of purposes including cultural enrichment and employment needs.

2.C.17 The institution maintains direct and sole responsibility for the academic quality of all aspects of its continuing education and special learning programs and courses. Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for academic credit are approved by the appropriate institutional body, monitored through established procedures with clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and assessed with regard to student achievement. Faculty representing the disciplines and fields of work are appropriately involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities.

CityU maintains sole control of all of its continuing education options and appropriate academic quality and rigor are ensured as the vast majority of its continuing education options are actually subsets of degree programs/courses. All such certificates and the courses they contain are subjected to the same academic scrutiny as the degree programs.
Due to the scope of its programs, undergraduate pre-English development and graduate TESOL programming, Washington Academy of Languages maintains a School Curriculum Council reporting to the Curriculum Quality Council. Courses, whether academic or continuing education credit bearing, follow the same curriculum approval process and standards as those in other schools. Course curriculum follows the standard City University of Seattle curriculum development requirements for approval.

Separate from Washington Academy of Language continuing education offerings, the University offers a limited number of continuing education offerings each year. During the AY 2016-17 a total of 11 courses were offered as CEU courses, and six of the courses are long standing offerings. Curriculum approval in the Management Institute also follows an approval process that parallels the academic credit course approval process. However, due to the limited offerings, rather than maintaining a standing school-based curriculum committee, when a course is proposed an internal ad-hoc review committee is appointed to review content. Membership for the ad-hoc group is comprised of subject matter specialists from the Administrative Faculty and/or Associate (Teaching) Faculty pool. Course proposals are required to define course learning outcomes, courses assessments, as well as the qualification of the instructor of record.

2.C.18 The granting of credit or Continuing Education Units (CEUs) for continuing education courses and special learning activities is: a) guided by generally accepted norms; b) based on institutional mission and policy; c) consistent across the institution, wherever offered and however delivered; d) appropriate to the objectives of the course; and e) determined by student achievement of identified learning outcomes.

CityU has very few courses or options where students will earn CEUs but in those cases where it is an option, the university applies specific standards that students and instructors must follow in order to earn the CEUs. Each CEU requires 10 hours of documented work. Students must be properly enrolled in a class section and must record their work in order to be eligible for CEUs. Any course that provides CEU credit must pass internal school reviews to ensure that it is in alignment with the mission of the school and that it is staffed by qualified faculty members able to teach the content leading to the CEUs.

Continuing education units are awarded following the standard of 1 CUE for each 10 hours of contact time. Each course leading to the awarding of a CEU credit is required to have both learning outcomes and appropriate assessments for the measure of those learning outcomes. Course grading for continuing education courses may be pass/fail or decimally graded, but either option follows the institution’s established grading policy.

2.C.19 The institution maintains records which describe the number of courses and nature of learning provided through non-credit instruction.

All certificate courses are maintained in the Curriculum Development System (CDS). Most non-credit courses are as well. A few non-credit courses, designed for specific companies are not maintained in the CDS but are tracked by instructors and/or administrators. These would not be courses that are available to be taken by the general public.

All non-credit instruction is required to be approved through the same approval process that governs continuing education (CEU) offerings. In addition, completion of non-credit instruction may result in a participation certificate or State of Washington Clock Hours. Verification of completion of seat hours, and copies of certificates and clock hour forms are kept in the Office of Continuing Education in paper files. Currently a project is underway to digitize the records into the Registrar’s Archive.

Standard 2.D Student Support Resources

2.D.1 Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, the institution creates effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning needs.

Reflecting its mission, the CityU’s core student demographic is a working adult population, largely career bound and returning to school to improve skills and/or chances of promotion within the organizations and institutions in which they are employed. Typical of most adult learners, this population is focused academically and uniformly interested in services that reduce university barriers related to attendance.

The University strives to provide support resources that are available online and on demand. These include advising, registration, financial aid, digital library services, and tutoring. Academic advisement for this group is
largely focused on program progression and recommendations for registration. Students with special needs may be self-identified, or through referrals from advising or faculty, and are supported through the Disability Support Services (DSS) Office co-located in the Counseling Center. Support for this population includes, but is not limited to, tutoring and specialized equipment determined via the DSS Coordinator.

Students who fall outside of the purview of the DSS Office, but who may be at risk academically, are supported in a variety of ways. These include targeted language support to second language learners; free online tutoring services delivered by Smarthinking for writing, mathematics, quantitative business courses, and computer science courses; and faculty delivered writing, mathematics, and technology labs. In addition, faculty often offer extra support to students at risk through informal one-on-one sessions.

Career advisement is provided by programs in specialized professional such as teacher education or counselor preparation. With the strategic growth of international students skewing to a more traditional profile, CityU has expanded its more traditional student services, such as career counseling, mental health counseling, student activities and student clubs. Over the past several years the University has added several new support services, including a fulltime career/internship counselor. The key focus of these services is to provide greater access and customized delivery to the populations that CityU serves.

2.D.2 The institution makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students and their property at all locations where it offers programs and services. Crime statistics, campus security policies, and other disclosures required under federal and state regulations are made available in accordance with those regulations.

Maintaining teaching locations in non-traditional campus locations, CityU has limited incidents of crime and those that do occur are usually related to property theft. On site security personnel are maintained through the University itself, sub-contracted with professional security services, or provided by building property management. Regardless of delivery, the purpose of all security measures is to provide a deterrent to and immediate on site response should an incident occur.

Complying with federal and state regulations, CityU makes public all campus policies related to safety as well as crime statistics to students and other interested parties. The annual Cleary Report is posted on the public website and all current employees and students receive annual notification of the posting.

University safety guidelines are made available on the faculty and student portal (my.cityu.edu), the staff portal (home.cityu.edu), as well as posted at university teaching locations. Safety guidelines are reviewed annually by the Campus Safety Committee and updated to meet all federal and local guidelines.

2.D.3 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational offerings. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advising about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

City University’s mission is to provide educational opportunities to those segments of the population not being fully served by traditional instructions. The Enrollment department supports the mission of the University by connecting learners to programs that meet their personal and professional goals.

As an open enrollment institution, CityU provides the widest access possible to students attracting a broad range of diverse populations. Even as an open enrollment institution, the university primarily works with degree completion students at the undergraduate level. Students have typically demonstrated the ability to successfully perform at the college level prior to attendance at City University.

Students are assigned to Enrollment Advisors (EAs) upon their first contact with the university. Part of the EA’s responsibility is to ensure that students are ready to begin their upper division course of study or to begin graduate work. Under graduate students who have not met the necessary preparation levels are routinely permitted to begin work at the university but typically enroll in lower division English or mathematics first. Programs are sequenced to ensure that students begin with the appropriate developmental classes first.
General University orientation webinars, online orientation of the Blackboard LMS, self-service help videos/documents are made available to all students. Additional program orientations are conducted for new students who are entering cohort programs in education, counseling, and project management. These orientations typically involve the program teaching faculty, assigned cohort advisor(s), and, if applicable, departmental representation from Financial Aid or the Registrar’s Office. Providing a broad overview of CityU’s services, the purpose of these orientations is to familiarize the student with the program, coursework, required internships, and services available to them.

Graduation requirements are published in the University General Catalog. Policies governing the requirements are reviewed on an annual basis and applied consistently to both the certificate and degree verification process. Disclosure of graduation rates and other items related to the Student Right-to-Know Act is completed July 1 of each year and available through the Registrar’s Office. Compliance with the act is documented in the University General Catalog.

2.D.4 In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, the institution makes appropriate arrangements to ensure that students enrolled in the program have an opportunity to complete their program in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption.

In the event of program closure, or a significant change in requirements, students are provided the opportunity to complete their original program requirements for a period of time after program closure. Undergraduate students are provided four (4) years, graduate students are provided three (3) years, and doctoral students are provided six (6) years. If eligible students switch to a different or redesigned program they consult with their Student Success Advisor, the Registrar and the Academic Program Director to ensure a smooth transition, while also meeting all applicable Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and CityU Learning Goals (CULGs).

All eligible students are provided timely notification of program closure as well as a teach-out schedule. Students may remain in a teach-out program as long as they maintain active enrollment (at least one course in four consecutive academic terms). See University Policy Enrollment in Discontinued Programs (2200.08) in Appendix 21.Q.

2.D.5 The institution publishes in a catalog, or provides in a manner reasonably available to students and other stakeholders, current and accurate information that includes:

a) Institutional mission and core themes;
b) Entrance requirements and procedures;
c) Grading policy;
d) Information on academic programs and courses, including degree and program completion requirements, expected learning outcomes, required course sequences, and projected timelines to completion based on normal student progress and the frequency of course offerings;
e) Names, titles, degrees held, and conferring institutions for administrators and full-time faculty;
f) Rules, regulations for conduct, rights, and responsibilities;
g) Tuition, fees, and other program costs;
h) Refund policies and procedures for students who withdraw from enrollment;
i) Opportunities and requirements for financial aid; and
j) Academic calendar.

CityU publishes the University General Catalog each Academic Year effective July 1. A mid-year addendum may be published effective January 1. The catalog is made available electronically on the public website at https://www.cityu.edu/catalog/ with direct links from the Faculty and Student portal at my.cityu.edu, and the Staff SharePoint site at home.cityu.edu. A limited number of paper catalogs are produced and distributed as desk copies in offices such as enrollment, advising, academics, registrar’s office and financial aid.
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The Academic Year 2017-2018 Catalog includes the following information:

a) Institutional mission and core themes (p. 9-10);

b) Entrance requirements and procedures (p. 13-19);

c) Grading policy (p. 44-46);

d) Information on academic programs and courses (p. 57-107);

e) Names, titles, degrees held, and conferring institutions for administrators and full-time faculty (p. 216-219);

f) Rules, regulations for conduct, rights, and responsibilities (p. 49-55);

g) Tuition, fees, and other program costs (p. 29-30);

h) Refund policies and procedures for students who withdraw from enrollment (p. 28-29);

i) Opportunities and requirements for financial aid (p. 26-28); and

j) Academic calendar (p. 4).

Information regarding program specific learning outcomes, required course sequences, and information on progress are made available on program pages in the my.cityu.edu Student Portal.

2.D.6 Publications describing educational programs include accurate information on:

- National and/or state legal eligibility requirements for licensure or entry into an occupation or profession for which education and training are offered;
- Descriptions of unique requirements for employment and advancement in the occupation or profession.

All publications related to national and/or state eligibility requirements for licensure in education (teacher, counselor, and administrator) and mental health counseling are maintained by the designated programs. Guidance for students seeking national and/or state licensures is published in the University General Catalog, on the CityU.edu website and additional information is provided during their specific course of study.

2.D.7 The institution adopts and adheres to policies and procedures regarding the secure retention of student records, including provision for reliable and retrievable backup of those records, regardless of their form. The institution publishes and follows established policies for confidentiality and release of student records.

The University Registrar’s office, reporting to the Provost, is tasked with the management of student records worldwide. Adhering to the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) standards for retention of student records, the University maintains both paper and electronic format records. Paper records are stored in locked fire-proof filing cabinets in a secure records room. Electronic records are backed up and stored offsite under a contract with Iron Mountain. The student Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system is hosted offsite with redundant back-up systems through Sierra-Cedar.

CityU maintains several policies focused on the confidentiality and release of student records, most notably Student Education Record Access According to FERPA (2300.03), FERPA and Sharing Student Work or Media Rich Content (2300.03.01), and Maintaining Current Personal Data (2300.04) see Appendices 21,R, S and T.

2.D.8 The institution provides an effective and accountable program of financial aid consistent with its mission, student needs, and institutional resources. Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (such as scholarships, grants, and loans) is published and made available to prospective and enrolled students.

Student Financial Services provides financial aid counseling to students in the US as well as oversees CityU’s Scholarship Program which is available to students in the US and Canada. Information regarding scholarships and grants is published and made available to both prospective and enrolled students. The my.cityu.edu portal and the general university website provide a list of scholarships and grants that are available to students. These resources also provide the necessary application procedures. The Student Guide provided by the U.S. Department of Education, distributed to inquiring students, also provides information on federal grant programs.

Financial Aid is available to students attending in Canada directly through the Canadian Federal Government. Local staff are trained in supporting federal reporting requirements.
2.D.9 **Students receiving financial assistance are informed of any repayment obligations. The institution regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institution’s loan default rate.**

City University of Seattle participates in a number of US Federal and State of Washington and Canadian financial aid and grant programs. The institution takes an active role in educating students on financing their education and the tools necessary for repaying their loans, providing entrance counseling prior to first disbursement as well as exit counseling upon exiting loan program usage. The institution’s most recent U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2014 Official 3-Year Cohort Default Rate was 5.0, below the national average of 7.0 for four-year private institutions as of September 25, 2017.

2.D.10 **The institution designs, maintains, and evaluates a systematic and effective program of academic advisement to support student development and success. Personnel responsible for advising students are knowledgeable of the curriculum, program requirements, and graduation requirements and are adequately prepared to successfully fulfill their responsibilities. Advising requirements and responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students.**

In alignment with our student populations’ needs, each student enrolling domestically or in Canada is assigned a Student Success Advisor (SSA) during the first quarter of attendance. This person is responsible for providing guidance to students in meeting each individual’s education completion goals. Advisors aid students in navigating CityU processes and procedures, ensuring progression toward course completion requirements, and facilitating the resolution of issues. Students may meet with their Advisor in person or via phone, e-mail, or through web-based social tools such as chat or Skype.

Student Success Advisors and their supervisors meet regularly with program faculty to ensure the team understands program expectations and requirements and provides feedback to faculty on student issues and concerns.

Students enrolled at the university via partner sites abroad are provided advisement activities under contract at the local level through designated location coordinators assigned by the partner but reporting to International Operations at CityU. International Operations maintains primary advising responsibility with the help of the local coordinator. Members of the International Operations staff, the Provost, and Deans (as appropriate) regularly visit partner locations to ensure up-to-date training of local coordinators. Periodically, coordinators are brought to Seattle to engage in more in-depth training with University staff and faculty.

2.D.11 **Co-curricular activities are consistent with the institution's mission, core themes, programs, and services and are governed appropriately.**

CityU sponsors some co-curricular activities, and student based programming does occur. The primary goal of most programming is to focus on developing social connections between peers and/or serve as a mechanism for cultural adjustment to newly arrived international students.

Student programs made available to English Language Program (ELP) students is supported by a position located in Washington Academy of Languages. Housing and Residence Life programming is managed and delivered by the Assistant Director of Housing and Residence Life. Both positions report to the VP of Student Services. Programming delivered via the International Student Office (ISO) is supervised by the Director of International Student Office and engages International Student Mentors in the organization and design of programs.

The School of Management has an assigned faculty member that leads and supports the ENACTUS (ENtrepreneurial ACTion for others creates a better world for US all) program at the university. The purpose of this program is to provide business students with the opportunity to apply the knowledge they have learned in their programs to socially responsible entrepreneurial projects in the community.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, with 21 plus members, ENACTUS participated in community projects impacting at least 623 individuals. The team spent more than 4,000 hours working on four brands resulting in 21 partnerships with corporations, business leaders, and local businesses.

Each year, ENACTUS hosts a competition where each team presents its projects. In 2017, the CityU ENACTUS team won a Top 8 place at the ENACTUS National Exposition, more than 450 teams competed. For more information about past and future CityU ENACTUS projects, see www.cityuenactus.org
RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

The Master of Arts in Counseling Faculty support a Chi Sigma Iota (CSI) chapter – Epsilon Beta Alpha, to provide development opportunities for counseling students.

2.D.12 If the institution operates auxiliary services (such as student housing, food service, and bookstore), they support the institution’s mission, contribute to the intellectual climate of the campus community, and enhance the quality of the learning environment. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators have opportunities for input regarding these services.

The bookstore in the US is contracted to the University Bookstore and the bookstore in Canada is contracted to Nuskule Inc. Students attending outside the US, via educational partners, are provided instructional materials under contract by the partner institution. CityU has made concerned effort to migrate to digital resources that are both more accessible and more affordable.

The Residence Hall is located at Cornish Commons at Cornish College of the Arts in downtown Seattle. City University of Seattle has a ten-year sublease from Cornish College of the Arts for four floors (108 beds) in the Commons building. In turn, Cornish Commons is owned by HRSE-Capstone Cornish LLC, and the facility is maintained under contract by Capstone Management. Cornish and CityU work collaboratively to share in the traditional housing activities such as resident assistant positions, professional staff coverage, Student Residence Hall Council, conduct programming, and activities.

The University annually evaluates its services and programs during its planning and budgeting process. Departments providing services regularly assess the quality of those services through student satisfaction instruments such as the New and Continuing Student Surveys, departmental level satisfaction feedback instruments, and regular analysis of best practices available through professional associations such as NACUBO, AACRO, and NACADA to ensure the fulfillment of CityU’s mission through the delivery of these auxiliary services.

2.D.13 Intercollegiate athletic and other co-curricular programs (if offered) and related financial operations are consistent with the institution’s mission and conducted with appropriate institutional oversight. Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards, degree requirements, and financial aid awards for students participating in co-curricular programs are consistent with those for other students.

The University does not offer intercollegiate athletic. CityU’s co-curricular programs such as Enactus, International Student Office Student Mentors and Housing and Residence Life programming are detailed above.

2.D.14 The institution maintains an effective identity verification process for students enrolled in distance education courses and programs to establish that the student enrolled in the distance education course or program is the same person whose achievements are evaluated and credentialed. The institution ensures the identity verification process for distance education students protects student privacy and that students are informed, in writing at the time of enrollment, of current and projected charges associated with the identity verification process.

Every City University of Seattle student is given a unique identification number and username. Students use this information to establish their system password. Students must use their username and password to access all student systems, including the Blackboard LMS through which distance education courses are delivered. Students are expected to maintain the security of their City University of Seattle account and all methods of verifying student identity protect the privacy of student information in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Furthermore, City University of Seattle’s academic model articulates the university’s commitment to authentic learning activities and assessments, including regular communication with instructors and peers, written work, problem solving, and personal reflections. Faculty are encouraged to monitor student behavior for sudden shifts in academic performance or changes to writing style or language and to report any changes to the Scholastic Honesty Board. Where high stakes online exams are used, students must complete the exam in a proctored setting.

For more information, please reference Information Technology Resource Code of Conduct for Students Policy (2300.15), Student ID Policy (2300.19) and Student Identify Verification Procedure (2300.19.01) see Appendices 21.U, V and W.
Standard 2.E Library and Information Resources

2.E.1 Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution holds or provides access to library and information resources with an appropriate level of currency, depth, and breadth to support the institution’s mission, core themes, programs, and services, wherever offered and however delivered.

City University of Seattle’s Library and Learning Resource Center (LRC) supports the university’s educational mission to provide a high quality, relevant education to anyone with a desire to learn by providing the resources and services that students and faculty need to achieve program learning outcomes. Located in the center of classrooms at the main Seattle campus, the library is a modern digital library keenly focused on solutions that meet the needs of students and faculty located around the world. Librarians and staff are actively involved in the life of the university, from strategic planning to participation on academic committees, supporting relevant university initiatives and goals. In addition to providing information resources and services typical to an academic setting, staff in the library support faculty selection and adoption of textbooks as well as oversight of, and training on, classroom technology at CityU sites. All resources and services are selected to provide academic support for students, faculty, and staff whenever and wherever they are learning, teaching, and working. Library resources, services, and support are accessible through the library’s website [http://library.cityu.edu](http://library.cityu.edu), through course resource pages listing required and recommended resources, and through links integrated into the Blackboard LMS.

The library's approach to collection development is aligned with the University’s core themes to provide a high-quality relevant education and ensure student access (See Collection Development Policy and Procedure). Due to the world-wide distribution of CityU’s programs the library continues to prioritize online multi-user resources over print materials whenever they are available, resulting in a collection that is 98% digital. Materials selected for and maintained in the physical and online collections are appropriately current to support the Academic Model’s emphasis on relevance to the workplace, up-to-date knowledge, and practical skill application. The library provides access to standard academic journal databases such as those provided by ProQuest and EBSCO. Discipline specific databases are also selected to directly support the university’s academic programs and to facilitate student and faculty access to journals, e-books, industry reports, video, and more. For example, resources such as Mint Global and IBISWorld are selected specifically for the breadth of worldwide business and industry information they provide to support the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and Masters in Business Administration programs offered in multiple countries. A complete list of the databases the library subscribes to can be found, organized by subject, on the library’s website [http://library.cityu.edu/databases/](http://library.cityu.edu/databases/). As of February 2017, the library’s collection consists of 272 online databases, 230,524 eBooks, 149,820 eJournals, 45,000 eVideos, 900 online resources curated by CityU librarians, and 12,413 print books.

### Table 5: Library Resource Usage and Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ebrary PDA</th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titles Accessed</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Cost</td>
<td>$25,858</td>
<td>$33,752.66</td>
<td>$27,093.48</td>
<td>$30,519.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STL Cost</td>
<td>$10,260</td>
<td>$9354.52</td>
<td>$6,847.32</td>
<td>$5,370.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>$15,598</td>
<td>$24,398.14</td>
<td>$20,246.16</td>
<td>$25,149.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2012 these collection numbers represent a 560% increase in eBooks, 199% increase in eJournals, and 346% increase in eVideos available to students, faculty, and staff.

To further expand the resources available to students completing, capstone research projects, librarians implemented a patron-driven-acquisition (PDA) program through Ebrary in 2012. Librarians pre-select broad categories of resources for inclusion in the program based on publisher, copyright date ranges, and discipline-specific collections within Ebrary. Materials included in this program are discoverable through Ebrary searches and when a PDA item is used, the library is billed a percentage of its cost in exchange for 7 days of access by multiple users. If the same item is used more than two times, it is purchased for perpetual access through the library’s collection and is added to the library catalog (see Table 5 for usage and savings). A similar purchase model was adopted July 1, 2016 for eVideos through Kanopy.
RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

In the event that students or faculty are unable to locate the materials they need through the library’s collection, items may be requested through interlibrary loan (See the link Interlibrary Loan Policy and Interlibrary Loan Procedure below). The majority of items requested through interlibrary loan are full text journal articles, delivered electronically to students worldwide via email. Print materials requested through interlibrary loan are mailed to students within the United States and Canada. Delays due to shipping time make it impractical to mail items to students outside the United States and Canada. In the event that the library does not have a specific resource requested by a student and cannot provide an electronic copy via email, interlibrary loan staff and librarians work collaboratively with students to identify a local source for the material via WorldCat (http://www.worldcat.org) or the equivalent information in an alternate format.

Staff who coordinate the delivery of interlibrary loans work closely with collection development librarians to identify trends in requests that would indicate gaps in the library’s collection. Gaps that are identified are addressed through subsequent additions to the library’s digital or physical collections. One example of this is the decision to add Taylor and Francis’s mental health journal collection in AY18 to meet the needs of students in counseling programs in the US and Canada.

Table 6: Library Requests and Fulfillment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests Filled</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>5,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Rate</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library regularly aligns its work with the university’s strategic and operational plans to support CityU’s mission and Core Theme fulfillment. Through the annual budget process and annual staff evaluation and goal setting, financial and operational plans are developed. Examples of library goal alignment with Core Themes from previous academic years are listed in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Library Goals and Core Theme Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Milestone Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY17</td>
<td>One: Deliver high quality, relevant</td>
<td>Support the use of academic technology and multimedia in the physical and online classroom</td>
<td>Upgrade classroom technology at the Seattle campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY16</td>
<td>One: Deliver high quality, relevant</td>
<td>Assess library instruction impact on achievement of CityU Learning Goal 3B (Information Literacy)</td>
<td>Extend Assessment in Action project to include Blackboard, Ask a Librarian, and EZProxy data to correlate engagement with library and student achievement or retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY15</td>
<td>Two: Ensure Student Access and Success</td>
<td>Reduce the cost of course resources</td>
<td>Initiate new bookstore partnership and e-Resource adoptions to reduce course resource costs for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY15</td>
<td>Two: Ensure Student Access and Success</td>
<td>Migrate Integrated Library System (ILS) and Discovery Platform</td>
<td>Complete migration of ILS &amp; discovery platform resulting in annual savings of $20,000 and improved discoverability for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY14</td>
<td>One: Deliver high quality, relevant</td>
<td>Continuously Improve Learning and Services</td>
<td>Collaborate with faculty to update exemplary teaching practice documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY14</td>
<td>One: Deliver high quality, relevant</td>
<td>Continuously Improve Learning and Services</td>
<td>Provide Collaborate and Tegrity training and support to faculty (448 courses/faculty trained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policies and information regarding access to library resources and services may be found on the library’s website, in the Policies and Procedures site in SharePoint, and an overview of library services is included in the University General Catalog.


**Interlibrary Loan Policy:** [http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/interlibrary-loan-policy/](http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/interlibrary-loan-policy/)

**Liaison Librarians:** [http://library.cityu.edu/who-is-my-liaison-librarian/](http://library.cityu.edu/who-is-my-liaison-librarian/)

**Canadian Services:** [http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/canadian-services/](http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/canadian-services/)

**Alumni Services:** [http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/alumni-library-services/](http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/alumni-library-services/)

2.2.2 Planning for library and information resources is guided by data that include feedback from affected users and appropriate library and information resources faculty, staff, and administrators.

Planning for library resources and services is regularly guided by data, and formal and informal feedback gathered from students, faculty, and staff. Sources of formal data and feedback include the annual Student Satisfaction Survey and library staff participation on CityU’s Academic Affairs Council, Academic Assessment Committee, Curriculum Quality Committee, Faculty Standards and Development Committee, Academic Technology Committee, and Quality Improvement Model teams. Additional formal and informal feedback is gathered via collaboration with faculty and librarians serving on curriculum design teams, school curriculum committees, and through routine conversations and reference interactions with library users.

Survey data from the past few academic years demonstrates that most students believe the library offers the resources and services they need to be successful and that they gain information literacy skills through the course of their studies at CityU (see Table 8 below). CityU changed its survey instrument in AY17 to the Noel Levitz Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL). This survey was distributed primarily to students in fully online courses at CityU which may account for the low satisfaction score compare to previous AYs that surveyed all students. However the PSOL score is within 3 points of the national average for satisfaction with library resources and services.

**Table 8: Library Student Satisfaction Metrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Satisfaction Survey Question Trends</th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The library has the resources I need to be successful</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My studies improve my ability to find, evaluate and use relevant information</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Strongly Agree & Agree)

Open-ended survey responses from students are sometimes specific enough to inform further resource or service improvements. Open-ended answers from the AY17 survey indicate two to three students experiencing difficulty accessing the library, and a preference for free online course readings. Actions that resulted from previous open-ended Student Satisfaction Survey responses include website navigation modifications and outreach to specific programs or locations to increase awareness of the library’s collection and research services.

Committee service provides direct information to library staff on the work of the university, such as new program or course development that will impact the library’s collection development and instruction needs, training priorities related to academic technology, or institutional assessment trends. Through participation on the Curriculum Quality Committee library staff helped plan the development and quarterly publication of course resource guides, accessible through the library’s website or online course shells, and the development of information literacy rubrics used by faculty through CityU’s Curriculum Development System.

University committee service also facilitates the development of collaborative relationships between faculty and librarians through which informal feedback is shared and resource or service needs are identified. For example, the library’s English language collection has expanded in the past two years based on faculty feedback provided to the librarian attending curriculum committee for the Washington Academy of Language programs.
RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

Student and faculty feedback in AY14 and AY15 regarding CityU’s online bookstore vendor and the increasing cost of course resources, initiated a complete review by the library of textbook and bookstore options. As a result, a new vendor was selected resulting in expanded student access to used textbooks as well as print or digital rental options. Through an initiative by the Provost, librarians also help faculty identify e-resources that appropriately support learning outcomes. Based on list price, students saved $850,694 in AY15, $1,198,549 in AY16, and $1,214,007 in AY17 through this e-resource adoption initiative.

2.E.3 Consistent with its mission and core themes, the institution provides appropriate instruction and support for students, faculty, staff, administrators, and others (as appropriate) to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness in obtaining, evaluating, and using library and information resources that support its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.

The CityU Library’s embedded Information Literacy (IL) Instruction Program supports university learning goals and aligns with the core theme to provide a high quality, relevant education. The program develops students who can define the type of information needed for specific situations and effectively apply strategies to find, access, evaluate, and use that information for the purpose of academic achievement and lifelong learning. Leveraging a variety of strategies and technology tools, the instruction program ensures course managers and instructors are knowledgeable about library resources and IL instructional support that librarians provide to the CityU community. Success of the program is dependent upon collaboration between faculty and librarians to embed information literacy competencies, instruction, and assessment in all academic programs. (See webpage Meet the Instruction Team for examples of how librarians and faculty collaborate, https://library.cityu.edu/about-us/meet-the-instruction-team/).

City University Learning Goals (CULGs) represent the critical competencies necessary to be successful in today’s workforce. In addition to Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that demonstrate knowledge and skills for an area of study, CityU students are expected to demonstrate mastery of the CULGs upon graduation. These learning goals are practiced extensively across the curriculum and within the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards.

Through its resources and services, the CityU library assists students in mastery all of the CityU Learning Goals but CULG 3 is of special interest to the library and the design of its instruction program. CULG 3 states:

CityU graduates are able to think critically and to reflect upon their own work and the larger context in which it takes place. They are able to find, access, evaluate, and use information in order to solve problems. They consider the complex implications of actions they take and decisions they make.

CityU organizes its instruction program across three levels, which are embedded within the Blackboard LMS. All courses have an associated Blackboard course, regardless of instructional delivery mode (in person, mixed mode, online, performance-based).

• **Library Instruction Level 1**: Blackboard courses include a library web link and the academic subject librarian’s contact information. All courses contain this level of instruction at a minimum.

• **Library Instruction Level 2**: Level 1 PLUS recommended support materials such learning modules, announcements, and additional library-provided links.

• **Library Instruction Level 3**: Levels 1 and 2 PLUS direct instruction by a librarian or collaboration with faculty which results in students’ completion of a required information-literacy skill-building activity. [Level 3 may include in-person instruction sessions in addition to online components.]

Updates to the mapping of all three levels of instruction is in progress, as program directors update Program Design Guides, in order to determine where instruction is being done and how it can be improved and/or enhanced.

Where all three instruction levels are already in place, assessment plays an important role in providing feedback and determining impact of the instruction. Participation in Levels 2 and 3 is monitored through Blackboard and Splunk data. The Library Blackboard Analysis dashboard, developed in AY17 in collaboration with CityU’s IT department, provides access to more robust information about which sites and programs are most actively engaged with Level 2 and Level 3 instruction. Librarians will utilize this information to inform outreach to programs or sites with low levels of engagement.
Table 9 shows participation by students at Levels 2 and 3 throughout the past four quarters.

**Table 9: Student Participation by Library Instructional Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Level</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Q1FY17</th>
<th>Q2FY17</th>
<th>Q3FY17</th>
<th>Q4FY17</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIB2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accesses</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>6142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>8479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information prior to quarter 1 of FY2017 was collected manually by the Associate Director of Instruction. The process was time consuming and yielded less accurate data. Library staff continue to explore strategies for utilizing the data now available to more effectively support student achievement and retention.

In addition to assessment conducted by the library, a librarian sits on the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) and can evaluate the progress of students for each learning goal as the university’s secondary rubrics are presented to the committee as part of a larger yearly report. Secondary rubrics are embedded in Blackboard shells for each CULG and are evaluated by the teaching instructor. The results of these assessments are presented to the committee yearly to monitor student and teaching progress. The results of Student Satisfaction surveys (which include questions regarding the library) are also presented here. Special attention is paid to CityU Learning Goal 3 by the assigned librarian. If there are areas of concern the librarian can offer guidance and suggestion to increase student achievement.

2.E.4 *The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, utilization, and security of library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, wherever offered and however delivered.*

CityU’s library staff regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy and utilization of the information resources it provides. This level and type of evaluation typically takes place during the budgeting cycle in February and March, though usage data is tracked and checked throughout the year as questions and needs arise. Data tracked and evaluated illuminates use of the collection, engagement with library instruction, and more. Over the past four years the library continues to refine which data is tracked and how that data can be leveraged to inform decisions about library resources and services to best meet student needs.

Usage data from database and eBook vendors is reviewed by librarians responsible for collection development on at least an annual basis prior to contract renewals. The review is primarily used to determine whether or not to continue investing in a particular resource. Annual usage trends are tracked at the individual database level and typically include the number of unique sessions, searches, and full text downloads. The type of data available is dependent upon what the vendor provides. In AY16 a new baseline for tracking major database usage data was established, using Intota Assessment, to reduce the time staff spent on this task. Alexander Street Press, Ebsco, Gale, Proquest and OCLC products are now tracked through Intota. While Intota includes duplicate session, search and/or full text download information, with consistent use over time trends useful for analysis will be evident.

Intota data is updated every six months with some lag time.

**Table 10: Library Database Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database &amp; Summon Usage</th>
<th>AY17 (Partial Data)</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>51,619</td>
<td>49,047</td>
<td>214405</td>
<td>220,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches</td>
<td>1,487,060</td>
<td>1,985,469</td>
<td>529,406</td>
<td>536,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Text</td>
<td>455,121</td>
<td>247,491</td>
<td>204,521</td>
<td>190,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon Page Views</td>
<td>125,084</td>
<td>134,704</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 above represents aggregated usage data for the past four academic years. At the time of this report the AY17 numbers include complete data from individual vendors and partial Intota data from July 2016 through December 2016.

Library staff use Google Analytics data to evaluate its website usage. The library designed its current website with input from student focus groups to improve ease of navigation, to reduce the number of required logins, and to provide more meaningful usage data via the library’s Google Analytics account. Website usage data is reviewed annually and is also available in customized formats on-demand when needed. Library staff anticipate that this data will guide the type and format of online tutorials it develops in the future and will enhance our understanding of how our users are accessing and utilizing our website. Table 11 shows annual library website traffic.

**Table 11: Library Website Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions (All)</td>
<td>114,045</td>
<td>164,070</td>
<td>156,751</td>
<td>115,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views (All)</td>
<td>125,644</td>
<td>383,782</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views (Tutorials)</td>
<td>27,604</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The geographic data available through Google Analytics also confirms that students at all sites are accessing the library’s resources. Table 12 lists the top 9 countries accessing the library website.

**Table 12: Library International Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CityU library uses QuestionPoint virtual reference services, branded at CityU as the “Ask a Librarian” service. Data provided by QuestionPoint’s standard report features focuses on the number of questions asked and answered via email and chat. While this is standard in the industry, it does not help library staff know which schools are using the service, the types of questions being asked, or whether faculty and/or students in international locations are requesting reference assistance. To increase the usability of “Ask a Librarian” data, the library began applying descriptive codes to every question in November 2010. All questions are tagged with one or more descriptive codes based on the nature of the inquiry. Descriptive codes currently in use are listed in Table 13 below.
Table 13: Library Descriptive Codes and Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AY17</th>
<th>AY16</th>
<th>AY15</th>
<th>AY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Problems</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Request</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref/Instruction</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOE</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruction and reference librarians review this data paired with anonymized question transcripts during peer review meetings to identify trends that may inform instruction needs. The data has also been anonymized and used to facilitate discussions with faculty in support of the need for additional instruction by librarians.

An outgrowth of library’s engagement with the Academic Assessment Committee and CityU’s secondary rubric pilot included participation in the second cohort of the Association of College & Research Libraries’ Assessment-in-Action project. Through this project the library hoped to enrich its understanding of the impact of its instruction program on student achievement of CityU’s information literacy learning goal. Lessons learned are detailed on the Library Assessment webpage (http://library.cityu.edu/about-us/library-assessment/).

The assessment work initiated through Assessment-in-Action continued in AY17 with support from a National University System Innovation Grant. Through collaboration with the Information Technology Department, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness, a new library analysis dashboard and two new library instruction dashboards are now available. Initial review of the data to identify trends by program, delivery mode, and location are underway. The library is exploring the relationship between total library use and student achievement. In this case, use includes instruction, reference, interlibrary loans, and EZProxy logins. Additional dashboards and tools enable the library to see trends in users and non-users of library services, and use by program, delivery mode, or location. The library plans to use the data from the dashboards to inform its outreach and instruction programs.

City University of Seattle Library does not provide any resources or services through cooperative agreements and Inter Library Loan.

Issues related to the security of library resources and patron information are overseen primarily by the university's information technology staff with occasional collaboration with the systems librarian.

**Standard 2.F Financial Resources**

2.F.1 The institution demonstrates financial stability with sufficient cash flow and reserves to support its programs and services. Financial planning reflects available funds, realistic development of financial resources, and appropriate risk management to ensure short-term solvency and anticipate long-term obligations, including payment of future liabilities.

2.F.2 Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and responsible projections of grants, donations, and other non-tuition revenue sources.
CityU’s budget process is driven by the Core Themes and operational objectives of the University. The annual budget is a zero-based budget, and with the vast majority of CityU’s revenue being derived from tuition, the budget process begins with tuition revenue, credit hour and enrollment projections developed through the collaboration of multiple departments. Funding for new initiatives, adjustments to staff salaries and addition of new operating expenses are only incorporated upon meeting existing operational expenses and debt obligations.

Grants, donations, and other non-tuition revenue sources are budgeted apart from tuition revenue and historically do not make up a significant portion of revenue. Currently, CityU has one large grant from the Sanford Foundation which supports three CityU programs, including Harmony – a social-emotional program designed to help improve communication skills; Inspire – a program designed to help teachers become, and stay, inspirational; and the Sanford Institute for Philanthropy – a program designed to help non-profits raise funds.

2.F.3 The institution clearly defines and follows its policies, guidelines, and processes for financial planning and budget development that include appropriate opportunities for participation by its constituencies.

2.F.4 The institution ensures timely and accurate financial information through its use of an appropriate accounting system that follows generally accepted accounting principles and through its reliance on an effective system of internal controls.

CityU’s annual budgeting process involves all departmental managers adhering to the established budget policy and procedure. Budget guidelines are reviewed in January of each fiscal year by the Director of Finance and the President and distributed to budget managers for development of the following fiscal year’s budget.

CityU utilizes PeopleSoft Finance to store and process financial transactions and PeopleSoft’s proprietary database reporting tool, nVision to create financial statements. The Director of Finance develops accounting policies with guidance from Wiley GAAP, NACUBO Auditing information and DOE Blue Book. CityU also undergoes an annual financial audit shortly after financial statements are finalized for the fiscal year. Part of the financial audit is a review of CityU’s internal controls relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements. External auditors also review controls related to access of the finance system. Controls include passwords needed by employees or contractors to enter the finance system and a security matrix that allows very tightly controlled interface permissions. Different levels of employees have different system access privileges based on their role: General Ledger, Accounts Payable or Payroll.

2.F.5 Capital budgets reflect the institution’s mission and core theme objectives and relate to its plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment. Long-range capital plans support the institution’s mission and goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership, equipment, furnishing, and operation of new or renovated facilities. Debt for capital outlay purposes is periodically reviewed, carefully controlled, and justified, so as not to create an unreasonable drain on resources available for educational purposes.

The University prepares annual capital budgets focusing on core themes and operational objectives. Once a capital budget is finalized and approved by the President, it is submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval. All new debt must also be approved by the Board of Trustees.

2.F.6 The institution defines the financial relationship between its general operations and its auxiliary enterprises, including any use of general operations funds to support auxiliary enterprises or the use of funds from auxiliary services to support general operations.

CityU’s only major auxiliary enterprise is a residence hall located close to the main campus. Residence hall revenue and expenses are kept within a separate department for budgeting and reporting.

2.F.7 For each year of operation, the institution undergoes an external financial audit, in a reasonable timeframe, by professionally qualified personnel in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Results from the audit, including findings and management letter recommendations, are considered in a timely, appropriate, and comprehensive manner by the administration and the governing board.

CityU is audited on an annual basis by Moss Adams LLP. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and assesses controls relevant to the preparation of financial statements. Historically audits have commenced within two months of the close of the year end. Any findings or management letter recommendations are reviewed by the President and Director of Finance. Over the past two fiscal years Moss Adams has issued no findings. After the audit is complete Moss Adams reports to the Board of Trustees’ audit committee any findings or recommendations.
2.F.8 All institutional fundraising activities are conducted in a professional and ethical manner and comply with governmental requirements. If the institution has a relationship with a fundraising organization that bears its name and whose major purpose is to raise funds to support its mission, the institution has a written agreement that clearly defines its relationship with that organization.

Currently CityU has very limited fund raising activities but it is exploring projects for University advancement and development. CityU’s Enactus team, a student organization promoting entrepreneurship, does limited fundraising to support the group’s expenses, but does not share any of those funds with the University. CityU does not have any other relationships with fundraising organizations that bears its name.

Standard 2.G Physical and Technological Infrastructure

Physical Infrastructure

2.G.1 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution creates and maintains physical facilities that are accessible, safe, secure, and sufficient in quantity and quality to ensure healthful learning and working environments that support the institution’s mission, programs, and services.

All of the University’s facilities are instructional in nature, and are designed and organized to meet this purpose. The University leases all facilities, and per its University Facility’s Standards Policy 4400.03, all leases are in no less than “class B” buildings using a metropolitan based definition. Facilities are evaluated to meet all local and state (or provincial) regulatory standards for safety and accessibility. See Appendix 21.X.

2.G.2 The institution adopts, publishes, reviews regularly, and adheres to policies and procedures regarding the safe use, storage, and disposal of hazardous or toxic materials.

CityU maintains a Hazardous Waste Policy and procedures, which is managed by the University Core Safety Team and the Facilities Department. Current programs at City University of Seattle do not require the use of any laboratories, biology labs, chemistry labs, nursing labs or medical facilities which may use and or result in the production of hazardous waste. Therefore there are no stored or generated hazardous materials at any of the University campuses.

General cleaning supplies are maintained at each site and are kept in locked closets or cabinets. Only hired janitorial companies have access to these supplies and are responsible for their safe disposal (generally the landlord is responsible for all janitorial services). Disposals are the responsibility of the landlord for all waste products. For the current hazardous materials procedures, see Appendix 14.

2.G.3 The institution develops, implements, and reviews regularly a master plan for its physical development that is consistent with its mission, core themes, and long-range educational and financial plans.

CityU maintains a master plan governing the physical development of the University in alignment with its mission, core themes, long-range education and financial plans. The master plan is reviewed and updated annually as part of the budgeting and planning process. Replacement of internal resources is key consideration of this plan as is the periodic assessment and renewal of space requirements for the regional campuses and housing.

During each budgeting cycle, and throughout the academic year, current and future utilization of space is a driving factor in determining what the physical plan will need to be to accommodate anticipated growth. Current enrollment and housing utilization is used as a baseline and then modified to account for projected differences in the coming years. These projections drive the plan for physical and technical resources for the University.

2.G.4 Equipment is sufficient in quantity and quality and managed appropriately to support institutional functions and fulfillment of the institution’s mission, accomplishment of core theme objectives, and achievement of goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services.

The institution provides equipment in the form of technical tools and applications that help the institution fulfill its mission and accomplish its core themes. Employees are provided with current desktops or laptops and access to printers, scanners and other supporting equipment. Employee laptops are well maintained and replaced on, at most, a four-year cycle. All current laptops have recently been upgraded to the latest versions of all standard Windows-based applications.
Employees who work at remote locations are connected to the Seattle location through high-speed internet connectivity allowing them the same level of access while maintaining cybersecurity through encryption protocols.

In 2015, the University established an eLearning team whose job was to oversee technology tools for use in program delivery. Since it was established, that team has grown and is now taking a more active role in providing access to applications that support high-quality teaching and learning. The eLearning team works closely with our IT department to ensure that faculty and staff, who need access to our systems, have supported and consistent access.

The eLearning team oversees:

- The Blackboard LMS
- The CityU Curriculum Design System (CDS)
- Blackboard Collaborate
- Collaborate Ultra
- New Faculty Orientation
- The Exemplary Course Design Process

Each of these tools are intended to enhance the student experience and our growing staff in eLearning is able to support an increasing number of faculty members in utilizing these tools. It is the intention of the University to invest more into the eLearning team particularly to facilitate the rollout of the exemplary course design standards consistent with its CityU Program Learning Outcomes and Learning Goals.

2.G.5 Consistent with its mission, core themes, and characteristics, the institution has appropriate and adequate technology systems and infrastructure to support its management and operational functions, academic programs, and support services, wherever offered and however delivered.

Technological Infrastructure

CityU’s major student-facing applications are out-sourced and hosted through professional data centers that provide network redundancy, off-site data protection, and increased service reliability. The student administration system is hosted by Sierra-Cedar in Georgia, and the my.cityu.edu Student and Faculty Portal is hosted by CampusCruiser in New Jersey, both of which provide 24-hour technical support and full disaster-recovery systems. The Blackboard LMS hosted at Blackboard, Inc. in Maryland, and also provides 24-hour technical support and full disaster-recovery systems.

CityU’s North American locations network topology, including wireless access, is managed by Sabey Corporation. The production data center is located in Tukwila, WA, also managed by Sabey.

my.cityu.edu — Student/Faculty Portal

The my.cityu.edu portal system provides CityU’s students and faculty a common entry point into CityU’s applications and services [e.g., Learning Management System (Blackboard), Student Information System (PeopleSoft), e-mail (Microsoft Office365), as well as Library and Lab services.] Student and faculty accounts are created automatically based on business rules. The same account/password enables access to all systems and services via a single sign-on protocol. The portal is also the central online system used to distribute CityU announcements and news and other relevant information to students and faculty.

The CityU portal currently provides secure access to appropriate people:

- Student records (accounts, transcripts, class schedules, etc.)
- Virtual classrooms (Blackboard)
- Library resources and services
- Resource guides
- Bookstore
- Syllabi and other course documents
Blackboard Learning Management System
The Blackboard Learning Management System is fully implemented for course offerings in the United States, Canada, China, Mexico and Europe. A Blackboard course shell is generated for every CityU class. Depending on the delivery mode, these shells substitute for a physical classroom for online courses or become an online supplement to a face-to-face course. Every Blackboard course shell includes:

- Course information (syllabus, assignments, schedule, and course resources)
- Library (resources, tutorials, APA style, chat reference)

The Blackboard course shells maintain consistency across delivery modes and geographical locations by providing a standard shell for each course. Every quarter, class shells are pre-populated for instructors from a pre-developed master template called a course master shell. CityU’s IT department is working to automate the creation of the course master shells by pulling the course information and learning activities from the curriculum development system, a proprietary online system to house CityU’s courses and programs and to show alignment across course and Program Learning Outcomes. CityU’s faculty development team, in conjunction with the Blackboard Operations and Standards Committee, is responsible for training faculty on the use of Blackboard course shells.

Classroom Technology
During the 2015–2016 academic year, CityU installed upgraded educational technology in a majority of its U.S. classrooms (see Table 14 below). These upgrades included the addition of a PC with wireless keyboard and mouse in each classroom and the installation of a VCR/DVD player and an overhead projector. Some classrooms were also recently equipped with document cameras and/or electronic whiteboards. In the past year, the much of the technology in the classrooms was updated with new technology and more recent versions of software.

All North American CityU sites have wireless access for students, faculty, and staff. Internet access is available anonymously, and restricted access is available through an authentication portal where users provide their CityU username and password.

Table 14: Equipment at CityU Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Teaching Lab Stations</th>
<th>Walk-in-Lab Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary AB</td>
<td>3 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton AB</td>
<td>3 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>8 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>9 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>19 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>4 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver BC</td>
<td>5 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver WA</td>
<td>2-4 classrooms as needed at Clark College. 2 Classrooms at Lower Columbia College.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria BC</td>
<td>1 Classroom with a portable PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labs
PCs for student use are available at all North American sites with the exceptions of Victoria BC, and Vancouver WA, due to their size, so that students can use a desktop PC. The number of PCs available in a walk-in lab is determined by space and feedback from site operations as to how many concurrent users they typically have.

A small number of the CityU sites also have teaching labs, which are mostly used for teaching technology courses to students and faculty. The number of PCs in the teaching labs is governed by the maximum class sizes allowed for courses that need to use the lab. These labs currently have desktop PCs.
RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

2.G.6 The institution provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations.

2.G.7 Technological infrastructure planning provides opportunities for input from its technology support staff and constituencies who rely on technology for institutional operations, programs, and services.

Support
The CityU IT department provides a three-tier support system through its own staff and outsourced support. The first-tier support is outsourced to Blackboard support services, providing students and instructors with 24/7 support. Blackboard's first-tier support offers live phone and computer chat support and an extensive self-service online knowledge base count. Any support issues that cannot be resolved at the first-tier level are then escalated up to the second-tier support level. Second-tier support is provided by CityU Help Center staff 10 hours a day, six days a week. The support staff consistently receives positive accolades from staff and faculty for their focus on customer service and their ability to support university users. Any issues that cannot be resolved by first- or second-tier support are then handled by the university's third-tier technical support staff members who are on call 24 hours a day.

Assessment
The IT department at CityU uses system uptime and student survey feedback as its primary performance measures. For a more holistic measurement, the IT department plans to add staff and faculty survey feedback in addition to the current measurements.

System uptime and Reliability – the my.cityu.edu portal, student records, learning management and e-mail systems maintained nearly 100 percent accessibility during the 2016-2017 academic year, excluding scheduled maintenance periods. Maximum maintenance downtime occurs one weekend per month for about 36 hours. There were a few minor outages due to external network failures. These systems have a scheduled maintenance one day per month that occurs during low volume times in the early mornings and weekends.

Student Satisfaction Survey results show that students are largely having positive experiences with the technology that they use in the classrooms. Table 15, below, shows that among the students who used and commented on these technologies in the 2017 satisfaction survey, only a small number report having difficulties with them.

Table 15: Satisfaction with Technologies Available in CityU’s Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wireless network</td>
<td>155 (19.47%)</td>
<td>298 (37.44%)</td>
<td>71 (8.92%)</td>
<td>37 (4.65%)</td>
<td>235 (29.52%)</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>144 (18.16%)</td>
<td>326 (41.11%)</td>
<td>46 (5.80%)</td>
<td>13 (1.64%)</td>
<td>264 (33.29%)</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>143 (18.24%)</td>
<td>301 (38.39%)</td>
<td>52 (6.63%)</td>
<td>15 (1.91%)</td>
<td>273 (34.82%)</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmartBoard</td>
<td>108 (13.78%)</td>
<td>201 (25.64%)</td>
<td>25 (3.19%)</td>
<td>13 (1.66%)</td>
<td>437 (55.74%)</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to technology lab</td>
<td>107 (13.63%)</td>
<td>218 (27.77%)</td>
<td>18 (2.29%)</td>
<td>22 (2.80%)</td>
<td>420 (53.50%)</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty and Staff Participation
Opportunities are provided for faculty and staff to participate in the planning process and development of the resources and services through CityU councils and committees including the Academic Technology Committee (ATC). The ATC is focused on the enhancement of teaching and learning at CityU, and it is responsible for advising
the Academic Affairs Council on strategic directions, policies, and standards pertaining to academic technologies for the University’s systems. These technologies are vital to sustaining CityU’s excellence and competitiveness as an institution where teaching and learning are at the forefront in accordance with its mission and Core Themes.

2.G.8 The institution develops, implements, and reviews regularly a technology update and replacement plan to ensure its technological infrastructure is adequate to support its operations, programs, and services.

IT Strategy
The IT department’s strategy is to keep a lean and flexible IT staff while providing excellent support and anytime, anywhere access to its systems.

Due to the geographically dispersed nature of CityU and its international partner institutions, the IT department leverages the benefit and edge provided by internet availability of its systems anytime and anywhere. This access to resources creates the ability to strengthen and enrich CityU programs and courses by providing online collaborative environments in which development teams can work.

The use of integrated packages aids in keeping the IT department’s response time quick by offering software that contains a variety of tools but requires fewer modifications.

It is important that students and faculty are able to hit the ground running. CityU’s IT department incorporates single sign-on access and ease-of-use principles in its strategy. The systems must be easy to use and understand so students and faculty are able to focus on their work instead of how a system works.

Information Technology Administration and Organization
CityU’s Information Technology department is centrally managed and uses the services of a number of outsourcing partners. The university’s portal is hosted by CampusCruiser; the student information system, finance system, and HR systems are hosted by Sierra-Cedar; the customer relations management system is hosted by Oracle; the learning management system is hosted by Blackboard, and the e-mail system is hosted by Microsoft. All are fully redundant with disaster recovery capabilities. The university’s 24/7 first-tier user support is outsourced to Blackboard Inc.

CityU’s IT department maintains a small staff (12 FTE employees, which calculates to 3.33 FTEs per 1000 institutional FTEs) but is able to provide the university with the services and support it needs. According to the 2016 Core Data Service report (Educause, 2016), the mean number of IT FTEs is 8.8 per 1000 institutional FTE’s for an Educause MA institution and the median is 7.7, which would mean an IT department of 24–27 FTEs. CityU must provide a high level of technical support because of the heavy use of online courses and the distributed nature of the University. The IT department does not have a large on-site student population, so providing technology services to student housing is a small requirement. While these two factors may offset each other from an FTE count perspective, a higher-level skill set is required to provide support when the university does much of its education online. The IT FTE count is supplemented by the fact that it utilizes a full-service-hosting vendor for the PeopleSoft Student Administration System, and Blackboard LMS, Office365 email, which replaces approximately 7 FTEs. CityU has a 24/7 Help Center partner, which replaces another FTE. Combining the FTEs replaced by those partner functions, the IT department at CityU is only slightly under the ideal staffing ratios for an institution of its kind.

IT administration is led by the Director of Information Technology, supported by the Manager of Desktop Services, and the lead programmer analyst positions. The expense budget for IT in FY2017 was just under $3.2 million. The IT budget includes salaries for the department, payments to outsourced partners, all telephone costs, all network costs, computer maintenance, printing consumables cost, and software license fees. The capital budget for FY2017 was $300,000, most of which was used for the implementation of executive dashboards. Other projects were the upgrade of classroom technology and the replacement of older servers. The system development team comprises five members who are responsible for supporting the following applications: PeopleSoft Student Administration, PeopleSoft HR/Payroll, PeopleSoft Financials, PeopleSoft CRM, CampusCruiser Portal, Blackboard Learning Management System, Microsoft SharePoint intranet portal, the custom-built curriculum development system, and several other miscellaneous systems.
RESOURCES AND CAPACITY

The desktop support team comprises three members who are responsible for acquisition of staff, faculty, and computer lab desktop equipment including PCs, multimedia devices, projectors, and miscellaneous other equipment; second-tier Help Center support; and the installation, maintenance and support of all desktop equipment and software applications such as Microsoft Word, Excel, Outlook, PowerPoint and Power BI; Adobe products; and miscellaneous others.

Security and Privacy Policies

CityU takes all prudent precautions to protect the information assets of the University. The IT department protects perimeter security and access, and access to data is determined by each data steward (Vice President of Student Services for student data, Director of Finance for financial data, and Provost for academic data) or selected representatives. CityU follows all government regulations (FERPA, etc.) to protect the privacy of student, faculty, and staff information.

CityU considers its students’ privacy to be of great importance. It does not sell or rent to any third parties any personal data that students submit electronically.

CityU uses personal data to:

• Communicate with users and provide information that users request, as well as share information about CityU’s programs and services;
• Help the university make informed admissions decisions or verify identity prior to granting new students access to some of CityU’s services. (See IT Security and Privacy Policy in Appendix 21. Y.)

CityU prohibits illegal file sharing and monitors computer usage for spikes or other misuses. CityU has never received notice of a file sharing violation.

IT Summary

CityU aligns its information services with the university’s mission “to change lives for good by providing a high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn,” providing support for students and faculty whenever and wherever they are learning and teaching.

Although managed from a central location, these centralized systems are accessed from dispersed geographic areas. This allows the IT department to work more efficiently since fewer staff are required to manage resources and the time spent updating systems is greatly reduced.

The IT department has been working with academics and international partner institutions to increase the access of CityU’s Blackboard LMS. This allows a standard and consistent learning experience across the CityU curriculum, and allows instructors to focus more time on teaching and less time on learning how to operate multiple outside learning management systems. With a single learning management system, students become familiar with one layout and can focus on their education instead of familiarizing themselves with varied systems.

Instructors also benefit from a single learning management system by knowing the content they create can be used in other courses they teach. CityU’s common curriculum is another factor in this decision.

IT is laying the foundation for the increased use of rich media for online and face-to-face classes through the implementation of rich media streaming servers. Streaming media reduces storage capacity and establishes standard formats for video and audio productions. Users store their content on a centralized server and then link their content into any number of courses. This reduces the need to create and store an individual video or audio file in each course.

In addition, IT has increased the ease-of-use of its systems for the end users by creating a single sign-on environment that allows a user to sign in one time and access all network resources without having to provide log-in credentials for each network resource. IT also has thoroughly revamped its faculty and student portal. This portal is the common entry point into all the systems used by students and faculty. The goal of the new portal is to reduce the knowledge required to navigate the variety of CityU’s systems by making more information available in a customized form to each individual student or faculty using the portal.
CHAPTER THREE: Planning and Implementation

Standard 3.A Institutional Planning

3.A.1 The institution engages in ongoing, purposeful, systematic, integrated, and comprehensive planning that leads to fulfillment of its mission. Its plans are implemented and made available to appropriate constituencies.

3.A.2 The institution’s comprehensive planning process is broad-based and offers opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies.

3.A.3 The institution’s comprehensive planning process is informed by the collection of appropriately defined data that are analyzed and used to evaluate fulfillment of its mission.

3.A.4 The institution’s comprehensive plan articulates priorities and guides decisions on resource allocation and application of institutional capacity.

3.A.5 The institution’s planning includes emergency preparedness and contingency planning for continuity and recovery of operations should catastrophic events significantly interrupt normal institutional operations.

City University of Seattle engages in ongoing, purposeful, systematic, integrated planning that is aligned with its mission and Core Themes in order to achieve the fulfillment of its mission. This includes strategic planning, operational planning, and annual budget planning. CityU also maintains plans covering safety, hazardous materials, facilities, and educational technology.

CityU has a long tradition of strategic planning, as evidenced by its strategic planning policy (University Polity 1400.01) and its strategic planning procedures (University Procedures 1400.01.01 & 1400.01.02). See Appendices 15. and 21.Z. Both the policy and its procedures emphasize participative planning and tying operational goals to strategic goals. Each of CityU’s three Presidents and leadership teams during the most recent accreditation cycle have implemented the policy and two procedures in different ways, with varying degrees of transparency. Early in the accreditation cycle, strategic plans were drafted by the leadership team and then discussed at day-long planning meetings that included representatives from all departments across the university. More recently, CityU has shifted to a unit-level planning process where annual operational goals were drafted and aligned to the institution’s strategic objectives and Core Themes.

However, both the nature of the participative input and process of tying operational goals to strategic objectives have been consistent throughout the leadership changes during the past accreditation cycle. In other words, the strategic planning policy and procedures have remained consistent.

In accordance with the previously cited strategic planning policy and procedures, former CityU President Richard Carter convened a Strategic Planning Committee in November 2014 which concluded its work in January 2016. The result was the CityU 2020 plan. The 19 members appointed to the committee collectively represented the schools and departments within the university. Committee members were explicitly tasked to serve as representatives and conduits to provide perspectives and views of the departments and schools they represented. President Carter charged the committee to complete an environmental scan, SWOT analysis and an appreciative inquiry exercise to generate the 5-year strategic plan. Data analyzed and used to inform the strategic plan included longitudinal enrollment, retention, graduation, and special student populations (e.g., military/veteran students, non-traditional students, and domestic vs. international students).

The key results of the CityU 2020 planning process were the five Strategic Objectives derived from the plan. Each key objective was intended to drive the creation of operational goals to be carried out by the respective units. There was a clear, high-level alignment between the five Strategic Objectives and the institution’s four Core Themes. The five strategic objectives are:

1. Focus resources on growing enrollment in the Pacific Northwest (Core Theme 2, Objective 2A).
2. Add one new graduate program each year in a discipline that is aligned with the job trends in the Pacific Northwest (Core Theme 1, Objective 1C).
3. Expand the number of international students that come to Seattle (Core Theme 3, Objectives 3A and 3B).
4. Increase cross-affiliate collaboration by implementing processes to share students and academic content (Core Theme 4, Objective 4B).

5. Realize quality and cost efficiencies achieved through a well-disciplined quality improvement model (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B; Core Theme 2, Objective 2B).

As the CityU 2020 plan was completed, it was approved both at the institutional and system levels. The other affiliates in the National University System completed their strategic plans at the same time. The plans were presented to, and approved by, the Board of Trustees during its February 2016 meeting.

The approved strategic plan was introduced to all staff at an “All Hands” meeting in early 2016 and has been repeatedly presented to key stakeholders on a number of occasions. A version of the plan resides on the CityU.edu website under “Discover CityU.” A copy can also be found in Appendix 15.

The CityU 2020 plan has been driving planning and operations since its adoption. However, in 2017, CityU took a significant step in implementing its plan through a newly adopted operational planning process described below. A snapshot of some of the key dashboards can be found in Appendices 3 and 4.

**Operational, Budget, and Academic Planning**

**Operational Planning**

In order to ensure that its Strategic Objectives and Core Themes are supported across the institution, CityU implemented a new annual operational planning process in 2017. Each operational, administrative and academic director was tasked with drafting three to five operational goals for the academic year – these goals cascaded up to their overall respective department/unit. A special PDF template was created to support this process. Each operational goal has an owner, a deliverable, and is time-bound with a clear completion date. Furthermore, each operational goal is linked to the Core Theme and/or Strategic Objective that it supports. An operational goal may link to multiple Core Themes and/or Strategic Objectives.

Once the individual units drafted their operational goals, there was an automated process that allowed them to be submitted to a central repository. Thus, all units submitted their operational goals for review by the institution’s leadership team. Operational goals were also categorized, across the institution, by Core Theme and Strategic Objective(s). This makes it possible to generate separate reports that show every operational goal that supports Core Themes 1 through 4 and/or Strategic Objectives 1 through 5. The detailed list of operational goals for each Core Theme and Strategic Objective can be found in Appendix 13.

**Budget Planning**

As the institution considers its Strategic Objectives and operational goals, it engages in an annual budget planning process. This process encompasses four stages. The first is to project enrollments, by program and location, for the coming year. This is done by reviewing past performance and adjusting projections to account for Strategic Objectives and market forces that are likely to impact those numbers. Through this detailed and careful process, the institution comes up with its annual enrollments and tuition revenue projections for the coming year and, in stage two, this is translated into a revenue budget.

The third phase of this process is expense budgeting. Each unit in the institution submits regular expenses, largely based on the prior year. New strategic initiatives are considered in this process and those that are approved are funded appropriately. Capital budgeting is also considered as a part of this process. The last stage of this process is to reconcile the revenue and expense budgets to place appropriate limits on what the institution can expect to spend in the coming budget year.

The planning process helps drive the budgeting process as operational goals and strategic objectives require appropriate funding. Any new initiative, requiring funding outside of the normal process, is reviewed by both institutional and National University System leadership. An initiative deemed to be important for institutional growth may be funded from CityU revenues or by the National University System. A key advantage that CityU has from its affiliation with the National University System, is access to expanded resources to fund significant growth initiatives. This benefits both the institution, other affiliates and the system as a whole.
Once the budgeting process is complete and all major initiatives for the coming year have been prepared, the budget is reviewed and ultimately approved by the CityU Board of Trustees.

**Academic Planning**

Each year, the institution checks a number of key performance indicators to determine its strategic and operational plans for Academics for the coming year. As a part of this process, each program's performance is analyzed in terms for enrollments, margins, and student satisfaction as indicated by student satisfaction surveys and end of course evaluations. Low enrollment or deficit margin programs need to be expanded and resourced or, in some cases, discontinued. Programs where satisfaction metrics are less than expected will need to be reviewed and revised.

Another key part of the planning process for Academics is the Annual Program Assessment Review (APAR) process. Every program in the university undergoes a review to determine the extent to which it is meeting its key metrics (enrollment, retention, student satisfaction, and outcomes assessment numbers). When necessary, programs must make adjustments to improve the student experience and this often impacts the academic planning process. For more details on the APAR process, see Appendix 7.

New programs also must be considered; a key Strategic Objective for CityU is to release at least one new graduate program per year. The annual academic plan must account for the time, resources, staff and costs of planning and launching these new programs. These new program initiatives also impact the budget planning process and resource allocation described above.

In 2015, CityU expanded its eLearning team to initially take control of the Blackboard LMS and other applications used in program development and instruction (Curriculum Development System and Collaborate). As the team has demonstrated success and grown, they have been tasked with helping improve academic quality by establishing exemplary standards for course design and delivery. Over the past year, the focus has been to update a selected group of programs to the new standards. This means revising every course and every Blackboard shell in those programs. To date, a small number of courses and programs have been revised but more needs to be done and a significant operational and strategic goal of both the eLearning team and the schools is to implement the new standards across all programs. These new standards further the CityU’s mission to offer quality instruction which complies with the quality section of Core Theme 1 (Objectives 1A, 1B and 1C).

**Emergency Preparedness and Contingency Planning**

CityU’s emergency preparedness plan is in place to help institutional continuity and to speed up recovery and return to normal operations in the event of the many types of catastrophes that may impact the Institution. CityU’s Safety Plan includes inclement weather, hazardous materials, and a number of other events that could affect normal operations. A system recovery plan exists for essential IT operations, as well as a contingency plan for alternate delivery, locations, and modes of instructional delivery. See Appendix 16.

CityU’s emergency response planning is under the direction of the Safety Core Team with resource support from the System. The Director of Facilities serves as the main incident commander for emergencies. As part of ongoing risk assessment planning, the institution is currently working with System level management in the development of continuity planning in the face of a serious disruption of services. System level support includes short-term ability to manage key operational functions from affiliate institutions such as National University and John F. Kennedy University who can provide access to the same software and systems that CityU uses. Services can be easily and quickly restored by using affiliate systems and software paired with access to offsite, secured storage of CityU data.

**Campus Safety**

The Campus Safety page provides general categories and specific instructions on what to do in case of an emergency. The page defines different emergency situations (bomb threats, crime and mental illness, earthquake, fire, gun threat, hazardous materials, hostage situations, personal safety, sexual assault and stalking, suspicious mail, gun threat, and workplace violence) and then includes possible responses to these scenarios. There is also information provided in text form and through training videos that addresses how one might act in specific medical situations.
CHAPTER FOUR: Core Theme Planning, Effectiveness and Improvement

Standard 3.B Core Theme Planning

3.B.1 Planning for each core theme is consistent with the institution’s comprehensive plan and guides the selection of programs and services to ensure they are aligned with and contribute to accomplishment of the core theme’s objectives.

3.B.2 Planning for core theme programs and services guides the selection of contributing components of those programs and services to ensure they are aligned with and contribute to achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of the respective programs and services.

3.B.3 Core theme planning is informed by the collection of appropriately defined data that are analyzed and used to evaluate accomplishment of core theme objectives. Planning for programs and services is informed by the collection of appropriately defined data that are used to evaluate achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of those programs and services.

Core Themes Planning

In 2011, City University of Seattle selected its four Core Themes because they were a part of its mission and values and they had a great influence on the University’s programs and services. Both the institution’s mission and values have been consistent drivers of strategy and operational decisions since well before the Core Themes were required or even institutionally defined. Thus, any past planning processes necessarily included all of the main elements of the Core Themes since they have been fundamental to CityU’s identity for decades.

In 2013, the objectives, indicators and measures for the four Core Themes were identified by CityU’s leadership. The objectives provided more detail on the Core Themes themselves and most were linked to indicators that were already being tracked by the institution to measure its performance. Because the Core Themes, objectives and indicators were derived from CityU’s mission, vision and values, a version of them informed each annual plan in an informal way. In 2015, the process was formalized through the creation of the CityU 2020 Strategic Plan.

As detailed above, the CityU 2020 Strategic Plan resulted in five key Strategic Objectives, each of which can be linked to at least one Core Theme and objective as follows:

1. Focus resources on growing enrollment in the Pacific Northwest (Core Theme 2, Objective 2A).
2. Realize quality and cost efficiencies achieved through a well-disciplined quality improvement model (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B; Core Theme 2, Objective 2B).
3. Expand the number of international students that come to Seattle (Core Theme 3, Objectives 3A and 3B).
4. Add one new graduate program each year in a discipline that is aligned with the job trends in the Pacific Northwest (Core Theme 1, Objective 1C).
5. Increase cross-affiliate collaboration by implementing processes to share students and academic content (Core Theme 4, Objective 4B).

With the alignment between the Core Themes and the CityU 2020 Strategic Objectives, the same set of indicators and measure can be used to broadly measure progress on both.

Operational Goals to Support Core Themes and Strategic Objectives

CityU has taken clear steps to ensure that its programs and services are aligned with its Core Themes through the development of operational plans for each of the units. In order to formally document and track institutional performance, relative to its Core Themes and Strategic Objectives, each unit within the University sets targets, tracks measures, and produces operational plans that align with and support the Core Themes.
This past year, CityU created a system where individual business units each identify operational goals for the current academic year. These goals are entered into a central repository using a PDF template that requires each operational goal to be submitted with an owner, a deliverable, a completion date, and a designation of which Core Theme or Strategic Objective the goal supports. All units at CityU completed this task so it is now possible to see which operational goals have been submitted for each core theme and for each strategic objective. Summaries of these goals, by Core Theme, are presented in the sections that follow.

Through this process of identifying operational goals, planning for core themes has become fully integrated into the overall annual planning process at all levels of the institution. And while this process is new, it has long-term applicability as new operational goals will need to be identified for each academic year. As CityU designs and delivers its programs and provides services to its students, its Core Themes and Strategic Objectives will continue to influence its operations based on measurable, actionable data determined by analyses of past performance and is integral to future planning. Various relevant dashboards and reports are referenced in the sections that follow.

Tracking Progress on Core Themes

Many of the indicators for CityU’s Core Themes are metrics that have been tracked for many years. Some of these metrics have recently been updated to reflect changes in institutional or System level requirements or processes. For example, the schools have revised their process of outcomes assessment to reflect the use of secondary rubrics. The methods for calculating retention and completion rates have also recently been revised. The institution is consistently reviewing its key performance indicators to ensure that they are valid measures of performance, including strategic and operational goals, which can lead to evaluation, analysis, possible program redesign and continuous improvement.

In 2016, the institution formalized and consolidated its reporting capabilities through the creation of a data warehouse that serves as a central source for all of its key measures. From this data warehouse, CityU has been able to create a number of key performance dashboards including an Institutional Dashboard and a Core Themes Dashboard. See Appendices 3 and 4.

The Core Themes dashboard is divided into four sections, each highlighting a particular Core Theme. These separate sections are organized around the objectives of each Core Theme and demonstrate the indicators, measures, and targets for each objective. This tool provides a high-level tool to assess achievement of key indicators, whether performance is on track or not, and, at an aggregate level, allows CityU to track performance on the Core Themes. The executive staff, along with the individual departments can use the Core Themes dashboard to determine the extent to which the Core Theme objectives are being met and which need further operational and/or strategic attention. This helps drive action for programs and services to improve results or address performance gaps.

**Standard 4A. Assessment**

4.A.1 The institution engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate to its indicators of achievement—as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

4.A.4 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of programs and services with respect to accomplishment of core theme objectives.

4.A.5 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of planning, resources, capacity, practices, and assessment with respect to achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of its programs or services, wherever offered and however delivered.

4.A.6 The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.
Data Warehouse, Institutional Dashboard and Core Themes Dashboard

In 2015, CityU began the data warehouse project. This was an effort to homogenize and standardize all data collection efforts so that key metrics such as enrollment, retention, completion rates, etc. were all being calculated in the same way across all programs and services in the institution. It also provided leadership with access to key metrics. Today, managers can check program specific applications, enrollment, retention, headcount and revenue at a moment’s notice by accessing the Executive Institutional Dashboard, which is a front-end rendering of what is captured in the data warehouse. The data was meticulously validated and is now being utilized by multiple business units across locations university-wide.

The existence of the data warehouse and Executive Institutional Dashboard has been a catalyst for the creation of a number of other measures, also presented in dashboard format. Perhaps one of the most important of these tools is the Core Themes Dashboard. CityU is now able to track key measures, for each indicator, for each objective across all Core Themes. The units can compare performance to established targets to determine the extent to which each unit is contributing to the fulfillment of the institutional mission, vision and values.

The Core Themes Dashboard provides aggregate and detailed information for both programs and services. It serves as a collector of data about key metrics such as learning outcomes assessment, enrollment, retention, completions, affordability, flexibility, diversity and satisfaction. Table 16, below, shows the measures that make up key parts of the core themes dashboard:

Table 16: Core Themes and Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Theme</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education** | • Student attainment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)  
• Student attainment of CityU Learning Goals (CULGs)  
• End of Course Evaluations (EOCEs)  
• Student Ratings of Instruction Quality from Student Surveys  
• Alumni Employment Status and Earnings  
• Professional Advancement and Return on Investment |
| **2. Ensure Student Access and Success** | • Enrollments by Location and Delivery Mode  
• Unduplicated Headcount by Program and Location  
• Year to Year Retention for New Students by School and Program  
• Graduation Rates by Percent Time to Completion  
• Average Student Loan Amounts, % of Students Borrowing and Default Rate  
• Students’ Perception of Flexibility of Offerings  
• Transfer Credits by Institution  
• Students Enrolled in ConED and WAL Courses  
• Military and Veteran Enrollments |
| **3. Strengthen Global Connections** | • Attainment of Global and Multi-Cultural Perspectives  
• Mastery of CityU Learning Goal 5: Diverse and Global Perspectives  
• Minority and Non-Traditional Enrollments  
• Number of International Students and Enrollments from International Partners  
• Student Satisfaction Comparison by Country |
| **4. Foster Lifelong Learning** | • Trended Student Experience and Overall Satisfaction  
• Master of CityU Learning Goal 6: Livelong Learning  
• CityU Alumni Completing Additional Education |

Other dashboards derived from the data warehouse are also being developed and/or delivered which assist with aggregate measurement of student/program/faculty performance across all segments and locations.
Core Theme Measurement and Assessment

The following section shows an evaluation of CityU’s four Core Themes with respect to mission fulfillment. Mission fulfillment is defined as the satisfactory achievement of the measures of the Core Theme indicators. In the next accreditation cycle (i.e., 2018-2025), the Core Themes, objectives, and indicators of achievement will be reviewed to ensure that they are realistic and aligned with any changes in CityU’s mission. Additionally, at the start of the next cycle, all objectives and indicators will be reviewed for validity and adequacy as true measures of mission fulfillment.

The core themes assessments, shown in the sections below, used objectives, indicators of achievement, measures, baselines, and targets. There are a few points to note when examining these results, including:

- Baseline measurements include three to four years of historical data up to the most recent academic year. These are compared to predetermined targets.
- The measures that comprise a core theme objective are compared holistically to determine whether that core theme objective is met. They are not weighted numerically; rather the measures are treated as a triangulation of sources of evidence in a qualitative manner. The holistic comparison’s goal is to show the degree to which a given Core Theme objective is met and to consider changes when a target is missed.
- Measures that do not meet targets are in need of further evaluation. Rather than assume that performance issues alone are the cause of any missed targets, it is important, in this first round, to also consider the validity and demonstrability of the targets themselves.
- Going forward, the relevance and validity of each measure will be reviewed. This will be part of a meta-evaluation of each Core Theme objective with recommendations for future evaluations and continuous improvement.

Core Theme 1: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education

Core Theme 1, focused on delivering high quality, relevant education, is measured using the following:

- Student learning outcomes
- Measures of instructional quality
- Alumni metrics

The results for the three objectives of Core Theme 1 are shown in Tables 17, 18, and 19 below.

**Table 17 – Results for Core Theme 1: Objective 1A – Student Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1A: CityU supports the achievement of student learning outcomes.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A1. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)/1A1a: Student Attainment of PLOs</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A2. CityU Learning Goals (CULGs)/1A2a: Student Attainment of CULGs</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18 – Results for Core Theme 1: Objective 1B – Instructional Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1B: CityU champions effective and innovative teaching.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B1. Instructional Quality/1B1a: End of course evaluation by school and delivery mode.</td>
<td>4.22 (5.0 point scale)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B1. Instructional Quality/1B1b: Student ratings of instructional quality as reported on student surveys.</td>
<td>3.14 (4.0 point scale)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 – Results for Core Theme 1: Objective 1C – Impact on Students’ Careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1C: CityU delivers relevant education that positively impact students’ careers.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1C1. Employment and Career Contributions/1C1a: Field relevant to studies</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C1. Employment and Career Contributions/1C1a: Reported salary</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C1. Employment and Career Contributions/1C1b: Professional advancement and return on educational investment.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment of Core Theme 1

**Objective 1A.** Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and CityU Learning Goals (CULGs) are measured using a system of secondary rubrics where instructors are asked to evaluate student performance, relative to these goals, on key assessments throughout the program. In both cases, at an aggregated level, the institution is meeting its target of 80% of student performing at or above standard on these key measures.

A strength of the assessment of Objective 1A, in its current form, is that it is based on over 30,000 individual student assessments of thousands of students over a three-year period. These results can be disaggregated to individual programs and single outcomes providing clear feedback on each outcome to program administrators. Also, the data provided by these measures is used to help drive the annual program review process by the Academic Assessment Committee, which is a robust faculty led peer review process.

**Objective 1B.** Table 18 shows aggregated measures of results from end-of-courses evaluations (EOCEs) and yearly student satisfaction surveys. These are used to evaluate Objective 1B. Both baselines represent three-year averages. The EOCE and surveys use different Likert scales, and both are meeting targets.

**Objective 1C.** The data for the metrics in Table 19 are derived from the 2014 alumni survey and the 2016 recent-graduate survey, which totaled 1,119 respondents. The respondents represent 22 percent of degree and certificate completers as reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) during the years 2011-2016. Whereas the response rate is good for graduate surveys, CityU is exploring other ways of tracking graduates via publically available data to add more information to assessing Objective 1C.

**Core Theme 2: Ensure Student Access and Success**

Core Theme 2, focused on ensuring student access and success, is measured using the following:

- Enrollments
- Retention
- Completions
- Affordability
- Flexibility
- Pathways for student transfers
The results for the three objectives of Core Theme 2 are shown in Tables 20, 21, and 22 below.

### Table 20 – Results for Core Theme 2: Objective 2A – Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2A: CityU is committed to student access and success.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A1: Enrollments/2A1a: Enrollments by location and delivery mode</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A1: Enrollments/2A1b: Unduplicated headcount by program and location</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A2: Retention/2A2a: Year to year retention growth rate for all programs</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A2: Retention/2A2b: Year to year average retention rate for all programs</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A3: Graduation/2A3a: Graduation rate for undergraduates by percentage time to completion</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 21 – Results for Core Theme 2: Objective 2B – Affordability and Flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2B: CityU is committed to offering affordable academic programs suited to adult learners.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2B1: Affordability/2B1a: Average student loan default rate</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B1: Affordability/2B1b: Average student loan amount</td>
<td>$11,856</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B1: Affordability/2B1c: Percent of US core students who borrow to finance their education</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B2: Flexibility/2B2a: Number of delivery modes and locations</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Not Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B2: Flexibility/2B2b: Student’s perceptions of flexibility by school as reported on student and alumni surveys</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22 – Results for Core Theme 2: Objective 2C – Access Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2C: CityU creates pathways that facilitate the transition into higher education.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2C1: Community and Technical College Transfers/2C1a: CCTC Transfer credits by institution</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C2: Continuing Education/2C2a: Growth rate of students enrolled in continuing education and Washington Academy of Languages courses</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C3: Military and Partner Transfers/2C3a: Growth rate of military and veteran enrollments</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Assessment of Core Theme 2

**Objective 2A.** Comparing the baselines to the targets, in Table 20, gives a mixed picture. Three measures (enrollment growth, unduplicated headcount growth and retention rate increases) all show positive movement relative to the stated targets. Yet the actual retention and completion rates remain below the selected targets indicating a need to review the drivers of these measures or a need to reconsider the targets.

**Objective 2B.** The measures of Objective 2B combine to assess financial affordability and flexibility of CityU’s programs. The affordability measures triangulate between three types of student loan data: average loan default rate, average loan amount, and percent of US students borrowing for their education. Nationally, CityU scores well in these areas; however, CityU strives to improve.
For the indicator of flexibility, the institution measures this construct in two ways. First, it examines the number of locations and delivery modes, of which there are 42 over the past three years. CityU has not determined a target for this measure. Second, Student Satisfaction Survey and Alumni Survey questions on course choice and availability form the other measure of flexibility. The baseline data falls slightly short of the achievement target.

**Objective 2C.** As the third and last objective for Core Theme 2, Objective 2C is designed to determine if special student population groups have pathways into CityU. These groups include: community and technical college transfers; students seeking continuing education including Washington Academy of Languages (WAL) students; and military and veteran students.

Continuing education/WAL and military/veteran students have shown explosive growth for three-year average baselines, far exceeding their four-percent growth targets. Conversely, community and technical college transfers into CityU have dropped and are well below the four-percent growth target. The drop in community and technical college transfers could possibly depend on two factors: one internal and one external. Internally, CityU’s 2020 Strategic Plan prescribes focus on graduate degree development and creating pathways from bachelor’s degrees to graduate degrees. At the same time, many State of Washington community colleges are now awarding bachelor’s degrees or have articulations with public State universities. This has reduced traditional community college transfers because baccalaureate degrees from State of Washington public schools cost less than similar degrees offered by CityU. The University’s expansion of its graduate programs is strategic, given these external developments.

**Core Theme 3: Strengthen Global Connections**

Core Theme 3, focused on strengthening global connections, is measured using the following:

- Student satisfaction regarding internationalization of curriculum
- Student achievement on CityU Learning Goal 5 – Diverse and Global Perspectives
- Domestic student diversity
- Number of international students
- Domestic and international student satisfaction

The results for the two objectives of Core Theme 3 are shown in Tables 23 and 24 below.

*Table 23 – Results for Core Theme 3: Objective 3A – Diverse and Globally Competent Learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3A: CityU develops diverse and globally competent learners.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A1: Global and Multicultural Learning/3A1a: Attainment of global and multicultural perspectives for domestic students as reported on student and alumni surveys.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A1: Global and Multicultural Learning/3A1a: Attainment of global and multicultural perspectives by international students as reported on student and alumni surveys.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A1: Global and Multicultural Learning/3A1b: Mastery-level achievement of CityU Learning Goal 5 – Diverse and Global Perspectives.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A2: Student Diversity/3A2a: Percentage of non-traditional domestic student enrollments</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 – Results for Core Theme 3: Objective 3B – Mutually Beneficial Global Alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3B: CityU fosters mutually beneficial global alliances.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B1: International Student Success/3B1a: Number of international students and growth by international partnership.</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2: Student Satisfaction/3B2a: Domestic student satisfaction by country.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B2: Student Satisfaction/3B2a: International student satisfaction by country.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment of Core Theme 3

**Objective 3A.** Table 23 shows that Objective 3A supports mission fulfillment, given the comparison of measures to targets. The survey question on global perspectives does show a weaker response opinion in domestic students. This data needs to be explored further by looking at both the curriculum and considering intercultural factors of domestic students and international students.

The level of mastery, as shown by the evaluation of CityU Learning Goal 5 – Diverse and Global Perspectives, seems to provide evidence, in aggregate, that the programs are properly addressing this goal. As part of the annual review process, each program assesses this goal individually and there may be additional work that is needed at the program level to further enhance course and program level initiatives to further advance the achievement of this target.

For domestic student diversity, the data is unreliable because, for 45% of US domestic students and 59% of worldwide students, ethnicity data is not provided. Age data is reliable. In order to further measure this indicator, data collection on all students, particularly non-white students, must improve to represent and analyze the CityU population as a whole.

**Objective 3B.** The results of the baseline to target comparison of Core Theme 3 are mixed. Student satisfaction for both international and domestic students is lower than target. International growth is strong in the selected areas for the Core Theme, however, the question of whether the measure of international growth is a valid construct of student success remains. More discussion is needed that may lead to the revision of the measures of this objective.

Canada and Europe are excluded for two reasons. First, Canada is not considered an international partner because it is part of CityU. More details can be found in the preface that describe the international partners and relationships. Second, European partnerships have experienced a decline, and several of the European partnerships have ended or are being phased out.

Based on the above analysis, it is inconclusive if this objective is being met. Given the conflicting baseline to target results, plus the construct validity questions between international student success and international enrollment growth; more discussion on validity and appropriate measures are necessary.

**Core Theme 4: Foster Lifelong Learning**

Core Theme 4, focused on lifelong learning, is measured using the following:

- Alumni satisfaction
- Student achievement on CityU Learning Goal 6 – Lifelong Learning
- CityU Alumni who complete additional education
- Percentage of students who agree that they would recommend CityU to a friend of family member

The results for the two objectives of Core Theme 4 are shown in Tables 25 and 26 below.
Table 25 – Results for Core Theme 4: Objective 4A – Student Experience and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4A: CityU provides a positive educational experience.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A1: Student Experience and Satisfaction/4A1a: Trended student experience and overall satisfaction as reported on student and alumni surveys.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A1: Student Experience and Satisfaction/4A1b: Mastery of CityU Learning Goal 6: Lifelong Learning.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 – Results for Core Theme 4: Objective 4B – Promotes Continuation of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 4B: CityU promotes the continuation of education.</th>
<th>Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4B1: Students Pursue Additional Education/4B1a: CityU Alumni Completing Additional Education.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Not Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Assessment of Core Theme 4

Objective 4A. There are mixed results when examining the measures related to a positive educational experience and lifelong learning. While it is difficult to measure lifelong learning itself, it is important to note that the wording of the core theme is to “foster” lifelong learning with fostering being of significant importance. Providing a positive educational experience and measuring learning outcomes related to the fostering of lifelong learning are what CityU adopted as indicators and these will need to be reviewed and revised in the next cycle to ensure that they are the most valid measures for this objective.

Objective 4B. The sole measure for this objective is the alumni survey question regarding furthering one’s education either through CityU or at another institution. The positive responses are difficult to gauge as there is no established target for this measure. The measure of 27% over three years represents data from only two alumni surveys. After a third survey, the measure will be adjusted and a realistic target will be selected. Also, as with Objective 4A, there is a question of validity as to whether the indicator and its measure relate to the objective. This leads to an inconclusive assessment. In the coming accreditation cycle, more work will be necessary to establish other measures that more appropriately evaluate this objective.

Summary: Assessment of Core Themes with Respect to Mission Fulfillment

The previous sections describe the evaluation of measures for indicators relative to the objectives for each Core Theme. Each measure is compared to an established target. Some of these sections also address concerns with construct validity of some of the measurements as accurate/valuable indicators of the objectives. This section synthesizes the Core Themes to mission fulfillment based on the previous and ongoing analysis.

Core Theme 1 clearly supports mission fulfillment in two of three objectives, according to comparison of measures to targets. There is a need to consider, and possibly revise, the measures for Objective 3C to ensure a valid connection between the indicators and the objectives of Core Theme 1.

Core Theme 2 supports mission fulfillment in several growth areas of student success: enrollment, student headcount, and retention. These measures triangulate well; however, outcome measures such as retention rates and graduation rates need more attention. Growth of special student population (i.e., military/veterans and non-credit students) measured very successfully. Affordability and flexibility scored moderately well, and CityU should monitor these areas further. Because of the institution’s relatively new focus on graduate enrollment, CityU should reexamine whether it is appropriate or helpful to continue to include the core theme measure of community and technical college transfers.

Both Core Themes 3 and 4 show inconclusive evidence towards mission fulfillment. The reason is the limitations on the construct validity of the measurements to the indicators and objectives. In the case of Core Theme 4, there is tenuous alignment between one of the objectives and the core theme (Objective 4A: CityU provides a positive educational experience). A strength of both Core Themes is the inclusion of pertinent learning outcomes assessment measures, which are direct assessments of student learning. By weighting the direct assessments...
more than the indirect assessments (e.g. survey results), both Core Themes satisfy mission fulfillment – with the stipulation that both Core Themes should undergo extensive analysis, discussion, and revision in the next accreditation cycle.

In conclusion, the baseline to target comparison of the Core Theme measurements establishes mission fulfillment, as well as reveals areas of improvement in both actual measurements and core theme revisions. Mission fulfillment is an ongoing process, and this summative snapshot at Year Seven reveals many of CityU’s institutional strengths as well as areas of opportunity. Mission fulfillment is a process of continuous improvement. In recent years CityU has demonstrated clear strides in achieving its mission, values and Core Themes. The institution will continue to monitor and devote resources to its overall mission fulfillment.

Academic Assessment Processes

4.A.2 The institution engages in an effective system of evaluation of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered, to evaluate achievement of clearly identified program goals or intended outcomes. Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services.

4.A.3 The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

City University of Seattle takes academic assessment very seriously. Not only does the institution evaluate student performance relative to both program and institutional outcomes, it has built a number of other processes for ensuring academic performance and instructional quality. This begins at the start of the program design stage and continues through and contributes to each student’s experience. The sections below describe all academic assessment processes and, where relevant, how each stage is assessed.

Program and Course Design

City University employs an outcomes-focused curriculum design process; a key part of this process is to determine what students will be able to demonstrate upon the successful completion of a course or program. The instruction is built to support student competence on these outcomes.

The first step in this design process is to identify Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). Again, these are the actions that successful graduates will be able to demonstrate upon completion of the program. The institution also has a set of City University Learning Goals (CULGs) which are competencies that all students, regardless of their program, should be able to demonstrate upon completion. These CULGs are tied very closely to general education competencies in the undergraduate programs.

The next step is to design the courses that make up a program. These course are also designed around a set of demonstrable outcomes and specify what a student should be able to do upon completion of each course. As the design of a program nears completion, there are three sets of outcomes that need to be measured: course outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, and CityU Learning Goals.

Exemplary Standards

In 2016, the University created a set of exemplary standards for course design. Courses, and subsequently programs, are created to conform to these design standards. This includes the course documents and the Blackboard shells. Currently the University’s eLearning team is helping with the rollout of these standards across all programs. This is a process that will take several years to complete. When completed, all courses and programs will conform to a consistent standard intended to ensure that students have a consistent and great experience.

Course Review Process

Each quarter, all online and hybrid courses are checked at least one time, by either the Academic Program Director or Associate Program Director, on a routine basis. A performance rubric is used to ensure that the course is being taught in a manner that meets CityU standards. Courses are checked for announcements, discussion board participation, gradebooks, student feedback, and overall quality. Each item is assessed on a scale of “below standard, approaching standard, at standard, or above standard”. The results of these course reviews are recorded.
in a SharePoint database. Any instructor of a course that does not meet standard on all assessed areas is coached by Administrative Faculty and must take steps to meet or exceed standards. Given that most instructors are retained on a quarter-to-quarter basis, these reviews have significant weight in determining whether an instructor will be offered the opportunity to teach future classes.

Recently the Schools of Education, Arts and Sciences, and Applied Leadership have moved to an Exemplary Standards class review rubric that is more comprehensive. This is a more detailed rubric and it takes longer to complete so courses in these schools are reviewed only once a quarter. To date, this new rubric has been in place for only one quarter and its utility and validity are yet to be fully determined.

**End of Course Evaluation Process**

The University conducts End Of Course Evaluations (EOCEs) through its Blackboard LMS. This makes it easy for students to follow a link to the evaluations.

Courses are evaluated on eight different factors. These are the same factors that CityU asks students to evaluate in an academic-related part of the Student Satisfaction Survey. This provides CityU the opportunity to compare responses for courses against survey responses that are reflective of general feelings about the institution. The factors are rated from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) and an average is calculated for each course, each school, and the institution overall. Currently, response rates are about 50% and the most recent EOCE aggregate score for the university was above 4.20.

Scores for individual faculty members are used as a gauge of student satisfaction in a particular class. Because of the variability of response rates, only general guidelines can be applied to determine if a course and instructor need to be investigated further. Courses with high response rate and low scores hold the most weight in regard to the need to take corrective action. Students are allowed to make free-format comments at the end of the evaluation process and these comment are often the richest source of information about the student experience. The most recent EOCE summaries and a sample report can be found in Appendix 17.

**Faculty End of Course Evaluation Process**

In 2015, CityU implemented a “Faculty End Of Course Evaluation”. This is mostly a qualitative survey of faculty about their experience with their class and it allows them to make suggestions about course design and delivery. A number of adjustments have been made to courses as a result of these faculty evaluations.

A sample Faculty End of Course Evaluation survey can be found in Appendix 18.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

In a section above, the process of designing course, program and CityU Program Learning Goals was described. This section will describe how these outcomes are assessed.

Once all of the courses in a program are completed, a curriculum map is used to determine strategic placement of secondary rubrics. These secondary rubrics are used to track student performance on Program Level Outcomes and/or CityU Learning Goals. When there is a major assessment that can provide insight on the student’s progress relative to a program outcome or a learning goal, that assessment will have a secondary rubric attached to it. The instructor evaluates this assessment twice. The first time will be to provide feedback to the student. The second time will be to indicate how well the student demonstrated competence on the program outcome or learning goal. Throughout the program, instructors complete both a primary and a secondary rubric for every assessment that has both rubrics. This secondary rubric data is gathered and assessed in aggregate to determine the percentage of students who are performing “at standard” or “above standard” on each program learning outcome and each CityU Learning Goal. Over the life of the program, there are a sufficient number of secondary rubrics to assess each program outcome and learning goal to properly and fully assess the student performance in the program.

Furthermore, secondary rubric data are gathered and stored in the data warehouse so that they can be displayed in a Microsoft Power BI dashboard. This dashboard allows faculty and administrators to view results by program for specific Program Learning Outcomes and/or CityU Learning Goals. Analysis follows and the university can determine if student performance is meeting the 80% goal of being “at standard” or “above standard” that CityU has set for itself. This secondary rubric data can also be displayed across the university allowing faculty and administrators to see performance of students across the institution on all of the CityU Learning Goals. An example of the Secondary Rubric dashboard can be found in Appendix 5.
Academic Program Assessment Process

Each year, every academic program is required to go through the academic assessment process. In preparation for this process, each program director will work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to prepare an Academic Program Assessment Report (APAR). A key part of this report will show the program’s performance on secondary rubrics. Program Directors are expected to evaluate the performance of their programs relative to student performance, instructor evaluations, enrollments, and other key performance indicators. Where there is a clear need to improve, the Program Director must formulate an improvement plan for the coming year and this includes any changes that need to be made to the program’s design to improve performance on secondary rubrics. In subsequent years, the Program Director will need to show that the changes he/she made successfully addressed the need for improvement. Sample APAR reports can be found in Appendix 7.

Summary

Overall, CityU has implemented a number of steps to assess its programs and services. The primary goal of all of these assessment efforts is to identify where the institution can improve to further ensure that all students have a outstanding experience and that the institution is fulfilling its mission.

Over the last several years, a number of improvements to CityU’s programs and services have been made, many of which are described in the sections above in detail but also the sections that follow.

Standard 4.B Improvement

4.B.1 Results of core theme assessments and results of assessments of programs and services are: a) based on meaningful institutionally identified indicators of achievement; b) used for improvement by informing planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity; and c) made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

4.B.2 The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements. Results of student learning assessments are made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

Improvements in Programs and Services

In the past year, CityU took a number of steps to standardize its data gathering, analysis, and visualization processes. Many of these data tools, such as the data warehouse, Executive Institutional and Core Themes Dashboard, are relatively new but the metrics that they report on are not. CityU has been tracking several of these metrics for many years to identify opportunities for improvement in its programs and services.

The following section will describe a number of improvement that have been made to the CityU’s programs and services. These are categorized by Core Themes.

Improvements to Core Theme 1: Deliver High Quality, Relevant Education

The following institutional improvements are related to Core Theme 1:

Objective 1A – Student Learning Outcomes (Program Outcomes & CityU Learning Goals)

• Student learning outcomes – The secondary rubric system, described in previous sections, has been implemented across all programs in the university. This has provided more than 30,000 measurements of student competence relative to program and institution learning outcomes. All programs now have measurements of how well their students are doing on the outcomes. The Academic Program Directors have used this information to make design and delivery improvements. Outcomes data is also a key measure in the Annual Program Assessment Report and evaluation that every program must undergo.

• Course quality through annual programmatic review – Every program offered by CityU must go through an annual review process (APAR). To begin this process, each Academic Program Director works with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to produce the Annual Program Assessment Report. This report contains metrics about the program, its enrollments, and it outcomes. A key section of this report describes improvements that are to be made to the program as well as progress on the improvements from past reviews. Several program improvements have resulted from these annual reviews. A sample APAR report can be found in Appendix 7.
Objective 1B – Instructional Quality (Effective and Innovative Teaching)

- Instructor Quality – Through both End Of Course Evaluations and the annual Student Satisfaction Survey results, the institution is able to gather key quality information on the quality of instruction and students’ overall experience. The EOCES are used to assess instructor performance and have led to policies and actions to address any shortfalls. Instructors whose overall rating fall below a defined threshold must improve their performance or be released from the institution. The surveys provide a broader picture of the student experience and a number of improvements were made to address concerns identified in the surveys. As an example, CityU established clear policies regarding acceptable methods of providing student feedback because the survey score for that question was below goal. Also, several programs set goals for the implementation of technology tools in online classes, again due results from the surveys.

- Instructional Delivery – Another method of tracking instructional quality is the process of observing courses throughout each quarter. Some years ago, CityU established a formal process for evaluating online and hybrid classes. Each course is evaluated at least once per quarter using an instructor quality rubric. There is a separate rubric for in-class courses. Every evaluation is logged into a SharePoint database and is shared with the instructors. Because of a multi-year collection of assessments, individual instructor performance can be tracked longitudinally which is helpful for performance evaluation purposes.

- Homogenization of course format – In the past, all courses within a single program usually followed a similar format. But that was insufficient for students who took courses across multiple programs where the formats varied. There were also differences in the content and quality across different programs. CityU recognized a need to standardize its curriculum and to do so in a way that conforms to recognized quality standards. Thus, the exemplary standards have been established for both curriculum design and Blackboard shells. This initiative is in progress and will be carried out over the coming years but the goal is to have all courses, in every program, conform to these standards.

Objective 1C – Positive Impact on Students’ Careers (Market Needs)

- Market alignment – Industry advisory committees and a suite of tools provided by the National University System have provided better program alignment with student needs. CityU’s 2020 Strategic Plan has the institution focusing on program needs in the Pacific Northwest. To that end, a number of initiatives have been put into place to identify and focus on student populations in CityU’s region. This helps increase the relevance of the programs while also demonstrating careful scaffolding in program design and delivery. For example, CityU offers business programs at all four academic levels to encourage pathways, lifelong learning and meet market needs.

Improvements to Core Theme 2: Ensure Student Access and Success

The following institutional improvements are related to Core Theme 2:

Objective 2A: CityU is Committed to Educational Success (Enrollments, Retention & Completions)

- “All About the Finish” – In the last two plus years CityU’s marketing plan has been retooled to differentiate CityU from its competitors by emphasizing that CityU is “All About the Finish.” This approach was based on extensive, nationwide market research around which the institution built the pillars of its marketing approach. In essence, most colleges and universities that serve the working adult, as CityU does, focus on getting students started. CityU’s marketing department utilized statistics produced by the Chronicle of Higher Education which state that CityU students finish at twice the national average. A focus on finishing is utilized in the institution’s recruitment strategy to create rapport with students, to understand their motivation, to retain them and to ultimately graduate them. There was a university wide internal marketing campaign as well to collaborate with other support departments and Academics to further reinforce this goal.

- Reorganization of Enrollment Management – A restructuring of the US domestic enrollment team was undertaken to increase student success and access as well as overall enrollments, utilize team strengths, better allocate resources and increase operational efficiency. The outcome of this restructure divided the team into Enrollment Advisors and Student Success Advisors. Enrollment Advisors work with prospective
students through their first point of contact with the University, the admissions process and, ultimately, to their successful enrollment in their first class. Student Success Advisors continue working with the students throughout the rest of their lifecycle with a particular emphasis on academic success and access to CityU resources to ensure that success.

• Frequency of student interactions – The entire enrollment team strives to encourage student access and success through multiple touch points, ensuring access to and utilization of the resources that CityU provides. For example, the upgraded Blackboard LMS included the redesigned online orientation course intended to increase adult learners’ comfortability and success in an online environment — as well as course resources facilitated by academics and the Library and Learning Resource Center. Enrollments in the online orientation course, redesigned and led by the eLearning team have increased four-fold over prior year.

• Expansion of Library Resources – The University’s library has expanded its digital collection from AY15 (40,700 eBooks, 75,400 eJournals, 26,000 eVideos) to AY17 (230,524 eBooks, 149,820 eJournals, 45,000 eVideos).

Objective 2B: CityU is Committed to Offering Affordable Academic Programs Suited to Adult Learners

• Maintaining affordable tuition rates – The enrollment management leadership team plays an integral role in the budgeting process – which includes designing an achievable budget, across both division and programs, based on past enrollment trends to ensure the achievement of the University’s growth goals. Part of this process is the necessary evaluation of tuition rates to ensure affordability and market competitiveness. CityU has worked to keep tuition increases low and, in some cases, has not increased tuition at all.

• Flexible programs – Program starts and quarterly course offerings are also influenced by enrollment management’s analysis of specific enrollment and student behavior patterns from the data analysis phase. In particular, ensuring appropriate course offerings based on past trends as well as current student needs (for example: tracking new student starts by program and career) helps to ensure both flexible class offerings while enhancing student access and success through a robust pedagogical experience. Further monitoring of low enrollment courses in any given quarter has mitigated class cancellations – thus simultaneously ensuring academic quality while also maintaining flexibility.

• Reduction of materials costs – Adoption of resources available through the library as required course readings to reduce the overall cost of education (AY17 $1,217,000 savings to students; AY16 $1,198,549 savings to students; AY15 $850,964 savings to students)

Objective C: CityU Creates Pathways that Facilitate the Transition into Higher Education

• Establish stronger pathways for program entry – As a transfer institution focused on helping students finish their programs and primarily in service to the working adult, CityU has long recognized the need to develop partnerships with community and technical schools to facilitate pathways into higher education. The enrollment team added a Senior Director of Military and Community College Relations to further facilitate the access and success of these student populations. In particular, CityU has committed to articulating specific pathways for community and technical college transfer students as well as continuing the direct transfer agreement pathway for Washington community and Technical College transfer students. In addition, CityU offers tuition discounts in line with military tuition assistance programs and made a commitment to offering 100% onsite undergraduate courses at various campuses each quarter to ensure that military students could utilize their full Basic Housing Allowance.

Improvements to Core Theme 3: Strengthen Global Connections

Objective 3A: CityU Develops Diverse and Globally Competent Learners

• Curricular revisions for internationalization – In past assessment cycles, outcomes related to internationalization and, specifically, CityU Learning Goal 5 – Global and Diverse Perspectives, have lagged behind other assessments. Often the internationalization goals for US-based students were not met. This led to curricular revisions to further emphasize internationalization and global content. The results have led to improvements with 91.6% of students scoring at standard or above standard on this learning goal over the past four years. For each of the past four years, the goal of 80% of students who are rated at or above standard has been consistently met.
• Increased international student population – One of the University’s strategic objectives is to grow the number of international students that come to study in Seattle. This is aligned with Core Theme 3. Since the opening of the new Seattle location in 2013, that number has increased by 28%.

• Services for international students – CityU’s International Student Office (ISO), which services international students studying in the US, has worked to improve the international student experience through interactive programming and student support services. In addition, this office facilitates the arrival and positive student experience of students studying for a short time in the US through our International Partners.

Objective 3B: CityU Fosters Mutually Beneficial Global Alliances

• International student recruitment – The ISO (International Student Office) has worked hard to increase positive agent relationships to effectively recruit and serve international students. In particular, they have retooled their welcome orientation, which students now participate in prior to arrival to better prepare international students for their CityU experience. The outcome of this has been to increase the show rate of international students and their overall satisfaction.

• Expansion of international partnerships – The University is currently working to increase its international partnerships in Asia. It works to maintain and grow its existing partnerships to provide a steady flow of international students coming to the U.S.

Improvements to Core Theme 4: Foster Lifelong Learning

Objective A: CityU Provides a Positive Educational Experience

• Academic Student Satisfaction – Over the years, a number of academic improvements have been driven by student satisfaction survey results which are gathered annually. Academics uses the results of the student satisfaction surveys to assess progress on key quality metrics. This includes academic design and delivery, relevance of the curriculum and perceived value of the degrees. Since satisfaction results can be broken out by school, they have led to a number of academic improvements including better feedback to students, increased use of technology in the live and online classrooms, and standardized curriculum design methods. As changes are made, their impacts can be verified in the next annual satisfaction survey.

• Services Student Satisfaction – Enrollment management utilizes the results of the annual Student Satisfaction Survey to determine and operationalize areas of improvement in advisor behaviors and student services under the department’s control. In particular, a focus on improved response time to student issues; more touch points throughout student lifecycle regarding student access to resources (Blackboard and the library for example); business process improvements for quicker resolution of student issues, etc.

• Referrals - A targeted referral campaign has been in place in the enrollment team for several years – intended to increase new student starts through word of mouth and family approaches. A key measure of a positive educational experience is word of mouth referrals and a willingness to submit personal testimonials. The enrollment and marketing team has worked hard to build rapport and to utilize specific strategies through referrals including collecting and publishing blog posts of satisfied students and alumni.

Objective B: CityU Promotes the Continuation of Education

• Re-enrollment – Each quarter the enrollment team calls on students that have fallen under the discontinuous enrollment policy to determine if they would like to return to CityU to complete their course of study.

• Degree tracks – The Academic programs have built a number of degree tracks that make it easier for undergraduate students to continue their studies into graduate programs. This better facilitates advanced study beyond the bachelor’s degree. Currently, there are several discipline areas that have scaffolded undergraduate and graduate degrees, some going through the doctoral level such as business programs offered from associate’s than doctoral level to encourage pathways and lifelong learning. The Enrollment Management team helps to make students aware of these options.
CHAPTER FIVE: Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation and Sustainability

Standard 5.A Mission Fulfillment

5.A.1 The institution engages in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments.

5.A.2 Based on its definition of mission fulfillment, the institution uses assessment results to make determinations of quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment and communicates its conclusions to appropriate constituencies and the public.

Collection and Use of Performance Data

As described in the preceding sections, CityU gathers a number of key metrics, many of which are used as measures for the core theme indicators. The measures provide evidence of core theme and mission fulfillment. The key measures include:

- **Student Learning Outcomes** – Through the use of secondary rubrics, assessments of Program Learning Outcomes and CityU Learning Goals are gathered and tracked for each program and the University overall. The secondary rubric system has been in place for four years and the information it has gathered is available through a secondary rubrics dashboard that has been rolled out to all Administrative Faculty. The data gathered through this system is used to assess program and instruction quality as evidenced by student competence (Core Theme 1, Objective 1A).

- **Measures of Instructional Quality** – Two key measures of instructional quality are gathered and used for all programs. The first are the End Of Course Evaluations. These measures are used heavily gauge the quality of instruction from the students’ perspective. They provide key information that is used by Administrative Faculty and shared with Associate Faculty on individual and overall instructional quality. The second key metric for instructional quality is the annual Student Satisfaction Survey which provides more detailed information about students’ impression of the quality and utility of their degrees (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B).

- **Annual Program Assessment Review Reports** – Every year, all programs are scheduled to be reviewed by the Academic Assessment Committee. To facilitate this review, an Annual Program Assessment Review report is produced that collects information about student outcomes, instructional quality, headcount, retention, graduation, and plans for past program improvement. These program reviews are intended to set goals for annual program improvements and then track that these improvements have been achieved (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B; Core Theme 2, Objective 2A).

- **Course and Shell Reviews** – Every quarter, all online and hybrid courses are reviewed by Administrative Faculty and are assessed using a course review rubric. In-class courses are assessed on a regular basis as well using a different rubric. Any performance short-falls are identified by the course manager and are reported back to the instructor who must take action and document steps to rectify the gaps (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B; Core Theme 4, Objective 4A).

- **Enrollment, retention, completions** – The Enrollment Management group defines and tracks metrics about enrollments, retention, and completions and much of this information is available to all administrators and faculty, across the institution, through the Institutional Dashboards. A separate dashboard has been created to track additional details about retention numbers (Core Theme 2, Objective 2A; Core Theme 3, Objectives 3A & 3B).

- **International student enrollments** – A key Strategic Objective for CityU is to increase the number of students who choose to come to Seattle to complete their programs. To that end, the institution has expanded its relationship with international universities and refined its relationships with recruitment agencies to attract more international students to Seattle. These numbers are tracked on a quarterly basis and reported out through financial reports and dashboards (Core Theme 3, Objective 3B).

- **Student Satisfaction Survey results** – A key source of actionable data comes from the annual Student Satisfaction Survey. It contains 42 multi-part questions that report student satisfaction on specific aspects of CityU’s programs and services. The survey is open to students studying at multiple locations, both domestic and international, and provides longitudinal measures across several years. The most recent satisfaction survey garnered 1,104 responses, which represents nearly 20% of CityU’s worldwide student population (Core Theme 1, Objective 1B; Core Theme 2, Objective 2B; Core Theme 3, Objective 3B; Core Theme 4, Objective 4A).
• Alumni survey results – CityU has conducted alumni surveys of all graduates in the past but, in the most recent survey, the population was limited to those alumni who had graduated in the last five years. And while this led to more actionable data, it also led to fewer responses. The alumni survey reveals a number of key indicators related to employment, compensation, pursuit of further education, and a reflective assessment of the graduate’s experience at CityU (Core Theme 1, Objective 1C; Core Theme 4, Objective 4B).

• Key financial measures – CityU uses a number of reports to track its financial performance when compared to prior years and current projections. Through this series of reports, the University can track its revenues, expenses, enrollments, margins, and trends for each department, each school and programs, and its international partnerships.

Transparency of Information

Website Information

In the spirit of transparency, CityU includes information about its mission, values, vision, Core Themes on the web site and in the General University Catalog. The organization’s strategy is also summarized on the website.

The mission, vision, values, and core themes can be found on the “Discover CityU” section of the www.cityu.edu website. A direct URL for this content is: https://www.cityu.edu/discover-cityu/

An abbreviated copy of the University’s CityU 2020 Strategic Plan can also be accessed from this page.

The university has posted a number of its key policies on the website. These are also available in the catalog. The key policies are accessible through the following URL: https://www.cityu.edu/discover-cityu/about-cityu/

In addition, the University has posted a number of key metrics about its student population. These metrics include retention, graduation, enrollments, international enrollments, and student demographics. These Fast Facts can be accessed through the following URL: https://www.cityu.edu/discover-cityu/fast-facts/ and are available in PDF format found in Appendix 9.

Communication of Performance Metrics

Much of the information about CityU’s performance is now tracked in dashboards that are populated through the data warehouse or other validated sources. The institution’s Data and Analytics Team has made producing and distributing validated performance metrics a priority. Currently, the top three dashboards used for data sharing include:

• Executive Dashboard – The Executive Dashboard is the primary reporting tool for the data warehouse and it provides information on credit hours, headcount, enrollments, gross tuition, and conversions as a percentage of projections and/or budget. All metrics can be viewed in aggregate or broken down to specific schools and programs. The data in the Executive Dashboard is available to several internal CityU stakeholder groups.

• Core Themes Dashboard – The Core Themes Dashboard tracks all measures, for all indicators, for every objective among the four Core Themes. In most cases, three-year means are calculated and used as the current measures. This is compared against established targets and it becomes easy to visually track progress on core themes and mission fulfillment. The Core Themes Dashboard is available institution wide and a training and transparency initiative is currently underway to familiarize all CityU staff and faculty with the Core Themes metrics.

• Secondary Rubrics Dashboard – The Secondary Rubrics Dashboard tracks student performance on all program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. The data for this dashboard is gathered in real-time. There are currently four years’ worth of outcome data being tracked in this dashboard. The data provides the ability to see how students are performing on specific program outcomes or CityU learning goals. Secondary rubrics data is made available to administrators and all Administrative Faculty in the University.

Instructional Quality

Measures of instructional quality are available to Administrative faculty and are communicated out to the Associate Faculty on a regular basis. The two key information sources are:

• End of Course Evaluations – These consist of Likert measures on eight course attributes along with a mean of those eight values. The scores for an instructor’s classes are made available to them at the end of each quarter.
• Blackboard shell evaluation results – In most cases, the results of a course evaluation are made available only when there is a performance gap. In the case of the School of Applied Leadership, all evaluations are shared with the faculty and more schools are moving toward that practice.

Student Satisfaction

Satisfaction results provide some of the most complete and widely used measures at the University. They have been used to identify improvement opportunities and track the success of past improvement efforts. Currently, student satisfaction comes from:

• Student Satisfaction Survey – Run annually, this survey provides key satisfaction measures on a number of programs and services. The results of each survey are made available staff and faculty across the University.

• Alumni (Recent Graduate) Survey – Run every three years, this report provides and number of key indicators about recent graduates including employment, compensation, and the pursuit of additional education. The results of each alumni survey are made available to staff and faculty across the university.

Standard 5.B Adaptation and Sustainability

5.8.1 Within the context of its mission and characteristics, the institution evaluates regularly the adequacy of its resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations to document its ongoing potential to fulfill its mission, accomplish its core theme objectives, and achieve the goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.

As a small and cohesive university, CityU has a singular annual process for evaluating its performance and planning for the coming year. On an annual basis, the University employs a zero-based budgeting process to draft its projections of revenues and expenses. Estimates of enrollments and resulting revenues are established and compared against estimates of expenses. By the end of the budgeting and planning cycle, the institution's projections of revenues must meet or exceed the expenses.

This requires a careful analysis and prioritization of operational plans to ensure that the university can fulfill its mission, expand its programs, and seek necessary improvements and efficiencies. Each month, on a program by program basis, the institution compares its actual performance to its projections to ensure that they are on track. Each quarter, a very close watch is kept on applications, matriculations and enrollments to, once again, ensure that projections are met.

In regards to expenses, the highest priority is placed on meeting the current mission and fulfilling the current Core Theme objectives. New programs, initiatives, or infrastructure are funded through special additions to the budget, known as SPOs, or through the capital budget process. In recent academic years, the University has been able to fully cover its current priorities and fund a number of new initiatives leading to improvements in academic quality and the student experience – further evidencing CityU's commitment to fulfilling its mission, values and Core Themes – in all programs, whenever offered and however delivered.

5.8.2 The institution documents and evaluates regularly its cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation, application of institutional capacity, and assessment of results to ensure their adequacy, alignment, and effectiveness. It uses the results of its evaluation to make changes, as necessary, for improvement.

CityU has maintained a consistent strategic planning process for many years. The current strategic plan format and planning process was developed in 2016 to identify the institutions’ Strategic Objectives, link them to the Core Themes, and use them to drive operational plans for the units. A full description of the planning process is included in Chapter Three of this report.

Strategic planning on both the institutional and unit level is vertically integrated. Operational plans are created and each units’ goals are linked to either a strategic objective or a core theme. This year, all operational goals were submitted and centrally collected so that the institution can see all annual operational goals, for every unit, in a single Excel sheet. Operational goals will be reviewed and revised, as needed, in the next academic year.

As described in Chapter Four of this report, the university regularly and systematically collects data that includes clearly defined indicators of achievement. It analyzes those indicators and develops evidence based plans to further its progress toward meeting core theme objectives and fulfilling its mission. The analysis of core theme
measures versus targets is the process that drives strategic and operational planning review and assessment. It also is a key factor in the planning and implementation of institutional improvement for both programs and services.

At the institutional level, progress in implementing the Strategic Objectives of the CityU 2020 plan is assessed annually through the operational plans. These operational plans are reviewed by the President’s Executive Team and are used by the individual units for performance management. Any failure to achieve goals is assessed by the individual units and the goals are revised as part of the following year’s plan.

As outlined in Standard 3.A., CityU has an integrated process for establishing and evaluating its institutional plans as they related to the budgeting process. Allocation of resources is aligned with strategic objectives, operational goals, and core theme objectives at both the institutional and unit level. The institution’s capacity to achieve desired and required outcomes of its programs and services, core theme objectives, and strategic objectives is tracked and continues to support mission fulfillment.

The University’s budget process, includes projections and margin targets for each unit. This model allows unit leaders to track expenses and revenues against projections and provides a clear idea of how well each unit is staying on track while achieving its operational plan. The clear connection between budget and strategy ensures that priority projects receive funding that can be supported by operational performance. When revenue targets are exceeded, it becomes possible for CityU to allocate additional resources to help it accelerate the realization of its operational goals.

5.B.3 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it uses those findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, core themes, core theme objectives, goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement.

In 2015, under supervision of the Board of Trustees Audit Committee and using the Business Assessment Framework for Higher Education developed by Huebner Advisory LLC, the institution established a CityU Business Assessment Framework to identify business risks and their impacts. Based upon this framework, the institution developed an Enterprise Risk Mitigation (ERM) plan. This plan is updated annually with status reporting throughout the year to the Board Audit Committee. A copy of the most recent ERM plan can be found in Appendix 20.

In addition to enterprise level review, it is important that the University tracks and reviews feedback, both from internal and external sources to ensure that it is positioned in its market and region to be successful and fulfill its mission, vision and strategic objectives for the short and long term. A number of internal and external data sources are utilized to identify emerging trends, both locally and nationally, that may impact operations and the strategic direction of CityU.

Some examples of recent internal and external data sources and how they are being used for planning and improvement include:

**Internal**

The University utilizes a number of reporting processes, dashboards, and metrics to track its performance. These provide indicators of academic performance, enrollments, retention, completion, student satisfaction, and market relevance. Please see the various dashboards referenced above for examples, such as the Institutional or Core Themes dashboards. CityU uses these indicators to gauge the extent to which it can fulfill its mission, achieve its Core Themes, complete its strategy, and remain competitive in its market. A key part of both mission fulfillment and competitive strategy is a constant focus on quality improvement, especially as it relates to the academic programs. Thus, there is a heavy emphasis on the use of internal metrics for quality, retention, and completion.
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External

When completing the CityU 2020 Strategic Plan, both a SWOT and a detailed environmental scan were conducted. This provided a clear assessment of the market and student population that CityU serves. It also allows the University to consider new degree areas and disciplines where it can be competitive.

Because of its affiliation with the National University System, CityU has the opportunity to take advantage of a number of tools that the System has employed. The Office of Strategy at the National University System does market scans and competitive analyses for all affiliates in the System. This provides a clearer picture of student needs and demands in CityU’s region and this information has been used to drive initiatives such as expanded degree programs in Health Care Administration and the evaluation of competency-based education.

CityU has a three-year contract with Hanover Research to conduct market studies for specific disciplines. Generally, these studies are conducted when the institution is considering a new program discipline area. Hanover has recently helped CityU understand the national marketplace for new doctoral programs that it is pursuing.

Many programs have industry advisory councils that help the program match its curriculum to the needs of the students. These councils are consulted for new programs or when major program changes are implemented.

Lastly, a number of CityU’s programs have specialized accreditation, the standards of which help drive direction about what programs in these areas should be delivering.
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CityU is a significant private, not-for-profit, postsecondary educational institution in the Pacific Northwest. While it is an affiliate of the National University System, CityU’s focus has remained primarily on the Pacific Northwest and Southwestern Canada. Its mission, vision, strategy, and resources are dedicated to serving this population. With degrees at the Associates through Doctoral levels, the institution is today serving a broader range of students than ever before.

CityU will continue to pursue its strategic objectives, as detailed in its CityU 2020 plan, driven by its Core Themes. A focus on delivering high quality, relevant education will drive much of what the CityU does in the coming years through its academic offerings and student services. Continuing emphasis on student access and success will ensure that the institution takes steps to make education affordable, flexible, and exceptional experience for all who entrust CityU in helping them achieve their educational goals.

CityU is focused on the Pacific Northwest but still maintains a number of international partnerships and will continue to support international students as they pursue a CityU degree. A significant portion of the institution’s efforts to strengthen its global connections will be to create additional opportunities for students to come to Seattle to complete their programs. Finally, CityU will continue to foster a desire for lifelong learning as it prepares students for their careers.

Key Strengths

Through its many accreditation processes, the University has been able to affirm a number of strengths.

- **Strong and Consistent Mission and Vision** – CityU has remained dedicated to providing high quality, relevant education to anyone with the desire to learn. This remains a key driver for programs and services that the institution offers.

- **Focus on Academic Quality** – Academic quality is a significant concern for the institution. It begins in the program design process and continues into the delivery of instruction, where a number of metrics are used to ensure excellence in the classroom. The focus on quality also drives the outcomes assessment process and the annual program review cycle.

- **Discipline-specific Accreditations** – The focus on quality has allowed the university to earn a number of discipline specific accreditations including ABET (Bachelor of Arts in Information Systems), ACBSP (specific business programs), PMI/GAC (Master of Science in Project Management), CACREP (Master of Arts in Counseling), and NSA Center of Excellence (Bachelor and Master of Science in Information Security).

- **Excellence in Doctoral Education** – In 2011 CityU launched its first doctoral program in leadership. That program has grown substantially mostly due to a targeted focus on academic quality. A number of data sources have shown extremely high levels of satisfaction, retention and growth. The practices used to make this program so successful have now been extended to new doctoral offerings.

- **Practitioner-Faculty Model** – CityU has long embraced the use of academically-qualified practitioners as its faculty allowing students to learn from industry professionals that teach what they do for a living. This faculty model has been a key strength domestically, in Canada, and at our international locations.

- **Completion Rates** – In 2015, The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that CityU ranked #1 in the State of Washington for the percentage of its students that complete each year. This has confirmed CityU’s role as being a top institution to help adult students complete their degrees.

- **External Rankings** – For the sixth year, CityU has been ranked in the top 50 for online bachelor’s degree programs by “US News and World Report,” The 2018 ranking is #31.

- **Serving the Pacific Northwest** – CityU is proud to serve the Pacific Northwest and Southwestern Canada with quality programs aimed at adult students seeking career advancement. Future programs and services will continue to focus on this region. It is CityU’s role, as part of the National University System, to focus on the Pacific Northwest.
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- **International Students and Programs** – With roots in the Pacific Northwest, CityU has had a focus on providing US style education to international students for nearly three decades. The University offers US style degrees at our international locations and recruits a good number of international students into our US based programs. International students bring global perspectives that are shared with domestic students. CityU faculty who teach abroad are able to bring a higher level of internationalization to all of their courses.

- **Fiscal Responsibility** – The University continues to demonstrate fiscal responsibility by carefully planning and implementing sound budgets that allow the institution to pursue and fulfill its mission, vision and Core Themes in a sustainable manner.

- **Affiliate of the National University System** – CityU has a unique role as a member of the National University System. Its focus, described in its strategy, is to focus on the Pacific Northwest and Southwestern Canada with adult focused programs that meet the needs of students in these regions.

- **Connections to the Community** – As a member of the Seattle community, CityU continues to build its relationship with students, businesses, and other education providers. Our Enactus team has embarked on a number of socially responsible projects, supporting the needs of the community, and earned a top-10 finish at the Enactus National competition in 2017.

**Areas of Focus**

The NWCCU accreditation process has encouraged CityU to review its Core Themes and the process of assessing its progress on them. As these processes become more refined, the University will benefit through the following improvements:

- **Comprehensive Approach to Improvement** – CityU will push toward a more comprehensive model of assessment of instructional quality merging information from outcomes, course evaluation and student satisfaction surveys into single measures of quality. Currently, the Academic Program Assessment Reports are serving this purpose and this process will continue with the focus being placed on actionable and verifiable improvement plans.

- **Consistent Core Theme Data Tracking** – CityU will ensure that consistent and valid data are available for all Core Theme objectives. Refining Institutional metrics and processes that impact data integrity is a key part of this continuous effort.

- **Expansion of the Secondary Rubric Assessment System** – CityU will review secondary rubrics to ensure that they are complete, aligned with the proper assignments, and providing useful and timely information about student performance.

- **Centralized Operational Plans** – 2017 was the first year that all of the units created operational plans with goals that were clearly aligned with core themes and/or strategic objectives. It was also the first year that such plans were centrally gathered and analyzed. This practice will continue into the future to ensure that core themes and strategic objectives are properly supported across all business units.

- **Formalized Data Tracking and Reporting** – CityU has made great strides in the past two years with the development of a data warehouse and a number of dashboards that consistently and easily report key operational metrics. Many of these dashboards are updated in near real time. The University will work to expand the number of available dashboards and will work toward ensuring all dashboards are consistently and automatically updated with accurate, relevant, actionable data.

The self-reflection presented in this report has provided the staff and faculty at CityU with an opportunity to examine and better understand the effectiveness of its programs and services. As CityU continues to address a number of areas outlined in this report, it is committed to ensuring engagement of students; improvement of programs; accountability of faculty; and continuous quality improvement, all of which will be needed to lead CityU toward an higher level of mission fulfillment.
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