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Preface

Eligibility Requirements & Executive Summary
INTRODUCTION TO CITY UNIVERSITY OF SEATTLE

City University of Seattle’s mission is to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. Established in 1973, CityU earned accreditation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities in 1978, and today is one of the largest private, not-for-profit universities in the Pacific Northwest. It offers programs in management, technology, education, psychology, counseling, and communications at teaching locations in eleven countries around the world and via online learning.

In its 2008–09 self-study year, CityU served 7,639 students worldwide, almost one-third of them outside the United States. Over nine hundred full- and part-time faculty members brought substantial professional expertise and currency to the CityU teaching and learning experience. The university awarded over twelve hundred master’s degrees and over five hundred undergraduate degrees, and recognized over forty-five thousand alumni around the world.

THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

The aim of the self-study is to understand, evaluate, and improve—not merely to defend what already exists. A well-conducted self-study should result in a renewed common effort within the institution to improve the whole enterprise and document its achievements (NWCCU Accreditation Handbook, p. 15, 2003).

City University of Seattle incorporated this aim into its goals for its own self-study process, to improve CityU through a rigorous review of each aspect of its operations, identifying its strengths and applying those strengths to meet its challenges. The president appointed the steering committee responsible for organizing and developing the self-study in July 2008, which in turn appointed teams of faculty and staff to focus on each of the nine standards, with an additional team convened to address CityU’s international operations. These teams included sixty-five members of the university community, spread across the various departments and regions. They began their work by conducting gap analyses of the operations, policies, procedures, or other improvements that would be required in order to answer the questions posed in the standards. The gap analyses were presented to a wider group of CityU faculty and staff in October 2008, where additional input was gathered and incorporated. The steering committee synthesized the analyses into three main areas that required attention:

1. Finalizing, documenting, and communicating policies and procedures
2. Aligning domestic and international operations with standards and practices, and ensuring effective oversight
3. Documenting how students in all locations are served equitably and are achieving learning outcomes

Each area received substantial consideration. There was a concerted effort to redo, update, and complete the operational policies and procedures manuals that document the actual operations of the institution and to bring greater consistency to its practices. CityU enumerated and classified these documents into the Policy and Procedure Manual, which is maintained by the President’s Office on the institutional intranet system. Along with the Board of Governors’ policies, the Policy and Procedure Manual thoroughly documents the practices and principles that guide CityU’s decisions and operations, and sets the framework for organized and thoughtful evolution and change into the future.

A great deal of energy was invested in improving the communication and collaboration across CityU’s international operations. Early on in the self-study process, CityU made an explicit commitment to develop a stronger sense of being “one university.” Peer administrators at CityU’s home campus in Bellevue and at its European locations developed stronger working relationships. Policy development and implementation became more inclusive, and accountability for effective oversight was clarified. As teams with representation...
from different regions tackled challenges, new and stronger working relationships developed.

As the teams conducted their analysis of student services, CityU as a whole developed a greater awareness that it serves different populations in its various locations. In the United States and Canada, the student body consists primarily of returning adult students, with a majority of students in graduate programs. In Europe and Mexico, the majority of students are younger, many directly out of high school. This knowledge led to a renewed evaluation of CityU’s student services model, and clarification of the responsibilities of its international partner organizations to provide appropriate services.

CityU’s attention to student learning outcomes assessment received new energy as its international locations became more engaged in providing and analyzing evidence of student learning. The faculty at CityU’s home campus has embraced learning outcomes assessment as an ongoing part of ensuring the quality of academic programs. Increasingly, as a result of the self-study process, they are collaborating with faculty at other locations in the collection, analysis, and application of outcomes assessment data to program improvements.

The process of conducting the self-study analysis took nearly a full academic year. In spring 2009, another meeting of faculty and staff reviewed the evidence of student learning collected by six programs and provided feedback on CityU’s continuous improvement model. First drafts of the reports related to each standard were due in July 2009. Over the next several months the drafts were edited and consolidated into this report, an effort to tell CityU’s story accurately and completely that engaged everyone who participated in the self-study process.

At all times in the development of the self-study, CityU’s Board of Governors was informed. Status reports were provided at every board meeting. A first complete draft of the self-study was presented to the board in November 2009, and opportunities for feedback and revision extended through until final publication in January 2010. The commitment of the board and its mandate to ensure that the process involved all segments of the university provided a strong force for unifying the organization across its various schools, programs, and locations.

Each of the teams assigned to a standard had its own epiphanies and made adjustments in institutional practices to improve CityU’s ability to fulfill its mission. A description of the overarching findings, conclusions, and recommendations for improvement of the self-study process is included in the summary chapter. Reflecting on the goal of the self-study process, it is clear that bringing together virtually everyone in the organization into one focused activity had a significant unifying impact. A sense of community evolved from the self-study process. This ultimately led to the clear realization that everyone at CityU, from the Board of Governors to the staff to the Teaching Faculty, maintains a strong commitment to CityU’s mission. CityU is a stronger organization as a result of the self-study process, due to the intense efforts of the many faculty and staff involved. While there are continued challenges in bringing everyone together around its strategies and long-term vision, CityU’s commitment to expanding access worldwide to the opportunities higher education can bring is alive and vibrant.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Authority

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 Higher Education Coordinating Board of the state of Washington. These institutions have met the criteria as outlined in state law and rules for continuous exemption. The schools are exempt from state authorization and review so long as they continue 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 Governors. The Board of Governors has, in turn, adopted operational policies and procedures that describe and operationalize the governance structure of the university.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Six.

Mission and Goals

Throughout its history, City University of Seattle has had a consistent mission to provide educational access to those traditionally underserved. Its current mission statement captures its history and purpose: to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. The mission statement, vision, and values were approved by the Board of Governors as part of the Strategic Plan presented at their annual planning retreat in January 2007. City University of Seattle publishes its mission statement in its annual catalog and in the annual President’s Report. The mission statement also appears on the university’s website. The mission, vision, and values of CityU provide the foundation for constructing its Strategic Plan. In its plan, the university establishes goals and associated metrics to make progress toward its mission. CityU’s four strategic goals are to

1. excel in teaching and learning;
2. expand access to high-quality, relevant programs;
3. become a leading, globally connected university;
4. improve and sustain financial health.

The Strategic Plan and its goals are reviewed annually by the Board of Governors, along with evidence of progress in each goal area. This provides a check on alignment with the mission and overall direction for the coming year.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard One.

Institutional Integrity

City University of Seattle recognizes and welcomes its obligation to its students, faculty and staff, organizations 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. 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Nine.

Governing Board

CityU’s Board of Governors’ bylaws specify that the board must comprise at least six and no more than twenty-one members. Currently, the Board of Governors consists of sixteen regular members and three honorary members, all of whom are independent of the institution in terms of salary or income. 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Six.

Chief Executive Officer

One of the principal responsibilities of the Board of Governors is the appointment and evaluation of the
president. President Gorsuch was appointed in 2006 and undergoes a formal evaluation every year. His full-time responsibility is to CityU, and he recently committed to serve an additional three years at the institution.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Six.

Administration

CityU’s administrative structure is based on clear lines of authority and responsibility. Direct reports to the President include the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer and Vice President of Finance and Administration, the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services, the Chancellor of the International Division (currently vacant), and the directors of Human Resources, Alumni Relations and Development, and Institutional Effectiveness. The administration for Academic Affairs includes the Dean of the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the School of Management, and the Associate Provost reporting directly to the Provost. The academic officers in all foreign locations also have a dual reporting relationship to the respective school deans.

Administrators’ duties are clearly defined in their job descriptions, and the expectations for performance are established as part of the organization’s annual performance review process. Over the last two years, CityU has engaged in a transition to a performance management system that links individual performance goals to the strategic and operational goals of the institution.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Six.

Faculty

CityU boasts a well-qualified cadre of faculty. One hundred and sixty faculty members from the United States and Canada hold a doctoral degree as their terminal degree. 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 2008–2009 academic year, CityU employed over nine hundred Teaching Faculty worldwide, each of whom 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 will 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 program coordinators — the Administrative Faculty. Each academic degree program is overseen by a designated program coordinator or program director who is responsible for ensuring the staffing of the courses and managing the curriculum. At the end of the 2008–2009 academic year, CityU employed a total of sixty-two full-time and part-time Administrative Faculty in its North American locations.

Salary surveys are periodically completed to confirm that faculty salaries are competitive and sufficient to attract and retain competent faculty. Turnover of Administrative Faculty within CityU was slightly less than 10 percent during the 2008–2009 academic year.

Faculty/program directors and coordinators 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). Administrative Faculty also participate in the university’s Strategic Planning Committee and its semiannual strategic planning events.

The Teaching Faculty participate in governance through the Faculty Advisory Committee, which meets quarterly 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 has several subcommittees 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Four.

Educational Program

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 and psychology, and communications. 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 list of degree programs offered as of fall term, 2009–2010, is included in the Preface.)

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, 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, and librarians work closely with faculty on curriculum design and identification of course resources.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Two.

General Education and Related Instruction

City University of Seattle constructs its General Education requirements in alignment with its mission and commitment to expand educational opportunities around the world. CityU recognizes the importance of general education for any student earning an undergraduate degree at the university. 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 math, five credits of college writing, 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 Bellevue by the Division 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.

CityU has addressed the first need by requiring a standard distribution of lower-division General Education credits across various general study disciplines. CityU meets the second goal of general education, providing the opportunity to learn essential skills and abilities, by embedding and assessing general education–related learning outcomes into all of its undergraduate degree programs. These outcomes are incorporated through the integration of CityU Learning Goals in classes. In many undergraduate programs, courses meeting General Education requirements are embedded into the third year, in order to best serve the needs of adult students. Through the combination of distribution requirements and embedded outcomes, CityU ensures that it offers undergraduate students exposure to the breadth of knowledge that characterizes general education, and the opportunity to learn the skills and abilities that are essential to engaged citizens in the twenty-first century.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Two.

Library and Learning Resources

City University of Seattle’s Dr. Vi Tasler Library, located in Bellevue, Washington, supports 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.” The library aligns its work with the university’s goals to promote excellence in learning, to expand the reach of CityU programs, to create a leading and globally connected university, and to improve and sustain the financial health of the university. Library resources, services, and information-literacy instruction are coordinated through the Bellevue 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Five.

Academic Freedom

CityU promotes faculty exploration in teaching and in research. The CityU Board of Governors has adopted the following policy on Academic Freedom, which was adapted from the 1940 resolution of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges:

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.

The Board of Governors believes that 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Four and Standard Nine.

Student Achievement

CityU’s most important measures of the effectiveness of its academic programs are the learning outcomes achieved by its students. All degree programs are
Admissions

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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Three.

Public Information

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, fee, and refund information; procedures for grade grievance, scholastic honesty, and other student rights and responsibilities. The core marketing function for the United States and Canada is centralized in Bellevue under the supervision of the Director of Marketing and Vice President of Admissions and Student Services. All materials used in recruiting, advertising, and promotion are developed under the guidance of a centralized team to ensure accuracy and consistency of representation. The university’s Accreditation, Local Approvals, and Marketing Policy and its related procedure govern the promotion of programs and locations. Statements regarding regional accreditation and approval are boilerplate statements and required to be used uniformly across all publications. Statements regarding local country approvals are established and cleared by the appointed accreditation liaison officer in the President’s Office prior to use and implementation in printed documents.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Three.
Financial Resources

The 2009–2010 fiscal year budget for the university is approximately $43 million. As of June 30, 2009, the university’s unrestricted net assets were $11,114,113, which represents an increase of $13,548,856 over the past ten years. Nearly 97 percent of its revenues are derived from tuition.

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) uses a composite score based on three ratios (Primary Reserves, Equity, and Net Income) to calculate the overall financial health of colleges and universities for purposes of determining Title IV financial aid eligibility. The university’s current composite score (DOE ratio) stands at 1.65 at June 30, 2009, compared to .65 at June 30, 2000. The university prepares annual operating and capital budgets, approved by its Board of Governors. The mission and vision statements of the university and its operational goals and plans drive the budget and its preparation process.

Since 2001, the university has invested significantly in facilities, classroom equipment and furniture, computer systems and networks, and took on debt and capital lease obligations for such. Additionally, the university constructed a building in Slovakia, which was also funded through long-term debt. Since 2005, CityU has been focused on reducing debt and has funded virtually all new equipment acquisitions through operations. Debt and capital lease obligations have been reduced by over $2.3 million since 2005 and will be completely paid off by 2011. Besides reducing debt levels since 2005, the university has also increased cash and cash equivalents balances by nearly $5.4 million to further strengthen its financial position and available reserves and exceed total debt outstanding.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Seven.

Financial Accountability

The university is audited annually by the independent certified public accounting firm, KPMG. 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 Governors’ audit committee. 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.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard Seven.

Institutional Effectiveness

CityU’s purpose is expressed in its mission to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. CityU collects and analyzes a body of evidence that demonstrates how well it fulfills its mission. The evidence includes results of regular surveys of students, alumni, staff, and faculty; direct evidence of student learning (discussed in detail in Standard Two); student credit hours earned in each region; and measures of financial health, among others. To measure progress toward achieving CityU’s strategic goals, specific performance indicators are determined for each institutional goal. Performance metrics quantify progress toward achieving quarterly and annual targets. Milestones show planned steps by quarter that will contribute to the achievement of a metric’s target.

Reports on institutional performance are shared with faculty and staff at the semiannual planning meetings and at quarterly State of the University presentations led by the president. An internal web-based document storage system allows department heads to access reports at any time. Internally, the monthly “President’s Report” is distributed via e-mail to all faculty and staff along with a more detailed update for the Board of Governors. This provides information about progress in pursuit of the university’s four strategic
goals. Annually, the President’s Office produces the President’s Report, which captures achievements of the year and is sent to the board, faculty, staff, alumni, business partners, community leaders, and friends of the university.

For further evidence related to this requirement, see Standard One.

**Operational Status**

CityU has been in continuous operation since 1973.

**Disclosure**

CityU responds to every request from NWCCU for information and complies with all required disclosures. 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 result in the development of new programs and new locations of operation. These changes require constant communication with the Commission. In 2008–09, CityU submitted eighteen substantive change requests in accordance with Policy A-2, Substantive Change.

**Relationship with the Accreditation Commission**

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 with the Commission.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2005 REGULAR INTERIM VISIT**

CityU’s last Regular Interim Visit in 2005 resulted in nine recommendations. Eight of these were resolved in a Focused Interim Visit in 2006. CityU’s response to Recommendation Four, on student learning outcomes assessment, was reviewed again in a 2007 Focused Interim Visit and a 2009 Progress Report. Each recommendation is noted below, with a reference for its current status as described in this comprehensive self-study report.

**Recommendation One**

*It is recommended that the new Vision Statement (still under review) be finalized and broadly disseminated in the community, and that all programs, existing, new and proposed, be examined for programmatic consistency with the revised Mission (Standard 1.A).*

This recommendation was resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit. The current status of CityU’s mission and vision is addressed in Standard One.

**Recommendation Two**

*It is recommended that CU continue its progress in developing its institutional goals, operational objectives and responsibilities, resulting in an institutional strategic plan, reviewed and updated annually, as an important step in institutional planning and assessment (Standard 1.B).*

This recommendation was resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit. CityU’s current institutional goals and objectives and its Strategic Plan are addressed in Standard One.

**Recommendation Three**

*It is recommended that the recently devised planning processes for new programs, new locations, new modalities, and new domestic and international partnerships be implemented, recorded, and periodically assessed, in order to provide leadership the necessary management tools for institutional decision-making (Standard 1.B).*

3.A. Implementation of Institutional Approval Process for New Programs. It is recommended that the institution finalize, obtain Board of Governor approval (as required), and implement, and monitor its new academic program procedures, including the “Approval Process for Programs – Covering: New Programs, Substantial Program
The institution has undertaken a number of major initiatives during the past year that have affected educational programs and their effectiveness. In fall of 2004 the System-Wide Academic Affairs Council was appointed to provide high-level oversight of academic programs. That body has recently developed a number of policies and procedures that need approval, implementation, and monitoring.


In fall of 2004 the System-Wide Academic Affairs Council was appointed to provide high-level oversight of academic programs. That body developed a policy related to the extension of institutional programs to international locations. Implementation of this policy should become institutionalized and assessed, to assure successful delivery of quality programs in all locations, consistent with the institutional mission.

This recommendation was resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit. The program approval process and Academic Model are addressed in Standard Two. The chapter on international programs addresses the decision-making and approval processes for those programs.

Recommendation Four

It is recommended that the institution continue the process of developing metrics related to the institutional learning outcomes that have been selected for all CU graduates. While there has been substantial positive activity in the assessment of academic programs, the assessment of institutional learning outcomes does not meet the Commission’s criteria for effectiveness of academic programs. [Standard 2.A.2 - “The goals of the institution’s educational programs... are...periodically evaluated under established institutional policies and procedures through a clearly defined process”; Standard 2.B.1 – “The institution’s processes for assessing its educational programs are clearly defined, encompass all of its offerings...”; as well as Policy 2.2.]

The 2006 Focused Interim Visit resulted in a determination that progress had been made, but more was needed to bring CityU into compliance. Another Focused Interim Visit in 2007 resulted in the determination that CityU was in compliance with the standard, and a Progress Report in fall 2009 was requested. This report was submitted in October 2009, to be acted on at the Commission’s January 2010 meeting, after this report goes to print. The current status of CityU’s student learning outcomes assessment in general, and in relation to the CityU Learning Goals in particular, is covered in Standard Two. The importance of evidence of student learning in the assessment of the quality of academic programs is highlighted by the inclusion of a special section in the report's appendices entitled “Evidence of Student Learning.”

Recommendation Five

It is recommended that the institution continue the clarification of faculty roles and responsibilities and the development of institutional guidelines for faculty member workloads. The Office of Academic Affairs has fostered a discussion of faculty member “roles and responsibilities” through the System-Wide Academic Affairs Council, and each school is engaged in a review of faculty workloads including Teaching Faculty (adjuncts), Senior Faculty (permanent faculty), and Program Directors. The implementation and monitoring of these processes and the periodic assessment and analysis of these results is important for the institution to satisfy Standard 4.A (“The faculty’s responsibility is for educational programs and their quality. The faculty is adequate in number and qualifications to meet its obligations toward achievement of the institution’s mission and goals.”), 4.A.2 (“Faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising and institutional governance.”), and 4.A.7 (“The institution fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty.”).

This recommendation was resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit. The current status of faculty roles and responsibilities, their workloads, and evaluation of the quality of instruction is included in Standard Four.
Recommendation Six

It is recommended that, while the Board of Governors has done great service to CU by taking decisive action in recent years, at present it should focus on hiring and evaluating the President, setting broad policies for governance, and delegating to the chief executive officer the responsibility to implement and administer these policies (Standard Six).

This recommendation was resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit. The current status of the board’s role in governance and policy is covered in Standard Six.

Recommendation Seven

It is recommended that attention be given to ensure that appropriate program assessment strategies for the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree program in Hawai‘i are in place and implemented beginning with the completion of Cohort I (Policy 2.2).

Recommendation Eight

It is recommended that financial and sustainability issues related to the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree program in Hawai‘i be given close attention to ensure the viability of the program (Standard 7.A.2.).

Recommendation Nine

It is recommended that CU address the future of the Bachelor of Arts in Education degree program in Hawai‘i in the event that the HDOE grant money becomes unavailable (Standard 7.B.1.).

These three recommendations related to CityU’s Bachelor of Arts in Education offered in Hawai‘i were resolved in the 2006 Focused Interim Visit.
LIST OF DEGREE AND
CERTIFICATE PROGRAMS

School of Management

**DEGREES**
- B.A. Management
- B.S. Accounting
- B.S. Business Administration
- B.S. Information Systems
- B.S. Marketing
- M.B.A. Master of Business Administration
- M.S. Information Security
- M.S. Computer Systems
- M.S. Project Management
- M.S. Technology Management
- M.A. in Leadership

**CERTIFICATES**
**Undergraduate Certificates**
- Accounting
- Marketing
- Project Management
**Graduate Certificates**
- Accounting
- Change Leadership
- Finance
- Human Resources Management
- Marketing
- Project Management
- Sustainable Business
- Technology Management

Gordon Albright School of Education

**DEGREES**
- B.A. in Education (including Alternative Routes programs)
- B.A. in Early Childhood Education
- M.Ed. Reading and Literacy
- M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction: Professional Certification, Technology Emphasis or Specialized Study

**CERTIFICATES**
**Undergraduate Certificates**
- Child and Adolescent Services
- Gerontology

**Division of Arts and Sciences**

**DEGREES**
- A.S. General Studies
- B.S. General Studies
- B.S. Communications
- B.A. Applied Psychology
- M.A. Counseling Psychology/Master of Counselling

**CERTIFICATES**
**Undergraduate Certificates**
- Educational Leadership: Administrator Certification
- Executive Leadership
- Professional Certification for Teachers
- Professional Certification for Principals and Program Administrators
- National Board Support Program

**ENDORSEMENTS**
**Undergraduate Endorsements**
- Elementary Education
- Early Childhood Special Education
- Special Education
- English Language Learners
- Middle-Level Humanities
- Middle-Level Math
- Mathematics
- Reading

**ENDORSEMENTS**
**Graduate Endorsements**
- M.Ed. Guidance and Counseling
- M.Ed. Leadership
- M.Ed. Leadership (BC, Canada)
- M.Ed. Leadership and School Counselling (BC, Canada)
- MIT Elementary Education
- MIT Special Education

**SECURITY**
**Undergraduate Security**
- Accounting
- Marketing
- Project Management
- Sustainable Business
- Technology Management

**CERTIFICATES**
**Graduate Certificates**
- Educational Leadership: Administrator Certification
- Executive Leadership
- Professional Certification for Teachers
- Professional Certification for Principals and Program Administrators
- National Board Support Program
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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, and now brings similar opportunities to students around the world. CityU currently enrolls over seven thousand students worldwide, and confers more than two thousand associate’s, bachelor’s, and master’s degrees each year.

CityU’s mission permeates every decision and action of the institution: “To 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. Once entered, students are held to high performance expectations by a faculty who apply consistent academic standards and incorporate relevant real-life experiences and knowledge. Faculty require students to produce evidence that demonstrates their ability to meet those expectations. 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 practicum, without preventing them from showing those talents by applying early admission filters. Instead, students 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.

This mode of operation reflects the explicit values CityU espouses. 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 mobility it provides inside and outside the classroom.

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 communications. 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.

CityU implements its educational model through its practitioner-oriented educational delivery structure. In the 2008–2009 academic year, CityU employed over nine hundred Teaching Faculty worldwide, each of whom was screened at the outset to ensure excellence in academic credentials (25% had terminal degrees or doctorates) and relevant current experience in the field of practice related to the subject matter they teach. The Teaching 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 no less than every four years of service.
These faculty are identified and supervised by a cohort of program directors and program coordinators — the Administrative Faculty. The Administrative Faculty are generally full-time, though some are less than a full FTE. Each academic degree program is overseen by a designated program coordinator or program director who is responsible for ensuring the staffing of the courses and managing the curriculum. 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; learning activities and resources can be customized to meet the needs of specific student groups, with an emphasis on consistent evidence of student achievement of the learning outcomes. The use of an online learning management system (Blackboard) 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 international reach. For example, business and management classes in Europe incorporate information about the European Union 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.

Assessment of Learning

CityU programs are actively engaged in assessing student learning related to the six CityU Learning Goals and the specific program learning outcomes. Faculty gather and analyze direct evidence of student learning, and apply the lessons learned to program improvements. As faculty design new programs or revise existing programs, they identify appropriate means of collecting direct evidence of student learning related to the program outcomes. Much direct evidence is gathered at the course level where CityU Learning Goals and program learning outcomes are embedded. Details of the specific evidence features for each program are identified in the chapter.
The alignment of CityU Learning Goals, program outcomes, and summative assessments is captured in a Program Design Guide. The Program Design Guide serves as a kind of “curriculum map” for program development or revision, and these are included in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

This process begins with the construction of program outcomes that align with the CityU Learning Goals. These outcomes are developed in consultation with industry advisory groups in order to ensure their relevance. The next step is to design summative assessments that provide evidence of student achievement of the program outcomes, such as a capstone business plan, an internship, or a portfolio of student work. The third step ensures that these tools are implemented to assess individual student work at the culmination of a program. The fourth step requires program faculty to aggregate and analyze data collected from evidence of student learning, with an emphasis on ensuring all locations where the program is offered are represented; and the final step requires programs to provide documentation of how the faculty have used the analysis of learning outcomes data to implement program improvements. This process is captured in annual student learning outcomes assessment reports completed for all programs with completing students, and provided by each program director to the appropriate dean and to the Academic Assessment Committee of the Academic Affairs Council.

The linking of program learning outcomes to the CityU Learning Goals reinforces the emphasis on authentic assessment — summative assessments that are generally highly relevant to the professional settings in which students will work. Rather than “layering over” another set of learning outcomes and another set of assessment tools, which would risk disconnecting the CityU Learning Goals from the curricula and instruction, this approach requires faculty to emphasize the connections between them. Core skills like critical thinking and information literacy are not afterthoughts in curriculum design; they are intrinsic to the curricula in each program.

The experience of the past year shows that the best way to infuse the CityU Learning Goals into program-level outcomes is to drill down to the course level, ensure a connection between the course outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals, and then carry that connection forward to the program level. This is done by first establishing a solid link between course outcomes and related CityU Learning Goals. Next, it is important to ensure that the assessments used to measure those outcomes do, in fact, provide evidence of achievement on both the course outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals. The committees established within each school to evaluate and approve curricula are systematizing a process to ensure that whenever a CityU Learning Goal is specified in a course, course documents clearly show how the evidence of achievement of CityU Learning Goals is to be gathered and assessed within that course. This process naturally supports the link between the program outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals once it is properly established at the course level.

Analysis of the summative assessments shows student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals is generally strong. If there are areas of weakness, the faculty work to determine the best interventions, resulting in plans to update curricula, better prepare instructors, and/or better align assessment tools. While the analysis of direct evidence of student learning appropriately receives far more attention and emphasis, CityU also reviews secondary evidence as a supplement and complement to the analysis of primary evidence. The university conducts annual surveys of its students that ask for their perceptions of how well programs support their learning in the areas related to the CityU Learning Goals. It surveys its alumni every two to three years, including parallel questions about learning in the areas of the CityU Learning Goals.

In the Student Satisfaction surveys conducted in the 2007–08 and 2008–09 academic years, students generally positively rated their perceptions of their studies’ contribution to achieving the CityU Learning Goals. The items receiving the lowest positive ratings
by students in both years are those related to diverse and global perspectives. This mirrors the analysis of direct evidence of student learning in the undergraduate business programs. The high positive ratings on items related to critical thinking and information literacy reflect the strong emphasis on building these skills into the curriculum in all programs over the last several years, including the incorporation of librarians in curriculum design teams.

Consistent with authentic assessment findings overall, at least 70 percent of students responding to the survey in 2008–09 gave positive ratings to all the items related to the CityU Learning Goals. In addition, in spring of 2008 CityU surveyed alumni regarding their perceptions of the outcomes of their CityU education. Nearly one thousand alumni participated in the survey. Of those who responded, 64 percent indicated they were employed in a field related to their CityU degree; 74 percent indicated their CityU education directly contributed to their professional advancement; and just over half indicated their incomes had increased as a direct result of their CityU education.

In relation to the CityU Learning Goals, participating alumni were asked to indicate how well their studies at CityU prepared them in all six areas. This served as a good validation of the assumption that the CityU Learning Goals were an articulation of the university’s existing mission and well aligned with its historical practice. Both of these indirect measures of student learning indicate the university has made substantial progress to date, with room for improvement to ensure that all students who successfully complete their programs do so with high levels of learning in all areas.

One obvious measure of success with the practitioner-faculty model is the capability of our graduates to excel in their chosen profession. CityU has an outstanding record in preparing minority teachers, and has made significant contributions to the ranks of principals and superintendents in Washington. Its graduates have been named Teacher and Principal of the Year in the state of Washington. The certification programs in the Albright School of Education were all granted five-year approvals by the Professional Educator Standards Board. Graduates of CityU programs in central Europe are sought after by multinational corporate employers. The graduates of CityU exit ready to be employed.

**International Education**

A unique feature of City University of Seattle is its international dimension. In addition to incorporating a global perspective into each program, CityU carries its mission to offer access to a high-quality, relevant U.S.-style degree to those in other countries. In the early 1980s, CityU took its academic offerings to an underserved adult learner population in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Since then, the university has responded to several other regions seeking U.S.-accredited programs and expanded its global presence to include three continents and eleven countries. Currently, CityU offers programs outside the United States in Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, the Czech Republic, Greece, Mexico, Romania, Slovakia, and Switzerland.

Integral to CityU’s vision is an expanding network of international higher education partners who share CityU’s vision and whose own capabilities to serve students are enhanced because of the partnership. With local advocates and champions of the vision, 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, and importantly, the same quality of education 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, and 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, and 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 largest program offerings in Europe are the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and the Master of Business Administration. Additional offerings include the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology, the Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology, the Master of Science in Computer Systems, and the Master of Science in Project Management. 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 Mexico, CityU partners with CETYS University, founded in 1961 and recognized as a candidate for accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 2008, to offer double degree programs to undergraduate students in business administration. Furthering its commitment to internationalizing opportunities to all its students, students in these programs travel to two of CityU’s sites during their degree programs, studying one summer in Bellevue and one in Europe. Currently, CityU is seeking to expand its partnerships in Mexico using the same model with other regional institutions.

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 British Columbia. In Australia, CityU’s newest partner is the University of Southern Queensland, offering a double degree opportunity for students to earn CityU’s Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and USQ’s undergraduate degree in Accounting and Sustainable Business. This partnership is enriching CityU’s own business curricula with additional courses in sustainability for students in its U.S. program.

CityU’s international programs result in continuous reminders of the importance of maintaining global relevance. 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 own home site. The common curriculum 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 nearly 97 percent of its revenues derived from tuition, City University of Seattle requires great fiscal discipline and solid financial planning to maintain its viability. The 2009–2010 fiscal year budget for the university is approximately $43 million. As of June 30, 2009, the university’s unrestricted net assets were $11,114,113, which represents an increase of $13,548,856 over the past ten years.

The Board of Governors adopts a July 1/June 30 fiscal year budget at its meeting each May. Quarterly results are reviewed with the Board of Governors.
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 Admissions, 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. Quarterly results are also provided to the university’s bank.

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) uses a composite score based on three ratios (Primary Reserves, Equity, and Net Income) to calculate the overall financial health of colleges and universities for purposes of determining Title IV financial aid eligibility. The university’s current composite score (DOE ratio) stands at 1.65 at June 30, 2009, compared to .65 at June 30, 2000. Additionally, the university has exceeded the minimum required DOE ratio the last four years, improving from a negative .63 in 2000 to a projected ratio of 2.11 at June 30, 2010.

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 7 percent for the 2009–2010 fiscal year while state-supported institutions increased tuition rates up to 14 percent. A full-time student will pay approximately $15,000 per year, and CityU assures students they will get the courses they need when they need them in order to ensure that they complete in a timely way without institutionally caused delays from course inaccessibility.

The university has recently implemented activities to engage alumni support and to more actively seek grants. The university received a $98,750 grant from the Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation Public Benefit Program in 2009 for diversity scholarships in its teacher education programs. CityU also implemented two new scholarship programs in 2009–2010, one for community college graduates who will find reduced access to public four-year universities due to state budget reductions, and one for displaced workers. Both scholarship programs when launched were hailed by Washington State Governor Christine Gregoire as a meaningful private response to state fiscal restrictions. The university will continue to seek additional funds and provide additional scholarships to maintain affordable tuition rates.

CityU’s focus on accessibility led it to establish a network of teaching locations, mostly leased, that maximize convenience for students and flexibility in responding to student needs and market changes. Since 2001, the university has invested significantly in facilities, acquired new classroom equipment and furniture, improved its IT networks, and acquired new computer systems. To do so, it took on debt and capital lease obligations. Additionally, the university purchased a building in Slovakia, which was also funded through long-term debt. Since 2005, the university has been focused on bringing down debt and has funded virtually all new equipment acquisitions through operations. Debt and capital lease obligations have been reduced by over $2.3 million since 2005 and will be completely paid off by 2011. Besides reducing debt levels since 2005, the university has increased cash and cash equivalents balances by nearly $5.4 million to further strengthen its financial position and available reserves.

## Conclusion

City University of Seattle prides itself on daring to be different. But it is different for the right purpose: to provide educational access to many students who would otherwise not be able to acquire a degree. It designs its programs to be convenient, by placement or delivery design, to working adults who want to complete a degree to change their fields or advance their careers. Whatever their motivation, students can fulfill their education quests through the opportunities provided by CityU to study online, in a weekend cohort, or in an intensive session once during a quarter.

CityU at one time was unique in this marketplace. It is less so today. Therefore, it continues to adopt new strategies and develop new programs that will
attract the working adult student in an increasingly congested market. It will continue to prioritize keeping its tuition affordable in alignment with its mission to expand accessibility. It will continue to be a good community neighbor by providing access to increasingly disenfranchised populations, community college graduates who cannot gain access to the public four-year alternatives in the area and laid-off workers who need to retrain and gain advanced education to successfully reenter the workforce.

Furthermore, CityU will seek to enhance its global nature by becoming even more attractive to international students who want to study in the United States or who want to gain the benefit of a U.S.-style education while remaining in their home countries. The world becomes smaller each day, and understanding the value each culture brings to the educational arena is critical for all to learn. The global classroom is a reality, and CityU intends to remain a leader in providing high-quality, relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.
Standard One

Institutional Mission & Goals, Planning & Effectiveness
MISSION AND GOALS

Throughout its history, City University of Seattle has had a consistent mission to provide educational access to those traditionally underserved. Its current mission statement captures its history and purpose: to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. The mission statement, vision, and values were approved by the Board of Governors as part of the 2007–2013 Strategic Plan presented at their annual planning retreat in January 2007. City University of Seattle publishes its mission statement in its annual catalog and in the annual President’s Report. The mission statement also appears on the university’s website.

First located in downtown Seattle, Washington, CityU added teaching locations throughout the Puget Sound region, eventually expanding into western Canada, Europe, China, and Latin America. CityU started with programs in business and management, adding education, counseling, psychology, communications, and other areas to respond to community needs. In pursuit of its mission, CityU developed evening and weekend courses, located in geographically dispersed sites, school district facilities, and students’ places of employment. CityU was an early pioneer in distance learning, adding online and mixed delivery modes in recent years in pursuit of its mission to provide greater student access.

In the United States, CityU has historically attracted adult students who have been seeking to complete a degree program, acquire new skills and training, or develop an entirely new career path, usually while working full-time. CityU now serves a wider variety of populations. CityU’s international programs have expanded significantly. A coordinated strategy for international growth is based on identification of key partnerships in each country to ensure the acceptance, relevance, and quality of academic programs delivered abroad.

CityU today is one of the largest private, not-for-profit, postsecondary educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest. It occupies an important 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, and now brings similar opportunities to students around the world.

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 articulated 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 to be convenient to students;
- accessible: provide educational opportunities to anyone, anywhere;
- innovative: continually create new educational opportunities;
- relevant: what is taught today can be applied tomorrow;
- global: act locally and think globally.

City University of Seattle’s mission statement reflects the principle that learning is a lifelong process. Based upon this principle, CityU considers past educational performance relevant as only one dimension of a student’s current interests and desire to learn. Accordingly, to facilitate access to lifelong learning, CityU has an open admissions approach to its programs. CityU values flexibility, leading to an institutional emphasis on providing educational opportunities on evenings and weekends and in small classes offered at multiple, convenient locations. Courses are offered in class and online, and in a combination of both (mixed mode).

CityU values educational offerings that are relevant and global, with a focus on fields where employment follows directly, e.g., business and management, technology, education, and counseling. All the curricula are taught by highly qualified practitioners in their fields, bringing currency and relevance into the academic classroom. Faculty come from around the world, with global content integrated in every
program. Conversely, the opportunity exists for students to experience education internationally through mobility programs in any one of the locations where CityU offers programs. The common English language curricula taught worldwide give students the extraordinary capability to experience international culture while progressing toward graduation.

The mission, vision, and values of CityU provide the foundation for constructing its Strategic Plan (see Exhibits). In its plan, the university establishes goals and associated metrics to make progress toward its mission. CityU’s four strategic goals are to

1. excel in teaching and learning;
2. expand access to high-quality, relevant programs;
3. become a leading, globally connected university;
4. improve and sustain financial health.

The Strategic Plan and its goals are reviewed annually by the City University of Seattle Board of Governors, along with evidence of progress in each goal area. This provides a check on alignment with the mission and overall direction for the coming year.

The annual President’s Report documents progress in accomplishing CityU’s mission and goals, with an emphasis on recent accomplishments. This report is published annually and distributed widely to City University of Seattle alumni and constituents. The report is also available on the City University of Seattle website. At each of the Board of Governors quarterly meetings, the president reviews the performance for each of the CityU goals. In addition to the externally distributed annual President’s Report, an internal monthly “President’s Report” is distributed online via e-mail. This report also emphasizes progress toward CityU’s four strategic goals.

City University of Seattle’s mission is reflected in the public service activities that CityU provides. During the current economic downturn, the university has been regularly hosting events to assist displaced workers and provide professional development, networking, as well as a résumé workshop. In addition, lectures on topics ranging from data governance to business and finance fraud are offered on a regular basis to the public. For a list of recent speaker and event opportunities open to the public, please see http://alumni.cityu.edu/events/event_list.asp.

CityU is also an active member and sponsor of CityClub of Seattle activities. CityClub is a nonprofit organization with the following mission statement: “CityClub informs, connects and engages citizens to evaluate complex issues, make sound judgments and contribute to solutions that address issues vital to our region.” CityU was a sponsor of the CityClub forum in July 2009 on “Examining Our Investment in Early Education.”

CityU’s public service is not limited to speeches and sponsorships. The university’s Counseling and Career Center, located at the Bellevue site, is open to the public with fees starting as low as $5.00 per session, depending upon ability to pay. The center provides confidential support by supervised Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology interns. Similar counseling services are provided in community clinics in Canada, where Master of Counselling students complete internships.

The university also supports the community by encouraging employees to participate in the annual United Way fund drive and in the Puget Sound Blood Center blood drives. The university encourages employee participation in public service activities. (See Exhibits.)

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 of maintaining 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 result in the development of new programs and new locations of operation. These changes mean constant communication with the Commission. In 2008–09, CityU submitted eighteen substantive change requests in accordance with Policy A-2, Substantive Change.

City University of Seattle’s programs in management have been accredited by the International
Assembly for Collegiate Business Education. In the 2009–10 academic year, the university has begun transitioning its specialized accreditation for management programs to the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs, achieving candidacy status in late calendar 2009. Programs leading to teacher and administrator certification in the state of Washington are approved by the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). In 2008, all certification programs offered through the Gordon Albright School of Education were approved by PESB for the maximum term.

Programs offered by CityU in international locations also go through rigorous local, external review processes. In British Columbia, Canada, the Master of Counselling program and the Master of Education program were both approved to be offered in 2007 after review by the Degree Quality Assessment Board of the Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. In Alberta, Canada, the Master of Counselling degree was approved by the Campus Alberta Quality Council of the Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology. In Europe, all CityU programs are approved by the respective education ministries or other applicable regulatory authorities in the countries in which the programs are offered. (See details in the chapter on CityU’s international programs.) CityU’s oldest and largest European partnership is with the school it cofounded in Slovakia, the Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM). VSM successfully achieved its complex re-accreditation by the Slovak Ministry of Education in 2009.

City University of Seattle is approved by the China Ministry of Education to offer courses in partnership with the Beijing University of Technology (BJUT) and the CIBT School of Business and Technology in Beijing, China. The university is currently awaiting approval of its arrangement to offer the MBA in China with a new partner, the University of International Business and Economics (UIBE).

## PLANNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

City University of Seattle values inclusive planning that actively engages participation from its constituents in all the regions in which it operates. To ensure that it pursues its mission with effective and continuous long-term strategic and annual plans, CityU adheres to the following process:

- The Board of Governors establishes and approves any changes to the university’s mission, vision, and values.
- The president presents a long-term Strategic Plan consistent with the university’s mission, vision, and values to the board for its approval.
- The president provides the board with annual updates to the plan.
- The president and executive leadership team ensure that faculty, staff, students, and other constituencies in all the regions in which CityU operates are represented in the planning process.
- The president, his executive leadership team, and the university’s Strategic Planning Committee construct strategic goals, measures, and metrics that guide the implementation of the plan.
- The president and executive leadership team ensure that all units establish goals, measures, and metrics that align with the institution’s goals.
- The president and executive leadership team regularly evaluate the direction, results, and effectiveness of the plan, its implementation, and the planning process, and make changes accordingly.
- The president is responsible for communicating the university’s achievements, aligned with its goals, to the public.

In addition, the university hosts two major strategic planning sessions each academic year, one in the fall that focuses on the assessment of the current year’s performance, and one in the spring that focuses on looking ahead to plans and actions for the upcoming year. These sessions are jointly planned by the university’s Strategic Planning Committee with its Leadership Council, as further described in the section below on engagement in the planning process.
Planning Process

CityU maintains a multiple-year Strategic Plan with annual updates and department/unit plans. CityU uses the following procedures to develop and implement an effective Strategic Plan and to ensure engaged participation in planning from its constituencies.

At the beginning of the strategic planning process, the president engages university leadership and key constituencies from all the regions in which CityU operates in discussions that lead to the identification of core strategic goals in alignment with CityU’s mission, vision, and values.

The president and executive leadership team (including the university-wide Strategic Planning Committee) develop and assign measures and metrics to each goal, and determine key initiatives or performance drivers to be implemented in a given year. A metric is a standard measure to assess performance in a particular area. For each metric, actual results for the quarter are compared to the target for the quarter, to the same quarter last year, and to the average performance for that quarter for the last two or three years, depending on the data available. This gives a good sense of performance to projections and trends over time. Performance data on metrics are produced regularly and reviewed by the president with the university community at his quarterly State of the University address and at every Board of Governors’ meeting.

The university’s strategic goals, which use the Plan, Act, Assess, Revise (PAAR) model as described below, drive the annual planning and continuous improvement process.

**PLAN**

Each department or unit develops a plan with goals, measures, and metrics that align with the university goals, measures, and metrics. Plans are typically completed each spring quarter for the next academic/fiscal year.

Each department or unit develops its annual budget request to support achieving the goals set out in its plan. Budget requests are submitted by the end of winter quarter for the next academic/fiscal year.

Department heads are responsible for ensuring that individual employee (faculty and staff) goals align with their departmental goals and with university goals and that each individual employee has performance expectations that support goal achievement.

**ACT**

Departments carry out their plans through the fiscal year by identifying and implementing the specific action steps needed to meet plans and achieve goals.

**ASSESS**

Performance is assessed regularly, using the measures and metrics identified in the planning process. The Strategic Planning Committee serves as the venue for regular reviews of performance to goals.

**REVISE**

Based on the assessment of performance, department heads are charged with making revisions to their plans, which may include changes to departmental or unit goals, plans, action steps, and/or individual goals and performance measures. The President’s Executive Team may also recommend changes to university-wide initiatives, strategies, resource allocations, and/or action steps, based on the assessment of performance. These revisions are then captured in plans for the next annual planning cycle.

This strategic planning process is diagrammed in Figure 1.1 below. Note that one virtue of the PAAR process is that continuous improvement is integrated into the process. The entire process is guided by CityU’s mission, values, and vision. Figure 1.1 also serves as a visual road map for the phases of CityU’s strategic planning process. It provides staff and faculty a common understanding of how CityU plans and implements its work and provides the Board of Governors with oversight and approval of the process, plans, and budgets.

The university recently purchased Success Factors, a web-based software tool to systematically and electronically align all units to this PAAR process.
Engagement in Planning Process

Through the Strategic Planning Committee, semianual planning sessions, advisory groups, surveys, and/or other means, university leadership gathers input from faculty, staff, students, and alumni to incorporate into CityU’s planning process. Leadership ensures that participants from all the regions in which the university operates are engaged in the planning process. In the fall 2008 Employee Engagement Survey, 69 percent of the employees who responded agreed with CityU’s strategy and mission. (See CityU 2008 Employee Engagement Survey in Appendix A.)

**Strategic Planning Committee**

In order to fulfill the responsibility of creating, implementing, and evaluating an ongoing long-term Strategic Plan and annual departmental plans, the president convenes and chairs the university’s Strategic Planning Committee (SPC). The SPC is typically a committee of about fifteen members, university leaders, and department heads who are annually appointed by the president. The SPC serves as a venue for discussing overall strategy and direction and making recommendations to the President’s Executive Team for decisions consistent with the university’s policy on strategic planning.

The SPC both guides and participates in the annual planning process for the university. It provides monitoring and oversight of the university’s performance toward its strategic goals, and develops and monitors progress on key institutional strategic initiatives. It
holds regular plan reviews at which departments and units present their key performance indicators and discuss any necessary revisions to their annual plans.

As part of the strategic planning cycle, the SPC holds semiannual planning sessions each fall and spring. These sessions engage wider participation from university faculty and staff in planning, implementation, and performance assessment. The fall session provides an updated environmental scan and focuses on assessments and revisions related to the plans. The spring session develops new plans and actions consistent with the updated Strategic Plan and the previous fall’s assessments and suggested revisions.

The Director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as the primary liaison between the SPC and the President’s Office, and organizes the semiannual planning sessions held in the fall and spring of each academic year. The president’s executive assistant provides staff support for this committee.

**ENGAGING CONSTITUENTS VIA SURVEYS**

CityU engages its entire student body in the opportunity to share its perceptions of the quality of education and services the university provides in annual Student Satisfaction surveys. Survey questions reflect the university goals and learning outcomes, and solicit student views on whether these goals are being met. These surveys are administered via web-based tools to ensure students worldwide have access. Typically, the Student Satisfaction Survey is administered in the fall or winter terms. Data reports and analysis are provided to university leadership within a few weeks of collecting the responses. The most recent student surveys were completed in winter of academic year 2007–08 and fall of academic year 2008–09, and the next one is scheduled for winter of academic year 2009–10.

Figure 1.2 shows the comparison of responses on overall satisfaction items on surveys conducted over the last two years. With 976 responses in the academic year 2007–08 survey and 1,232 responses to the academic year 2008–09 survey, the increase in overall satisfaction and willingness to recommend CityU is moderately significant.

Student survey data were used to identify key areas of improvement between 2007–08 and 2008–09. One of these areas was technology support, specifically the need for a 24/7 help function to serve CityU.
students and faculty worldwide. Such a service was implemented in fall 2008–09, and increased satisfaction with information technology support was indeed demonstrated in the student survey that year. The Student Satisfaction Survey is also used to collect input on topics related to planning, such as the incorporation of items related to student mobility in 2007–08 and 2008–09. These responses were used by the International Division and International Student Advising to help hone the approach to designing and supporting the mobility of CityU students among international locations.

A full-scale alumni survey was conducted in spring of academic year 2007–08; prior to that, a targeted survey to alumni as part of the groundwork for a comprehensive development plan was conducted in fall of academic year 2006–07. The full-scale survey mirrors many items from the student survey, including gathering perceptions on the overall quality, effectiveness, and reputation of the university, and the impact of a CityU education on the alumni’s professional trajectory. Figure 1.3 shows the overall satisfaction items from the most recent alumni survey.

Figure 1.4 shows the responses from alumni describing the impact of their CityU education on their professional progression. As a university primarily focused on providing education that is directly relevant to professional advancement, alumni perception of this element is a critical indicator. Virtually three out of every four alumni who responded to the survey indicated their CityU education did indeed contribute to their professional advancement, while the relatively high number of neutral responses indicates a potential area for improvement.

Employee engagement is also an important measure of an organization’s overall vitality. CityU transitioned from an in-house employee satisfaction survey last administered in fall 2006 to a nationally benchmarked Employee Engagement Survey completed in December 2008. The university’s staff and Administrative Faculty participated in this survey; the response rate was 70 percent (187 employees). As part of the significant commitment to following through on the results of the Employee Engagement Survey, follow-up focus groups were held with 45 percent of employees participating; and web-based action planning tools were used by managers to define and track specific actions to be completed. The next Employee Engagement Survey will be conducted in 2010.

A Teaching Faculty survey is in the design phase and will be administered in winter 2009–10. It will combine items on satisfaction with items to assist in

---

**Figure 1.3: Spring 2007–08 Alumni Survey: Overall Satisfaction**

*Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with your experience at CityU?*

816 responses

- **82.7%** Very satisfied plus somewhat satisfied
- **8.1%** Neutral
- **9.2%** Very dissatisfied plus somewhat dissatisfied
determining the Teaching Faculty’s perceptions of how well CityU is delivering its promise to provide a high-quality, relevant lifelong education to its students.

**Evaluating Achievement of Goals: Measuring Institutional Effectiveness**

CityU’s institutional effectiveness framework is constructed by answering these questions:

- What is CityU’s purpose?
- How well is the university fulfilling its purpose?

The answer to the first question is straightforward: CityU’s purpose is expressed in its mission to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn. To answer the second question, CityU collects and analyzes a body of evidence that demonstrates how well it fulfills its mission. The evidence includes results of regular surveys of students, alumni, employees, and faculty; direct evidence of student learning (discussed in detail in Standard Two); student credit hours earned in each region; and measures of financial health, among others, as detailed below.

To measure progress toward achieving CityU’s strategic goals, specific performance indicators are determined for each institutional goal. Performance metrics quantify progress toward achieving quarterly and annual targets. A dashboard visually displays a performance metric by quarter and compares it to the target, to the previous year’s performance, and to the previous two years’ average performance. A dashboard is color-coded to draw attention to performance that is lower than expected. Metrics indicate progress toward targets (goals). Milestones show planned steps by quarter that will contribute to the achievement of a metric’s target. The indicators for the academic year 2009–2010 are specified below.

**GOAL 1: EXCEL IN TEACHING AND LEARNING BY ACHIEVING TARGETS FOR**

- Learning outcomes (on the Learning Outcomes Assessment Index)
- Excellence in teaching
  - 45–60 percent of class sections rated by students at or above 4.5 on a 5.0 scale (specific goals set by each school and division)
  - 100 percent of new faculty completing orientation
- Highly effective faculty
- Awards and graduation rates

![Figure 1.4: Spring 2007–08 Alumni Survey: Contribution to Professional Advancement](image-url)
GOAL 2: EXPAND ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, RELEVANT PROGRAMS
BY ACHIEVING TARGETS FOR
• Student credit hours (153,304 worldwide)
• New student credit hours (18,644 in the United States and Canada)
• Student credit hours in new programs (2,746 in four programs in first or second year of launch)
• Student retention

GOAL 3: BECOME A LEADING, GLOBALLY CONNECTED UNIVERSITY
BY ACHIEVING TARGETS FOR
• Student credit hours earned outside the United States (62,001)
• Student credit hours earned in new international partnerships
• International students in the United States (345 unduplicated head count)

GOAL 4: IMPROVE AND SUSTAIN FINANCIAL HEALTH BY
ACHIEVING TARGETS FOR
• Percent net tuition increase (average 7 percent)
• Contribution to margin (4 percent of gross revenue)
• Department of Education ratio (1.5) — annual measure
• Average class size (13)
• Financial contributions
• Cost per credit hour

Metrics used to measure performance are structured to “cascade” through the organization, ensuring alignment of individual department goals with institutional goals. Sample dashboards are included in Appendix D.

Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Planning Process

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is charged with providing the means for the president and executive team to regularly evaluate the effectiveness of CityU’s planning process. This is done through the measurement of goal achievement and also through regular input from planning process constituents.

For example, the Employee Engagement Survey administered in December 2008 revealed that the vast majority of employees believed in CityU’s mission, but only 46 percent of survey participants indicated a favorable response to the item “this organization has a clear sense of direction.” In follow-up feedback sessions, employees indicated a perceived inadequate involvement and communication by managers related to CityU’s goals and strategies.

The President’s Executive Team used this opportunity to increase its efforts to engage the faculty and staff in understanding, supporting, and implementing the university’s plan. Follow-up meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee focused on the importance of members communicating back to their units about the decisions under consideration, and adding more university-wide opportunities for all employees to engage in discussions about CityU’s strategy and goals, including open forums and town hall sessions, over the current year. The adoption of Success Factors as the annual PAAR planning process will ensure departmental participation in and alignment with CityU’s strategies and goals.

Resources, Integration, and Assessment of Institutional Evaluation and Planning

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) was created in 2007 to coordinate strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts for the university. The director reports to the president, and is responsible for providing leadership and direction in developing and maintaining a comprehensive and effective assessment and institutional research program. The office also supports strategic planning activities throughout the organization. It works to integrate assessment processes within all units, programs, and services. OIE supports the academic planning and assessment
activities through coordination with Academic Affairs on learning outcomes assessment and program review; coordinates key institutional-level surveys as well as environmental scanning related to program development; coordinates and cooperates with accreditation liaison, providing data and analysis for accreditation reports and self-studies as well as for regulatory approval processes.

OIE works with the Finance Office to coordinate and integrate the annual planning and budgeting process, which begins in the winter, following the board’s adoption of the updated Strategic Plan. Instructions are sent to department heads and budget owners in mid-winter quarter, and drafts of plans and budgets are reviewed by the executive team. Iterations continue until a balanced budget is constructed and presented to the Board of Governors at its spring quarter meeting. Each fall the budget adopted in spring is reviewed and revised if necessary based on the actual fall enrollment.

In collaboration with other departments as needed, OIE provides quarterly reports on the key institutional performance measures associated with each goal. For goal one, the director tracks progress on the Learning Outcomes Assessment Index and provides an annual update; dashboards showing performance on End-of-Course Evaluations and New Faculty Orientation are produced quarterly. For goal two, OIE works with Student Services to produce quarterly dashboards showing performance related to student credit hours. For goal three, OIE assists the Finance Office and the International Division in producing quarterly dashboards showing performance in each country and partnership. For goal four, the Finance Office takes the lead in producing dashboards showing performance in revenues and margin (quarterly), and tracking financial contributions and the DOE ratio. Alumni Relations and Development produces the Alumni Engagement Index. OIE produces quarterly average-class-size dashboards.

The office also coordinates CityU’s contractual relationship with Hanover Research Council, which provides custom research and reports in support of institutional goals and initiatives. Since the relationship began in 2007, Hanover has provided CityU with over thirty-four custom research reports including market scans to inform program development, analyses of End-of-Course-Evaluation data, and identification of key performance and quality indicators. In addition, the university has access to Hanover’s library of hundreds of reports to its membership. In 2009–10, the university will take advantage of Hanover’s survey research support to host its annual Student Satisfaction Survey, providing greater analytic capacity and quicker turnaround time for results. (See Exhibits for examples of Hanover Research Council reports.)

Communicating Evidence of Institutional Effectiveness

Reports on institutional performance are shared with faculty and staff at the semiannual planning meetings, and at quarterly State of the University presentations led by the president. An internal web-based document storage system allows department heads to access reports at any time. Internally, the monthly “President’s Report” is distributed via e-mail to all faculty and staff along with a more detailed update for the Board of Governors. This provides information about progress in pursuit of the university’s four institutional goals. Annually, the President’s Office produces the President’s Report, which captures achievements of the year and is sent to the board, faculty, staff, alumni, business partners, community leaders, and friends of the university.

CONCLUSION

Strengths — Improving Effectiveness and Achievement of Institutional Goals

Since 2006, CityU has had a clear alignment of its mission, vision, values, and goals. The four strategic
goals have stayed essentially the same, and the university has been engaged in developing and using the appropriate measures for each that will best inform decision making. The establishment of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in 2007 allowed CityU to be more proactive in engaging its faculty and staff in the activities associated with planning and assessment.

In relation to goal one — to promote excellence in learning and teaching — the university has implemented a robust student learning outcomes assessment process. This process is described fully in Standard Two. As of the end of the 2008–2009 academic year, all degree programs had been through either a major program review or presented annual reports on student learning outcomes. The quality of evidence being gathered in each program continues to increase, and the use of that evidence to make program improvements is becoming more systematic. The recent adoption of a university-wide e-portfolio and assessment tool (Chalk and Wire) will convert the current manual system for gathering and analyzing evidence of student learning and enhance the university’s ability to conduct meta-analysis of learning.

The university also implemented a multi-year Faculty Initiative to improve the quality of instruction. A policy requiring participation in New Faculty Orientation by the end of the second quarter of teaching was implemented; compliance is an institutional dashboard measure. The percent of instructors earning End-of-Course-Evaluation scores above 4.5 is the second institutional dashboard measure related to faculty quality. The data from the first three quarters indicate some progress in improving instruction, yet overall participation rates by students remain low enough to keep analysis tentative. The faculty-profile-gathering project was launched in winter 2009. Nearly 80 percent of the active Teaching Faculty in the United States and Canada had updated their information as of October 2009, including information on scholarly activities. Significant progress was made with participation of Human Resources in recruiting qualified new faculty, where metrics show the time from job opening to hire has been reduced to about nine working days. Work to create a measure of highly effective faculty is under development, as is the role of academic supervisors in supporting and evaluating faculty development.

In relation to goal two — expanding access — CityU has implemented a streamlined program-development process that emphasizes learning outcomes while allowing the university to launch new programs in a highly responsive way. New program initiatives for 2009–2010 include:

- Early Childhood Education and secondary math/science offerings
- Master of Science in Information Security, new emphasis areas in the Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, and an MBA emphasis and graduate certificate in Sustainable Business

Relationships with community colleges have improved dramatically. Nearly all the community and technical colleges in Washington State agreed to participate in CityU’s Scholarships for Tomorrow’s Careers program by awarding scholarships to CityU undergraduate programs to their outstanding students. Classes are held on several college campuses including Centralia and Peninsula colleges.

In relation to goal three — becoming a leading, globally connected university — improved planning processes have led to better collaboration between the International Division and Academic Affairs to support new program offerings outside the United States. In addition, capacity was expanded to include international data in the regular quarterly reports and dashboards to provide better information for decision making. Academic oversight and coordination was expanded at two of the university’s international locations.

In relation to goal four — improving and sustaining financial health — the university is making progress in linking its planning and budgeting cycles to ensure it provides appropriate resources for its priority initiatives and regular operations. The Finance Office has significantly improved the timeliness of budget reports, allowing budget managers to adjust expenses to meet year-end targets. Efforts to expand
grant support have increased with a new contract with Hanover Research Council on grant writing. CityU secured a major grant of nearly $100,000 to support diversity and student mentoring in fall 2009. Perhaps most significantly, the university has diligently and successfully developed a strategy to build a financial reserve to provide for the long-term sustainability of the university.

Challenges — Engagement, Communication, and Capacity

Engaging stakeholders in planning continues to be a challenge for CityU. Its nontraditional and distributed nature means that faculty, staff, and students are spread across multiple locations in eleven countries. The number of students taking programs and courses online is growing. The typical adult student does not engage in the life of the university in the same way as a younger student might. Faculty and staff who are in locations separate from the main campus find their local priorities demand significant amounts of time and energy, making it difficult to participate in planning and evaluation activities done in a centralized way. The results of the 2008 Employee Engagement Survey show that the university needs to make more of an effort to engage employees in the planning and assessment process.

Communications regarding strategy, goal achievement, and adjustments to plans are challenging for similar reasons. Much progress has been made, including holding quarterly State of the University events during which the president and executive team share the status of goal achievement, but it is difficult to reach everyone in an organization where employees work across time zones in the United States, Europe, and Asia-Pacific. The university has joined the Washington K–12 Network to expand its electronic outreach and is actively exploring technologies that facilitate interactive video conferencing, beyond the current use of tools such as Skype, Live Meeting, and other web-meeting options.

As an institution funded almost entirely by tuition revenues, investing in resources to improve planning and effectiveness is also a challenge. Much reporting still requires manual intervention, taking significant staff time. Recent investments in upgrading core data systems have led to tremendous improvement in these areas, but more work needs to be done.
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Standard Two

Educational Program & Its Effectiveness
City University of Seattle is, first and foremost, a teaching institution. Its most important measures of the effectiveness of its academic programs are the learning outcomes achieved by its students. Through its increasing focus on collecting, analyzing, and applying evidence of student learning to the improvement of academic programs, CityU has made significant progress in assuring the quality of learning and teaching for all its students. This chapter starts with an overview of CityU’s schools and programs (with detailed program descriptions provided in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices) and provides a substantive review of progress in student learning outcomes assessment. It concludes with a discussion of the university’s academic policies.

SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS

CityU organizes its academic programs into the School of Management, the Albright School of Education, and the Division of Arts and Sciences. Each is presented here with an overview and a discussion of school and division organizational structure, policies, and practices. Summaries of each academic program are included in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

CityU’s current accreditation covers its degree programs at the associate’s, bachelor’s, and master’s levels. CityU is revising its proposal to NWCCU to advance to candidacy at the doctoral-granting level via the addition of an interdisciplinary doctorate in organizational leadership. Such a program would be a natural extension of CityU’s graduate offerings, and would provide an excellent opportunity to serve its over forty thousand alumni worldwide by enhancing their ability to advance in their professions.

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

The School of Management offers undergraduate and graduate degrees and certificates in business and technology. In all of its programs, the structure of the courses and the delivery of the content are based on the university’s Academic Model, the primary sections of which guide the use of practitioner-faculty to deliver instruction in an applied model that is highly relevant to a student’s workplace or goals. All programs and courses have been developed with the assistance of industry advisory committees, which are made up of professionals in the program that they are advising. This helps ensure a consistent and relevant link between all programs and the needs of employers.

The undergraduate programs in the United States are typically degree completion programs. Undergraduate students transfer in their lower-division credits, which usually include their General Education requirements. The programs they take at CityU are intended to allow them to complete their upper-division credits that make up their specialty. The five-credit courses in these programs are offered online or as a hybrid class.

Students in the graduate programs usually complete their programs entirely at CityU; it is less likely for them to transfer credits from another university, although, as discussed earlier, transfer credits are allowed. Programs are offered fully in class, fully online, or in a programmatic hybrid arrangement where students will meet in class for some number of weeks that alternate with weeks in which the students complete their studies online.

The School of Management offers all of its programs in the United States and a selected number of programs at international locations in Europe (Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, the Czech Republic, and Switzerland), China, Australia, and Mexico.

School of Management Academic Programs

The School of Management has eleven degree programs, some with multiple emphasis areas or majors. Many of these emphasis areas have been used to create undergraduate and graduate certificates. A brief list of these programs is provided in this chapter, with
a much more detailed description of each program included in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS
- Bachelor of Arts in Management
- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with emphases in:
  - General Management
  - Human Resource Management
  - Information Systems Management
  - International Management
  - Marketing
  - Project Management
- Bachelor of Science in Accounting
- Bachelor of Science in Marketing
- Bachelor of Science in Information Systems with emphases in:
  - Programming
  - Web 2.0 Development
  - Networking
  - Information Security
  - Systems Development and Management

UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATES
- Accounting
- Marketing
- Project Management

GRADUATE PROGRAMS
- Master of Business Administration with emphases in:
  - Accounting
  - Change Leadership
  - Finance
  - Global Management
  - Human Resources Management
  - Project Management
  - Sustainable Business
  - Technology Management
  - Practicum — Students take two electives and use two courses for a practicum project
- International MBA in Global Leadership
- Master of Science in Project Management
- Master of Science in Technology Management
- Master of Science in Information Security
- Master of Arts in Leadership
- Master of Science in Computer Systems

GRADUATE CERTIFICATES
- Accounting
- Change Leadership
- Finance
- Marketing
- Project Management
- Sustainable Business
- Technology Management

School of Management Staffing

The School of Management is staffed with full-time (or full-time equivalent, FTE) Administrative Faculty and a cadre of part-time Teaching Faculty. The school has thirteen Administrative Faculty: two are subject area managers, seven are faculty/program directors, two are faculty/program coordinators with other specialized duties, one is the director of English Language programs, and one directs the university's Management Institute (see Figure 2.1). A definition of each of the positions in the School of Management includes:

- Faculty/program director — The faculty/program director, who has been identified as a subject matter expert in a particular field, is in charge of one or more programs. The duties of the program director include responsibility for curriculum development, instructor oversight, course delivery, and instructional quality. A program director will work with a cadre of Teaching Faculty, whom he/she has selected to design/revise a program, create the program outcomes, design the courses and outcomes, and determine the best delivery mode. Each quarter, once the schedule of courses to be offered has been determined, the program director will nominate the most qualified faculty members to teach each of the courses within his/her program and then will oversee the performance of these faculty
members to ensure that students are meeting outcomes through quality instruction. At the end of the term, the program director will evaluate various metrics including End-of-Course Evaluations to determine if any changes need to be made to the selected faculty or program delivery options. The program director is required to teach a number of classes each year to ensure that he/she maintains firsthand knowledge of the students’ progress and needs.

- **Faculty/program coordinator** — While not directing an entire program, the faculty/program coordinator manages a set of courses that are associated with a discipline that he/she is an expert in either through academic preparation, professional experience, or both. The program coordinator is responsible for hiring qualified faculty, overseeing their performance, and taking appropriate action to correct any deficiencies. From a course management perspective, they fulfill the same role as the program directors; they just don’t manage an entire program. The program coordinator is also responsible for designing and updating courses within his/her field of expertise. The two program coordinators in the School of Management are assigned a limited number of courses because they also manage other areas, such as online instruction or community college partnerships. As a result, each program coordinator manages a much smaller number of Teaching Faculty and courses than do program directors.

- **Subject area managers** — Subject area managers supervise the curriculum and instruction for a set of courses that are associated with their area of expertise. The number of courses that they manage is relatively small compared to full-time program coordinators.

- **Director of English Language programs** — Due to the large number of international students who attend the School of Management’s programs, both in the United States and abroad, CityU has a full-time director of English Language programs who, as in the case of the program directors and coordinators, works with a cadre of ESL instructors to deliver instruction in two primary areas: ESL and the Assisted MBA. The director develops and manages a set of courses for both programs that prepare students to take regular CityU courses in English. The ESL faculty manage ESL courses. The other group of faculty, managed by the director of the English Language program, is the Assisted MBA faculty who provide language assistance to graduate-level international students who have come very close to demonstrating sufficient English proficiency but still need some assistance. These faculty teach in association with regular MBA faculty to ensure that international students are able to successfully complete the courses.

- **Director, Management Institute** — The Management Institute is the School of Management’s continuing education program. It is in its early stages and is being organized and built by a director who has completed some course proposals and a business plan for the Institute. It is expected that several noncredit courses will be offered through the Management Institute as it grows over the next few years.

- **Teaching Faculty** — Currently, the School of Management employs over two hundred Teaching Faculty, who teach courses in all of its programs and certificates. Some teach in the Management Institute as well. Teaching Faculty are practicing industry professionals who teach courses related to the area of their professional expertise. These faculty are selected by program directors, program coordinators, or subject area managers who make the determination that an individual’s academic preparation, professional background, and instructional ability are a good fit for the needs of the courses he/she will be teaching. The minimum academic requirement for a member of the Teaching Faculty member is a master’s degree, although many have completed doctorates or are in the process of doing so. Teaching Faculty must either be practicing professionals or must have accumulated substantial industry experience that remains relevant to current industry needs.

### Program and Course Delivery

All courses in the School of Management can be delivered using some of the delivery modes described below:
• **In class** — These courses are offered only in classroom format. Since all courses utilize an online course shell, each in-class course uses some online instructional support. In the United States, in-class format is reserved for some graduate programs. In Europe, in-class format is used for both undergraduate and graduate programs with the undergraduate courses being split into two weekly sessions of 2.5 hours each.

• **Online** — These courses are offered entirely online through the university’s Blackboard learning management system. Some European courses utilize a different learning management system, but plans are being formulated to transition all courses to Blackboard by summer 2010. These courses follow the same course guides and syllabi as in-class courses, however, they utilize substantial discussion-board work and learning activities to provide the same level of instruction as in-class courses. Online courses are very popular in the United States but much less so in the international locations.

• **Mixed mode** — These courses utilize both in-class time and online time. The School of Management currently employs three hybrid models. The “class” model splits each weekly class session into in-class and online contact time. The “course” model mixes weeks

Figure 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th># of Faculty Supervised</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony, Pete</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>MA Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary, Tom</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condit, Stephen</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton, Nina</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foe, Keith</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Larry</td>
<td>MPA, MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HR Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden, Corrine</td>
<td>M.Ed., MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>BS Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirstein, Kurt</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingg, Jodey</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luong, Linh</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BS Information Systems, BS Computer Systems, MS Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milhauser, Kathy</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>MS Technology Management, MS Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrill, Dan</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>BS Information Systems, BS Computer Systems, MS Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundy, Susan</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BS Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remund, Mariella</td>
<td>Doc.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Associate Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MBA, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxin, Charles</td>
<td>MPA, MCP</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaher, Lana</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>BELLEVUE</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total SOM Faculty Count** 230
with full class sessions with weeks of instruction conducted entirely online. The “program” model provides a combination of courses that are fully in class, fully online, and mixed mode. Courses are selected for each delivery option based on several factors; quantitative courses are run in class, for example, while a student can complete the rest of the courses online.

Ensuring Instructional Quality in the School of Management

Ensuring quality in the School of Management begins, first, with the development of quality, relevant courses. A key part of ensuring quality is the oversight of instructional delivery. The School of Management has methods of ensuring quality in all of its courses, which differ slightly depending on the delivery mode.

In class — Quality in an in-class course is ensured through direct observation of faculty performance. In addition to the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation program that has been recently implemented, School of Management instructors are evaluated on a regular basis or when there is reason to suspect that a problem might have arisen. Such observations may or may not be announced and usually involve a program director, coordinator, or subject area manager. A standard evaluation form is used to document observed instructor behavior.

Online — Various tools are built into the Blackboard system to allow program directors, coordinators, and subject area managers to evaluate the performance of online instructors. The statistics module allows a high-level view of daily utilization of the various parts of the Blackboard shell. This, however, only allows a quantitative view of the instructor's performance. The qualitative assessment is conducted through a direct evaluation of the Blackboard shell on a regular basis to ensure quality in all online courses. As instructors evaluate online courses, they enter their findings into an online survey tool in the university's SharePoint system, which allows the School of Management to track and record the state of every evaluated online course throughout a given term.

These data can be exported and summarized to give an overall evaluation of all online courses, and the comments from this survey are exportable to other applications, allowing a very detailed analysis of specific parts of an online course, or a group of online or hybrid courses.

Mixed mode — Quality in mixed mode is assured through the combination of strategies for in-class and online formats, with both aspects of the course monitored for effectiveness.

Every term, faculty administer standardized End-of-Course Evaluations. All End-of-Course-Evaluation scores are examined for all School of Management faculty who have taught that term. For faculty performance, the benchmark is 4.0 on a 1–5 scale. Any instructor who fails to score 4.0 or higher needs observation, coaching, remediation, or discontinuation.

There is also a section on the End-of-Course Evaluation that allows the student to evaluate the course. This information can be used to determine if materials were a good match, if the pace of the course was appropriate, and other important attributes that would contribute to course quality.

CityU has also recently developed and piloted a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process, through which faculty teaching, practice, and scholarly preference is cumulatively evaluated. Full implementation of this program is scheduled to occur by 2010 in all locations.

Lastly, and most importantly, the School of Management ensures instructional quality through periodic program evaluations that include assessment of student learning outcomes.

Curricular Policies in the School of Management

The School of Management Curriculum Council (SCC) reviews the documents for each new course or each course change before the documents are made available to students and Teaching Faculty. When a program director completes a new course or a course revision, he/she submits the new documents, along
with a Curriculum Change Request, to this committee, which is responsible for assessing the documents for quality, accuracy, and completeness. All courses must meet standards before they can be accepted into the system.

Once the SCC has approved a document, it is submitted to the university’s processes to list the course on the website and in the City University of Seattle Catalog. The SCC is actually a subcommittee of the Curriculum Quality Committee (CQC). The chair of each School Curriculum Council is a permanent member of the CQC. All of the committees are staffed with full-time faculty/program directors or coordinators. The assignment of committee members is made at the start of the academic year.

**PROGRAM CREATION PROCESS**

All programs in the School of Management were created or revised using a centralized, prescribed, student-focused process that followed a specific set of steps. All new programs are created using the following process:

1. A preliminary proposal is drafted, which includes a description of the program and high-level financial predictions. This proposal is presented to the President’s Executive Team for initial approval. If approved, the program director is granted authority to begin work on a formal proposal and, when completed, will take this proposal through the next levels of approval.

2. As a first step to drafting the formal proposal, the program director assembles an industry advisory committee that advises on the development of the program so that he/she can ensure its relevance to the needs of hiring managers, etc. That committee is assembled at the beginning of the program draft process and asked questions such as “What specific skills will graduates of this program need to be prepared for jobs in your industry?” This list of skills becomes the foundation upon which the program outcomes will be based. Additional interviews may be conducted to gather additional information about the skills the program needs to provide.

3. Once the initial interviews are completed, the program director forms a Program Design Team. This may have been done before the industry advisory committee was convened. This Program Design Team consists of faculty, subject matter experts, library personnel, and the program director. The first goal of this team is to draft a set of program outcomes. These outcomes are demonstrable, applied skills that a student should be able to do upon completing the program. For each program outcome that is designed, the following questions will need to be answered:
   a. What is the outcome?
   b. How will it be demonstrated in the program?
   c. What assessment(s) will provide evidence that the student has achieved this outcome?
   d. How does this outcome tie back to one or more of the six City University Learning Goals that are to be a part of all CityU programs?
   e. What foundational knowledge must be acquired before the student will be ready and able to demonstrate this particular outcome?

Each program in the School of Management will have one or more major capstone assessment(s) that will be used to measure evidence that students have achieved all of the program outcomes. This capstone assessment will be used as a summative assessment for student progress and, also, as a tool to ensure that the program is achieving its goals.

4. The draft of program outcomes usually yields eight to twelve program-level outcomes. These are then broken down into a bit more detail to generate a list of courses that can be used to present and reinforce the knowledge needed to achieve all of the program outcomes. Once this is done, the focus shifts to the work that will be needed to generate all of the courses that make up the program.

5. At this stage of the development process, the program director should have enough information to draft his/her proposal and take it through the approval processes. The proposal should contain the program outcomes, the list of courses, and the
major activities of the program. The approvals that need to be cleared typically include:

a. Curriculum Quality Committee decides if the curriculum in the proposal is of sufficient quality to meet the requirements of the university. This committee has a checklist of items used in making this determination.

b. Academic Affairs Council assesses the program for its quality, fit within the mission of the university, and other considerations.

c. The provost reviews the content of the proposal and the process followed and if he concurs that the program should be approved, presents it to the President’s Executive Team for a final substantive review.

d. The President’s Executive Team reviews the program and makes its recommendation to the president. The president makes the overall decision if the program should be presented to the Board of Governors.

e. The university’s Board of Governors, on advice of its own Academic Affairs Council, assesses program for quality, fit, sustainability, and economic contribution to the university, and finally determines if this program is to be approved as part of the overall curriculum of the university.

f. The program is thereafter submitted to the accrediting agency, which determines if it could be included within the accreditation of the institution.

Once these levels have been completed, the courses can then be developed.

6. For each course, a Course Design Team will be formed to create the following items:

a. Course outcomes — What should the student be able to demonstrate upon completion of this course?

b. Assessment — What tools/process/products will the student use to demonstrate that outcome?

c. Tie to program outcomes — Which of the program outcomes does each of the course outcomes support?

d. Tie to CityU Learning Goals — Which of the CityU Learning Goals does each of the course outcomes support?

e. What foundational knowledge must the student acquire to be ready and able to achieve the course outcomes?

7. When the course outcomes are determined and each of the questions above are answered, the Course Design Team will then be ready to draft the Course Guide, Instructor Guide, Schedule, and Syllabus which must then be submitted to the School of Management Curriculum Council for approval before the course can be offered. Once Curriculum Council approval is granted, the course materials can be made available to both faculty and students (on a limited basis).

8. Before a final decision is made to actually launch the program, a cross-functional team, headed by the provost, is convened to reassess the market, determine the likelihood of enrollment targets, and assess the best marketing strategies to use to ensure success of the program within a three-year time frame. Employer partnerships are explored to ensure that job prospects for graduates are real and likely to hold.

**Program Review Process**

Existing programs in the School of Management are reviewed and revised on a regular basis. The process is similar to, and incorporates many parts of, the new program design process. The process for program review/revision is:

1. A sample of program capstones are gathered and sent to independent reviewers external to the university who review them against a rubric that is made up of the list of program outcomes. A determination will be made regarding the extent to which a single capstone, as well as the aggregate of capstones, demonstrates proficiency on each of the program outcomes. This determination is usually based on the percentage of evaluated capstones that showed sufficient level of achievement. Each outcome is likely to have a different percentage of
students who have demonstrated sufficient mastery of that outcome.

2. Based on that feedback, the program leadership reexamines the program content and asks itself two primary questions:
   a. Is/are the capstone tool(s) providing the right kind of evidence to assess the progress of students in the program?
   b. Assuming that the answer to the first question is yes, what needs to be done to the program and its courses to improve the percentage of students who are demonstrating proficiency on each of the outcomes?

3. The second question will usually yield a set of recommendations for program revisions. If necessary, an industry advisory committee will be convened to provide further recommendations about program revisions. At this point, the review of the program concludes and the next step will be the program revision.

4. Program outcomes are revised to ensure that the program remains current and relevant.

5. Courses are revised or created to support the new program outcomes.

6. A new series of capstones are created to measure the students’ and program’s progress and quality.

7. The new program must be approved by the Curriculum Quality Committee and then by the Academic Affairs Council.

8. Each new course must be approved by the School of Management Curriculum Council before it can be made available to faculty and students.

Outcomes Assessment

Apart from the program review/revision process, each program in the School of Management is assessed annually to ensure that it is producing evidence to demonstrate that student learning outcomes are being met. This is done by submitting a report to the university’s Academic Assessment Committee that shows:

1. what evidence of student learning has been collected during the past year;

2. how that evidence was assessed and qualified against student learning outcomes;

3. the extent to which the evidence gathered confirms the achievement of learning outcomes;

4. for any deficiencies, the appropriate adjustments that need to be made to the program to ensure that the assessments that students are producing match the outcomes.

The assessment process usually involves the collection of a representative sample of capstone projects that are sent to a set of reviewers who are not associated with the program. The reviewers are given a rubric against which they are to assess each capstone. When all capstones have been assessed, the data are aggregated to determine the percentage of the sample that achieved an acceptable rating on each of the rubric descriptors, which are usually a combination of the program outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals. A descriptor that greater than 20 percent of students failed to meet is considered problematic and would require appropriate remediation, such as adjustments to content, materials, delivery, or the addition of a new course or two to ensure that the content is included.

Continuing Education

Over the past few years, continuing education in the School of Management has not been an area of focus, however, this is changing with the revival of the Management Institute. In its first year, the Management Institute has had a slow start and has a limited number of course offerings in management and financial planning. The goal is to develop a list of programs that can be offered through this institute that will focus primarily on management, leadership, financial planning, and technology. Other vocational training options are under consideration.

The Management Institute is currently managed by a full-time program coordinator who identifies opportunities, develops courses (or works with other subject matter experts to develop courses), and then oversees the delivery of these courses, which are often
taught by members of the School of Management’s Teaching Faculty.

**Analysis, Synthesis, and a Look Ahead**

Most of the focus of the School of Management in recent years has been in the area of quality improvement and outcomes assessment. Of particular note:

1. Old programs that lacked relevance are being revised or replaced by new programs that have been designed with the use of industry advisory committees and subject matter experts to ensure that the content is relevant and important for the students.

2. New Teaching Faculty quality and assessment processes have been implemented and are in place. All new faculty go through New Faculty Orientation, are informally assessed on a regular basis, and are formally assessed at least once every four years through the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process. Additionally, the End-of-Course Evaluations submitted by students are used as a gauge for faculty quality that alert program directors and coordinators where there might be a problem.

3. New Teaching Faculty have been hired with experience of direct relevance to the majority of our courses. In particular, virtually all the technology faculty are new and build a very strong cadre of individuals with direct industry experience.

4. An entirely new student-focused, outcomes-oriented curriculum development process has been adopted university-wide. All programs and courses in the School of Management have been converted to this process.

5. All programs in the School of Management have been reviewed and revised in the past two years. Those that did not undergo revision are in the process of being retired but are still being assessed to ensure that they meet quality standards.

6. Much stronger ties have been established between the School of Management in Bellevue, WA, and the international locations that are offering School of Management programs. Faculty from the School of Management travel to international sites, mostly in Europe, to assess programs, ensure proper implementation of new programs, and ensure compliance with all City University policies.

Future direction in the School of Management includes a focus on new initiatives to improve quality and expand programs. These initiatives include:

1. Expanded monitoring and tracking of online course quality — Progress has been made in the past few years with reports, statistics, and a formalized process by which online courses are monitored and the results are recorded in the university’s SharePoint system. Yet, a more formalized and regular process still needs to be implemented and enforced.

2. Improved response rates on the End-of-Course Evaluations — Currently, this runs anywhere from 25 percent to 40 percent for any given term. An improved process for delivering evaluations to students is being developed.

3. Improvement in class sizes — The School of Management has made adjustments in the way that it caps the number of students in online classes and this has had a positive impact on the average number of students per class. In the past, courses were divided into multiple sections with a relatively low number of students and this has a negative impact on the types of interactions, team activities, etc., that can be conducted in a class. Improvements were seen in 2009 and further improvements are anticipated.

4. Focus on responsible management education — The School of Management has adjusted its mission to focus more on sustainability and responsible management education. It has recently incorporated the UN’s Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME). This will inspire a gradual shift in all of its programs to incorporate content that makes all students aware of issues around sustainable business, environmental responsibility, social justice, and global citizenship.

5. Better empowerment of the School of Management’s Curriculum Council — The strong committee
mandate only allows it to approve fully completed materials.

6. The institutional decision to adopt Blackboard worldwide as its learning management tool will assist in ensuring uniform course quality of delivery.

7. Implementation of the curriculum development system — The university is adopting an updated curriculum development system and the School of Management will be tasked with transitioning all of its curricula to this new system. This represents significant tasks and opportunity for all program directors/ coordinators.

8. Continued tracking of courses and programs that are offered in a condensed time frame at international locations is being accelerated.

9. Implementation of new assisted ESL courses and programs will benefit international students.

For a full description of each program within the School of Management, see the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

**ALBRIGHT SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND THE DIVISION OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

The Albright School of Education (ASOE) and the Division of Arts and Sciences (DAS) are currently housed under the leadership of the Dean of the ASOE, an advantage for management efficiency and alignment of some programs.

The ASOE currently offers instruction at its sites in Bellevue, Tacoma, Everett, Vancouver, Renton, Seattle, WA; Hawai‘i; and locations in British Columbia including Vancouver, Vancouver Island, and various school sites in British Columbia’s lower mainland. It also offers programs at selected Washington community college sites including Skagit Valley College, Peninsula College (Port Angeles), Bates Technical College, and Centralia College. Some programs are offered online and are available to students wherever they reside.

In alignment with the unit’s mission and the approval of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) Professional Educator Standards Board, ASOE programs include initial teacher certification through the Bachelor of Arts in Education (BA Ed.) and Master in Teaching (MIT) programs, Endorsements, Professional Teacher Certification (ProCert), Educational Leadership programs, Guidance and Counseling (G&C) programs, and Master of Education programs. Each certification program and location has been approved by the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). (The report from the most recent OSPI review is available in the Exhibits.)

ASOE also operates Educational Leadership and School Counseling programs in British Columbia, with provincial approval (2007) from the Degree Quality Assessment Board, and in Hawai‘i, its preservice teacher education program in Special Education was approved for seven years by the Hawai‘i Teacher Standards Board in 2007.

The Division of Arts and Sciences offers programs in Washington State, British Columbia, Alberta, and online. It provides oversight to the university’s General Education courses, which are offered online, in class in the Puget Sound area, and in class aligned with the undergraduate programs in Europe (Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Greece). The Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology is also offered in Greece.

In the Division of Arts and Sciences, the school offers approved undergraduate programs in Applied Psychology, General Studies, and Communications. It offers graduate programs in Counseling Psychology both in the United States and Canada, and soon to be in Athens, Greece. Graduates in Washington are eligible, after further postgraduate supervised experience, to apply for state licensure as a mental health counselor. In British Columbia, graduates are eligible to apply for designation as certified clinical counselors with the BC Association of Clinical Counsellors. Graduates in Alberta may apply for provisional registration as a psychologist; after further supervised experience, they may apply for full registration. The Master of Counselling program in British Columbia
was approved in 2007 by the Degree Quality Assessment Board, and in Alberta it was approved in 2009 by the Campus Alberta Quality Council.

Figure 2.2 depicts the program information including site locations, degrees awarded, candidate enrollment, and approval of each program within ASOE/DAS.

Programs follow approved program plans that are reviewed and updated regularly and provide a listing of the courses and the prerequisites where required within the program. These program plans are available to all faculty via the Registrar’s Office intranet site. Programs are developed using a Program Design Guide and courses using a Course Design Guide. These processes ensure the identification of relevant and meaningful outcomes and the alignment of course assessments and activities with those outcomes.

The objectives of each program are clearly identified in the program outcomes. Courses are then identified by prefixes within the program. Graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites Offered</th>
<th>Degree or Certification</th>
<th>Certification Level (if relevant)</th>
<th>Number of Quarter Credit Hours</th>
<th>State or Provincial Program Approval (if required)</th>
<th>Approval Agency</th>
<th>Last Approval Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Bellevue • Centralia • Everett • Peninsula • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>BA Ed.</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Bellevue • Everett • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Special Education Dual Endorsement</td>
<td>Bellevue • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>BA Ed.</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Endorsement/Alternative Routes</td>
<td>Seattle Public Schools</td>
<td>Cert. Only</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Only/Alternative Routes</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>BA Ed. or Cert. Only</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>February 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education K-12 Endorsement</td>
<td>Bellevue • Everett • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>180 71</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Teacher Certification</td>
<td>Bellevue • Everett • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>M.Ed. or Cert. Only</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15 Advanced Track – 5</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites Offered</td>
<td>Degree or Certification</td>
<td>Certification Level (if relevant)</td>
<td>Number of Quarter Credit Hours</td>
<td>State or Provincial Program Approval (if required)</td>
<td>Last Approval Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor — Certification</td>
<td>M.Ed. or Cert. Only</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>59 or 42</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Administration — Principal/Program</td>
<td>M.Ed. or Cert. Only</td>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>52 or 36</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Nondegree</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nondegree</td>
<td>Professional 6</td>
<td>OSPI/PESB</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction — Specialized Study</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue • Tacoma • Vancouver</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements in Elementary Education, Special</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, ELL, Middle-Level Humanities, Middle-Level Math, Mathematics, Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master of Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue • Vancouver, BC • Victoria, BC •</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>BC MAELMD*</td>
<td>BC: 2008</td>
<td>AB: 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alberta • Calgary, Alberta • Athens,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>Associate of Science and Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>90 180</td>
<td>BC MAELMD*</td>
<td>BC: 2008</td>
<td>AB: 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Psychology</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicatons</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development
**Alberta Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology
programs utilize action research projects or a thesis as an important capstone component of their program design. Undergraduate programs often utilize a capstone project such as the positive impact on student learning project, which students in the Bachelor of Education program complete. All projects attempt to build in relevancy to the student’s professional career goals and develop experience with research in the knowledge base of the field to develop lifelong learning skills and attitudes.

In 2008–09, the university undertook a review of its programs offered in concentrated time frames. Because many programs at CityU have been designed for the working adult, they do not follow traditional ten-week delivery models. The following definition was established to help identify which programs and courses might fall within the definition of “concentrated.”

Delivery designs in which a full degree program is completed in 70 percent or less of the time it would take a student to complete the program carrying a full-time credit load (as defined by CityU’s credit load policy).

Delivery designs in which at least 25 percent of the courses in a program are designed so that the time students spend engaged in learning activities is 70 percent or less than a ten-week academic term are also considered to be concentrated.

Figure 2.3 displays the programs that are offered in a concentrated time frame. It includes the following programs:

1. The one-year MIT program is offered with approximately 12 credits a quarter for students who are fully engaged in their academic program during the year of study.

2. A planned Master of Counselling full-time program is scheduled to be offered in British Columbia beginning in winter 2009–10. It will be offered in seven quarters rather than eight.

3. The Guidance and Counseling and Early Childhood Education programs course delivery design offers two courses per quarter, as do other programs. However, the first course is typically offered the first half of the quarter and the second course offered the second half of the quarter. Classes meet in the evening or on Saturday. The rationale given in establishing this model was that students wanted to focus on one course at a time. The result is that all courses except for internships are offered in a time frame shorter than seven weeks. Thus, the program does qualify as a concentrated time frame program under that definition.

Following the identification of these programs/courses as concentrated in delivery, the annual program assessment reports were reviewed to determine whether the program outcomes were being achieved by students in the program. The results indicated that student learning outcomes were sufficiently met in the MIT and the Guidance and Counseling programs (see Figure 2.4). The Early Childhood Education program just began in 2009–2010. Data is not yet available for the Master in Counselling one-year program.

Curricular Policies in the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences

The programs of the ASOE/DAS are implemented and monitored within the governance and staffing structure of the school. The governance committees of ASOE mirror those of the university and include a Curriculum Committee, an Assessment Committee, and a Diversity Committee. Program directors participate in or chair at least one university- and one school-level committee. Program coordinators participate in or chair at least one school-level committee in addition to program-level committees. University and school committee appointments are identified each year in a document titled “Faculty Representation.” In addition, the program directors in ASOE/DAS meet weekly to oversee the work of the various committees, set strategic direction for the school, and provide annual charges to each of the committees. Three faculty program coordinators in Canada also serve as
regional directors for their programs, reporting to the program directors in Bellevue.

The ASOE and the DAS Curriculum Councils have responsibility for the quality of the curriculum that is developed, revised, and implemented by the various programs. The chairpersons of the Curriculum Councils also serve on the Curriculum Quality Committee (CQC), one of the four standing committees of the Academic Affairs Council (AAC), which governs the academic programs at the university. The AAC is chaired by the provost.

The ASOE Assessment Committee meets quarterly. Each program has its own assessment committee that oversees its work. The school has adopted its own assessment plan and each program has its individual plan. Certification programs in the ASOE also report assessment results and get input from Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEABs), which are constituted by the state government.

An active ASOE Diversity Committee provides for the implementation of goals and activities that have been important elements of ASOE programs for the last ten years. It oversees the progress of each program on its own individual diversity plan. It also administers the Diversity Scholarship program to teacher candidates of diverse ethnicity in an effort to place educators in the schools of our communities that mirror the population served.

In addition, the program directors, under the leadership of the dean, review all proposals for new programs, existing programs, and annual assessment reports before they are presented for further consideration by the Academic Affairs Council or the President’s Executive Team.

Program directors and program coordinators utilize the ASOE and DAS Strategic Plan, which aligns unit goals with the institution’s goals and identifies quantitative measures for evaluating outcomes. The goals outlined in the current Strategic Plan include:

- Achieve high levels of student performance based on program and institutional learning outcomes
- Promote the continuous improvement of quality and effectiveness of adjunct faculty
- Promote the continuous improvement of quality and effectiveness of full-time equivalent (FTE) academics (faculty)
- Achieve high levels of student retention across courses and programs
- Establish an appropriate mix of programs from the perspective of variety, sustainability, and delivery modes to contribute to growth
- Establish an appropriate mix of current and new partnerships to contribute to growth
- Based on the institutional framework, promote internationalization among students
- Based on the institutional framework, promote internationalization among full-time and Teaching Faculty
- Encourage appropriate levels of participation in (or of) relevant local, regional,
Implement a global version of a select ASOE/DAS program that leverages our international locations as part of the degree.

Operate programs within established financial benchmarks.

Achieve class sizes that promote student learning and support cost effectiveness.

A conceptual framework, available on the Albright School of Education SharePoint site, has been developed that guides the work of the school. The Division of Arts and Sciences currently uses the university’s Academic Model as its framework. A conceptual framework review being conducted in 2009–10 may result in the integration of a framework relevant to the specific work of all programs in ASOE/DAS.

Program Review and Assessment

Programs within the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences undergo annual reviews conducted by the program director and Administrative Faculty. Curriculum may be adjusted at that time and an annual report on student and program assessment practices is provided to the dean, the ASOE/DAS program directors, and to the Academic Assessment Committee of the university.

A comprehensive program review is conducted every five years, during which time external reviewers participate on the review team. Figure 2.4 lists the recent and projected program reviews. The full text of reviews recently conducted is available for examination. In addition, certification programs in the Albright School of Education are evaluated every five years by the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB). The most recent evaluation in Washington State occurred in 2008 and resulted in full five-year accreditation for all programs. ASOE and DAS programs in British Columbia and Alberta undergo full provincial review every five years and submit annual program status reports.

The ASOE assessment plan, available on the ASOE SharePoint site, further guides specific program assessment in the school. Identified assessments are systematically gathered to support the documentation of program effectiveness and student success.

Figure 2.4: Program Reviews and Annual Assessment Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Five-Year Program Review</th>
<th>Annual Assessment Report 2008–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, including associated programs</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Reading and Literacy</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Certification for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Technology Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master in Counselling</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP Endorsements</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Science and Bachelor of Science in General Studies</td>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology</td>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Communications</td>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In ASOE certification programs, reports are shared annually with Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEABs).

Annual assessment reports are presented to the dean and program directors of the school and then to the Academic Assessment Committee. An index score is used to calculate the achievement of student learning goals from year to year. The index score is based on the following elements:

- Define outcomes to support all institutional learning outcomes (1 point)
- Identify summative assessment providing direct evidence of student learning (2 points)
- Assess individual student learning (3 points)
- Aggregate and analyze data at the program level including all locations (4 points)
- Document program improvements (5 points)

Often the institutional learning outcomes are indexed to program learning goals, which may be influenced or determined by external accrediting agencies. Figure 2.5 reports the index scores for 2007–08 and 2008–09 for each program.

Over the past five years, ASOE programs have worked to increase the electronic collection and management of assessment data. Previously, programs collected data through pencil and paper instruments, aggregated data manually, and recorded and maintained that data in electronic files.

The goal of the assessment system is to improve the performance of candidates and programs, including curriculum, instruction, internships, sequencing, and faculty development. Each program within the unit collects data on graduate preparedness and performance from a multiplicity of sources, including internal sources such as job placement data and surveys of employers and external sources such as the Washington State Teacher Education Survey conducted by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI). The systematic review of aggregated data, as described previously, informs instruction and program design and is used to drive program improvements.

The four-step PAAR process used by the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences: (1) defines and embeds outcomes in programs, (2) collects and analyzes data from direct evidence of student learning; (3) uses the analysis of data to develop actions for program improvement, and (4) collects and analyzes data to determine the impact of previous improvements and to determine if additional improvements are necessary. This institutional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Index Score 2007–08</th>
<th>Index Score 2008–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, including associated programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Reading and Literacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. in Technology Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master in Counselling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate and Bachelor of Science in General Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Communications</td>
<td>N/A – new program, no completed students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
framework was intentionally aligned with the expectations of regional accreditation and professional standards, including OSPI’s accountability standards.

**Student Learning**

ASOE promotes growth of a learning community of faculty and students committed to continuous improvement through active, collaborative inquiry in a shared culture of learning that demonstrates a positive impact on student learning. In courses and fieldwork, candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to critique and reflect on their own work within the context of student learning. Students further describe the impact on their own and K–12 student learning through professional growth and development plans, design of lessons and unit plans to reach a diverse population of students, evaluation of instructional strategies, and journal reflections.

Teacher preparation programs have a strong focus in all internships and in classroom instruction on teaching candidates to use K–12 student work data to inform instruction. BA Ed. candidates demonstrate a positive impact on student learning in student teaching through teaching a unit, collecting data to document student improvement, and presenting the results of their teaching to the cohort. The capstone project, formally presented to the cohort prior to graduation, demonstrates positive impact on student learning in which multiple forms of evidence show growth in all students. MIT candidates demonstrate a positive impact on student learning through an action research project, which they accomplish during their student teaching experience. Candidates must identify an opportunity for improvement of student learning in their classroom, determine an instructional intervention to address it through a review of literature, and use three distinct measures to assess the efficacy of their instructional intervention. Candidates determine impact on student learning by conducting a pretest and posttest comparison on each of the three assessments used in their study. In both programs, candidates prepare an evidence-based e-portfolio that is shared with faculty and peers.

In the Guidance and Counseling program, students identify within their internship school an area of need with attention to at least one of the described underserved populations and design an action research project to positively impact student learning. Candidates utilize the advisory board model to identify a problem area, design and deliver a pretest, provide an intervention or implement a project, use a posttest, and report on the outcome to the internship school staff and cohort group during the final course of the program, EGC 510: Leadership for Change.

In the Educational Leadership program, the internships and capstone activities include a demographic analysis of the school population, logs, reflections, and presentations that focus on the leader’s role in impacting student learning in the critical areas of staff development, improvement plans, reform activities, curriculum development and evaluation, assessment instruments, analysis of evaluation data, and WASL preparation.

Division of Arts and Sciences programs also use internships and thesis and capstone projects to document authentic student learning. The Associate of Science and the Bachelor of Science in General Studies present unique challenges in developing program assessment strategies. The General Studies program is an individualized program that enables students to construct a set of courses from programs offered throughout the university to fulfill either the associate’s degree or bachelor’s degree. Because of the wide variety of courses that can be used to fulfill these degrees, the capstone courses required of all students must serve as the vehicle for assessing achievement of learning outcomes.

Students in the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology complete a portfolio at the end of their studies that includes samples of their work and artifacts from their culminating community service project. Students receive ongoing feedback on formative assessments throughout their BAAP program, and receive copies of graded summative assessments with
detailed feedback from instructors. Students receive feedback from peer reviews of their community projects as well as feedback from supervisors at sites where they completed their projects.

In the Bachelor of Science in Communications, the development of the portfolio and the preparation and completion of a practicum project allow students to demonstrate learning related to professional competence and professional identity.

Undergraduate Program

The university requires all undergraduate students to satisfy minimum General Education requirements including college writing, college math, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics. Specific requirements are listed in the CityU Catalog. They may be fulfilled by enrollment in CityU lower- or upper-division courses, through courses at other institutions, through standardized examinations in appropriate subjects or through Prior Learning Assessments (PLAs).

In the Albright School of Education, the Bachelor of Education program has 90 credits of lower-division requirements as described in the catalog. A minimum of 30 credits is also required in one academic area. Students may choose humanities, social science, or natural science and may draw those credits from their prerequisites.

In the Division of Arts and Sciences, the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology program requires 90 lower-division credits, including two prerequisite courses (Introduction to Psychology and Human Development). No transfer credits are accepted in the Applied Psychology core. The Bachelor of Science in Communications program, COM 201: Introduction to Communications, is also a prerequisite, in addition to the 90 required lower-division credits. A minimum of two different academic disciplines is required in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics. No transfer credits are accepted in the Communications core.

Students working toward an Associate of Science or Bachelor of Science degree in General Studies must complete a different set of general requirements consisting of 30 identified credits. Policy also specifies the requirements for entry into upper-division undergraduate coursework, including the demonstration of requirements met for college writing and college math.

Graduate Program

Graduate programs in the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences are primarily designed to prepare candidates for a profession or for advancement in their profession. These include preparation for initial teacher certification and advancement in the education profession through additional teaching endorsements, career advancement in reading and literacy or technology fields, continuing professional certification or for administrative careers. Aspiring educators can also obtain certification in school counseling. The Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master of Counselling program prepares clinical counselors in the United States and Canada who are able to meet licensing requirements in their respective regions. Graduates achieve highly respected placement rates in their fields as documented in program reviews. In addition, the Albright School of Education has had the highest or very high placement of ethnic minority teacher graduates in the state of Washington each year since that data has been collected by the state.

Teaching Faculty in the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences

City University of Seattle employs a practitioner-faculty model that promotes instruction both current and relevant to the workplace. Permanent faculty have advanced degrees and recent successful work experience in a field related to their faculty assignment. Faculty teach classes, advise university students, supervise instructors, manage programs, and engage in scholarship and service.
### Faculty Supervision in the Albright School of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Number of Faculty/Field Supervisors Supervised</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan, Terry</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball, Jerry</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedetti, Gary</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beveridge, Lynda</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birgensmith, Sherron</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chow, Marge</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denhart, Paul</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Centralia</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwell, Tracy</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoki, Don</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Micki</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follmer, Susan</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling; Reading &amp; Literacy; Technology, Curriculum &amp; Instruction; ProCert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortenbacher, Dale</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Roberta</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller, Michael</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Judith</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambly, Jay</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinrichs, Judy</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASOE &amp; DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Sue Anne</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Supervision in the Albright School of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Number of Faculty/Field Supervisors Supervised</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Krissy</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katayama, Christine</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ProCert; Technology, Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundsgaard, David</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main, Retta</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutadi, Neal</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naughton, Patrick</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Academic Location Leader</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Lynn</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell, Kathy</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Bellevue and Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs, Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Betsy</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schieber, Craig</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Johnson, Barbara</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Vancouver WA</td>
<td>Academic Location Leader</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiber, Susan</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipman Jr., Edward</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Stephen</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Academic Location Leader</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strozyk, Ed</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Vancouver WA</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toler, Karen</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Michael</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendt, Elizabeth</td>
<td>M.A., M.Ed.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher Certification Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total ASOE Faculty Count**: 318
In the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Science, the practitioner-faculty model also applies to Teaching Faculty and to field supervisors who have an advanced degree and recent or current successful work experience related to their teaching and field supervision assignments. They are hired and supervised by full-time faculty who were also practitioners in their fields. Figures 2.6 and 2.7 indicate how many Teaching Faculty are supervised by each program director or program coordinator.

Faculty qualifications for ASOE employment include a master’s degree with doctorate preferred, demonstrated success in P–12 schools with grade-level and content-area expertise directly related to the instructor assignment, and certification in the area of responsibility. In Washington, ASOE employs 24.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty, distributed among 34 individuals. Of the full-time equivalent faculty, 14 percent have doctoral degrees. Among Teaching Faculty, approximately 10 percent have doctoral degrees and more than five individuals are National Board Certified. In the Educational Leadership program for principal and program administrator certification, 34 percent of the Teaching Faculty have doctoral degrees, and in the superintendent certification program, 80 percent of faculty have doctoral degrees. Currently, five faculty members in the G&C program have doctoral degrees with one in progress.

Overall, 30 percent of the program directors and program coordinators in the Albright School of Education and the Division of Arts and Sciences have doctoral degrees.

To assure that candidates are well prepared to model best practices in an increasingly technological environment, CityU faculty utilize technology in their teaching and in maintaining currency in the profession. Upon employment, Teaching Faculty are required to take a three-week online orientation, which covers information needed for teaching the first course and includes activities that provide relevant application experience and an automated checklist that ensures completion of the orientation program. They prepare for teaching at CityU by taking the required Blackboard Basics course. Faculty receive support both online and in person from Information Technology, Curriculum and Faculty Development Support Services, and library personnel as well as from program directors, program coordinators, and mentors.

In alignment with CityU’s core value of relevance and the application of knowledge, Academic Affairs defines the requirements of its practitioner-faculty in terms of scholarship. First, faculty must be “current” in their teaching field. Second, they must foster the concept of scholarship as a pathway to lifelong learning. Scholarship is linked to practice as presented in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate by E.L. Boyer (1990, p. 16), which asserts that scholarship includes “stepping back, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively to students.” Building on Boyer’s work, CityU focuses on the scholarship of teaching and the scholarship of practice. The institutional definition of scholarship is elaborated in the institutional policy on scholarship.

In ASOE, a priority is the efficacy of faculty members in assuring that students learn. The utilization of significant evidence of student learning has been a focus for faculty. A series of workshops on Personalizing Student Learning: Positive Impact and Evidence of Learning, conducted by Marilyn Simpson, was offered in Bellevue and Vancouver in the fall and winter of 2007–08, with total attendance at nearly eighty faculty and colleagues from P–12 schools and other universities. An outgrowth of this initiative was a third workshop conducted by Marilyn Simpson entitled “Learning Together,” for preservice candidates and faculty.

To assure responsible utilization of resources, institutional support for the scholarship of teaching and practice has focused on priority issues. Presenters at local, national, and international conferences receive some financial support as do attendees at relevant local or regional conferences.

Faculty members are encouraged to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning as well as in
applied or original research. Dissemination within the university community and the larger professional community is recognized as an important component of scholarship. Participation in scholarship activities by Administrative Faculty is documented in a scholarship summary report, which is available on the ASOE SharePoint site.

“The Faculty Roles and Responsibilities” document defines service as engagement in governance, service and outreach, and student development. ASOE/DAS faculty demonstrate a continued commitment to service to the university in multiple ways through participation in university and ASOE governance committees. ASOE faculty serve on the Academic Affairs Council and on each of the standing committees of the council, as well as other committees, such as Scholastic Honesty and Grade Grievances. In addition, Administrative Faculty have at least one committee assignment within the school.

**Student Policies**

The initial assessment point for ASOE programs is program admission. Prior to entry into a program, faculty assess applicants’ qualifications to determine their potential for success in respective programs. At this assessment point, faculty determine applicants’ knowledge and skills as demonstrated by previous academic success, professional dispositions through recommendations, and commitment to meet the needs of students, the profession and the community through personal interviews or personal essays.

**Figure 2.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Supervised</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberts, Gerard</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Academic Location Leader</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brommer, Stephanie</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BS Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholewinska, Anna</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Undergraduate DAS Courses, BA Applied Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Avraham</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gokiert, Mary Lynne</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigg, Glen</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie, Brian</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henley, Arden</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Academic Location Leader</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinrichs, Judy</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASOE &amp; DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering, Greg</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, Colin</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver BC</td>
<td>Clinic/Supervisor</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theisen, Michael</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade, Allan</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Vancouver Island</td>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total DAS Faculty Count** 77
For those students seeking teacher certification, they must also undergo the standard Washington State Police background check and FBI fingerprint.

ASOE faculty, field supervisors, and mentor educators monitor candidate growth in proficiencies in an ongoing manner at multiple points during programs. Faculty monitor acquisition of knowledge by assigning grades in course work, assessing skills through performance in field experiences, and by observing the demonstration of professional dispositions by candidates throughout program components.

Candidates in all programs with internships also meet a predetermined level of proficiency before admission to the culminating internship. At this assessment point, faculty determine applicants’ knowledge and skills as demonstrated by academic course work and performance in field experiences, essential dispositions through evaluations of field supervisors and mentor educators, and commitment to meet the needs of students, the profession, and the community through professional development plans, goals, and portfolios.

In the Teacher Certification program (TCP) pre-admission process, candidates’ transcripts are reviewed for content-level prerequisites aligned to meet or exceed those articulated in the Washington State Direct Transfer Agreement with community and technical colleges for the BA Ed. program and with admissions requirements in the MIT program. The prerequisites are reviewed regularly and modified as needed by faculty for their applicability to the teaching and endorsement standards.

TCP candidates in Washington must pass the WEST-E (Washington Educator Skills Test) for the endorsement area of their program prior to student teaching. Dual endorsement candidates must complete both Praxis II exams for their endorsement areas prior to student teaching in both. Alternative Routes candidates seeking a Residency Certificate in Secondary Math complete the Praxis II as an admissions criterion. Evidence for competencies in endorsements is provided through course grades and the WEST-E (Elementary, Special Ed.), and is monitored using the Performance Pedagogy Assessment (PPA).

Other programs in the Albright School of Education and the Division of Arts and Sciences typically use candidate essays and reference letters as screening criteria in addition to documentation required by the university. Programs that result in professional credentials typically require a personal interview with a faculty member prior to admission. This interview helps to provide final screening of the candidate and provides both information and connection with a faculty advisor to candidates who are going to spend one to three years in an intensive, cohort-based program.

**Continuing Education**

The Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences currently have limited continuing education or special programs. Since the elimination of the QUEST Continuing Education program in 2006, the only current or planned offering is a National Board for Professional Teachers support program being offered 2009–10. In the last five years, the school has cosponsored a summer reading institute for Science Research Associates and a summer math academy with the Everett school district. Those programs are no longer being conducted.

The Albright School of Education offers a newly approved program for the preparation of National Board Certified teachers. The program proposal was reviewed by the governance structure of the university in the same manner as regular program proposals and approved by the Academic Affairs Council. It will be included in annual program assessment reports and in periodic comprehensive program reviews to measure its outcomes and ensure its effectiveness.

For a full description of each program within the Albright School of Education and the Division of Arts and Sciences, see the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.
This section addresses Standard 2.B and Policy 2.2 on the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs. It describes CityU’s policies and processes that guide ongoing evaluation of the quality of academic programs and the conceptual framework that guides CityU’s approach to learning outcomes assessment, including the Academic Model and the Philosophy of Academic Assessment. It also summarizes the use of direct evidence of student learning and provides an overview of the progress of programs in collecting and using direct evidence in an ongoing outcomes assessment process. Finally, data from the annual Student Satisfaction Survey are included to show student perceptions of how well their programs assist them in achieving the CityU Learning Goals.

City University of Seattle has been engaged in learning outcomes assessment for the better part of the last ten years. During that time, it has articulated and refined a comprehensive structure for learning outcomes assessment that increases transparency and accountability for student learning. CityU’s approach to student learning is based on four questions:

1. What does CityU want students to learn?
2. How does CityU enable students to master that learning?
3. How does CityU assess student learning?
4. How does CityU use the results of assessment to enhance future success for its students?

CityU’s approach is driven by its mission and values as indicated in Figure 2.8. The mission and values are incorporated into the Learning Goals established at the institutional, program, and course levels; these goals are integrated into curriculum design and program delivery. The framework provided by the Academic Model (see Appendix E) and the Philosophy of Academic Assessment (see Appendix F) informs curriculum design and program delivery as well.

Over the last five years, CityU developed and refined a conceptual framework to guide its approach to learning outcomes assessment, including the Academic Model, the Philosophy of Academic Assessment, and the policies and processes that guide ongoing evaluation of the quality of academic programs, aligned with NWCCU standards.
CityU's Conceptual Framework: Academic Model and Assessment Philosophy

The conceptual framework for the assessment of student learning at CityU is directly related to its mission: *To change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.* The framework is based on the foundational work captured in two documents:

- City University of Seattle Academic Model
- Philosophy of Academic Assessment

THE ACADEMIC MODEL

CityU’s Academic Model, approved in spring 2005, 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, ensuring curricular relevance to the workplace, service to students, accessibility, and responsiveness. (See Appendix E for the complete text of the Academic Model.) 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.

The Academic Model specifies six CityU Learning Goals that describe exit competencies for graduates of all degree programs. Since at the undergraduate level, CityU primarily offers degree completion, the CityU Learning Goals also serve as a means for assuring the acquisition of General Education–related competencies.

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.

CityU’s institutional-level Learning Goals were designed to align the program learning outcomes already in place with CityU’s mission and to ensure consistency across programs. They were a natural articulation of CityU’s mission, values, and historical approach to education. Therefore, the assessment of student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals is fully embedded in and integrated with assessment of each program’s learning outcomes. Program faculty embed CityU Learning Goals in program outcomes and ensure program assessments provide evidence that students achieve CityU’s Learning Goals.

**PHILOSOPHY OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT**

Once the Academic Model was constructed, it was important to articulate a philosophy of assessment for curriculum and program development at CityU. The Philosophy of Academic Assessment was adopted by the Academic Affairs Council in August 2005. (See Appendix F for the full text of the Philosophy of Academic Assessment.) It incorporates material from two sources, *Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* (Astin, 1991) and the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Policy on Educational Assessment (NWCCU Accreditation Handbook, 2003), and includes the following statement:

The primary purpose of assessing student learning is to optimize students’ educational development. Student learning is best assessed using the principles of authentic assessment, in which students engage in learning activities that require them to apply knowledge and skills to real-life challenges. While specific assessment strategies vary according to context, all strategies should be:

- Relevant to student learning outcomes
- Efficient, accurate, and appropriate in scope
- Appropriate to the diversity of cultures, learning styles, and other differences in our student body

This Academic Model and corresponding Philosophy of Assessment provide the conceptual framework and basis upon which program faculty have developed and/or refined the means for gathering direct evidence of student learning. This process includes identifying learning outcomes for each program, embedding the CityU Learning Goals into the program outcomes, constructing assessments of student learning that provide evidence of student achievement of each outcome, and determining the courses in which those assessments would take place. This is done at the time of designing new programs and when existing programs are revised following a major program review.

**Program Development Process**

CityU provides unique opportunities for faculty and staff to participate in the evolution of an international system for the development and delivery of postsecondary education. The university’s mission, vision, and institutional goals provide a framework within which this evolution takes place. A rolling multi-year Strategic Plan, incorporating a broad consensus of faculty and staff and approved by the Board of Governors, sets priorities and outlines strategic directions. In relation to academic programs and curriculum, the university’s Academic Model identifies the parameters for development and implementation. The deans of the two schools (the Gordon Albright School of Education including the Division of Arts and Sciences and the School of Management) and the provost provide overall coordination and academic oversight.

The development of academic programs takes place within the broader governance structure of the university and is based on a matrix of relationships among faculty within the schools and across the regions. In working toward the overriding goal of the highest quality of education from multiple perspectives, collaboration and innovation are encouraged. The operative principles are appreciation, mutual influence, and stewardship within a framework of shared values and assumptions.

The basic framework includes an initial screening of
a potential program idea, a vetting of feasibility by the President’s Executive Team, and the approval of the system-wide Academic Affairs Council (AAC). The AAC, chaired by the provost, meets monthly and is the overall decision-making body for new programs and other major curricular changes within Academic Affairs. The AAC is composed of academic deans, and other directors reporting to the provost, and faculty representatives from across programs and regions. Once a new program receives AAC and provost approval, it is recommended to the president. The president takes the proposal to the Board of Governors for approval as needed and to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities for its review.

The Curriculum Quality Committee, one of four standing committees of the Academic Affairs Council, is the venue for peer review of academic matters (e.g., the General Education program, undergraduate and graduate degree plans, changes to degree programs, etc.) that may have substantial impact on the university; it also constructs and recommends policies related to the university’s curriculum development standards and process. The Curriculum Quality Committee reviews new and substantially revised programs that are recommended to it by the schools and makes recommendations to the Academic Affairs Council.

The School Curriculum Councils serve as the vehicle for academic governance for faculty within schools concerning matters related to curriculum. School Curriculum Councils approve course additions and changes and recommend new programs to the Curriculum Quality Committee for review. The main responsibilities of these councils include the following:

- The overall quality of programs within each of the schools
- Communication and integration across programs and content areas

The Albright School of Education, the Division of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Management each have curriculum councils that include representation from faculty across programs and locations and library services. Periodic meetings involve home-campus personnel plus representatives from other sites. For some of the professional programs, external nonfaculty advisory members are invited to assist. When the School Curriculum Council approves an initiative with institutional-level implications, the initiative is forwarded to the Academic Affairs Council for approval.

Degree programs at CityU are designed around a set of learning outcomes that specify what graduates of the program will know and be able to do upon successful completion of the program requirements. The CityU Academic Model includes five major components that align with CityU’s mission and describe the dimensions of a CityU education: focus on student learning, practitioner-faculty, relevance to workplace, service to students, and accessibility and responsiveness. The Academic Model also specifies six CityU Learning Goals intended to describe exit competencies for graduates of all degree programs. Information literacy is emphasized in the CityU Learning Goals, and faculty work with librarians to integrate relevant research and information-literacy activities into their courses and programs. (See Appendix E for the complete text of the Academic Model.)

Each program then identifies the summative assessment(s) that will provide evidence of student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals and program learning outcomes, and identifies in which course(s) the assessment will occur. Courses are also designed around a set of learning outcomes and clearly defined assessments that produce evidence of student learning. School Curriculum Councils provide oversight and quality control at the course review level.

The alignment of CityU Learning Goals, program outcomes, and summative assessments is captured in a Program Design Guide. The Program Design Guide serves as a kind of “curriculum map” for program development or revision. The Program Design Guide from the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration is included here as an example (Figure 2.9). It is important to note that Program Design Guides are “working documents” developed early in the program design process, and are therefore subject to revision as work continues.
**Bachelor of Science in Business Administration Program Design Guide**

**Program Description:** Students completing City University of Seattle’s BSBA will have a solid understanding of the art and craft of business. As students are immersed in the fundamentals of business, they learn the softer skills of communication, teamwork, cultural fluency, and maximization of technology. Students may apply the knowledge and skills they acquire in their undergraduate studies directly to their current occupations. Students choose from seven different emphasis areas, General Management, International Management, Project Management, Human Resource Management, Information Systems Management, Marketing, Hospitality Management or Individualized Study (where students may design their own emphasis, to add depth in an area of interest to them). Graduates of the baccalaureate program are well equipped to continue their studies in the graduate degree programs.

**Program Entry Requirements:** Admission to City University of Seattle

**CityU Learning Goals:** (1) Professional Competency and Professional Identity, (2) Strong Communication and Interpersonal Skills, (3) Critical Thinking, (4) Commitment to Ethical Practice and Service, (5) Diverse and Global Perspectives, (6) Lifelong Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Required Assessments</th>
<th>Core Concepts, Knowledge, and Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What must the student successfully demonstrate as a result of this program?</td>
<td>Which CityU Learning Goals are supported by program outcomes?</td>
<td>What graded assessment(s) provide evidence that the learner can demonstrate proficiency in this program outcome?</td>
<td>What core concepts, knowledge, and skills must the learner acquire to demonstrate proficiency in program outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this program, students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluate the industry and economic sector in which a given organization operates and propose strategies to succeed.</td>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
<td>BSM 407 BSC 401 BSM 405 BSM 495</td>
<td>Econ. analysis project Financial analysis Quality mgmt. paper Operations (Ops.) improve. plan XM exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Industry/Sector Perspective</strong> Industry research and analysis Broad financial risks Macroeconomics Microeconomics Regulatory context of business research plan Financial analysis Present value concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appraise the threats and opportunities of conducting business in a world with fewer barriers.</td>
<td>3, 5, 6</td>
<td>MK 300 BSC 407 BSC 401 BSM 405 BSM 495</td>
<td>Marketing plan Trade theory paper Financial analysis statement Ops. improve. plan XM exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>International/Global Perspective</strong> Market structures International economy Ethics Business policy Business strategy Organizational behavior SWOT International business Environmental analysis Financial analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcomes</td>
<td>CityU Learning Goals</td>
<td>Required Assessments</td>
<td>Core Concepts, Knowledge, and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Assess the impact of changes in relevant legal and regulatory environments. | 2, 3, 4             | BSC 403 BSC 402 BSM 495   | **Legal/Regulatory Perspective**  
  Sarbanes–Oxley  
  Uniform Commercial Code  
  Intentional tort  
  Ethics  
  Securities regulation  
  Negotiable instruments  
  Legal analysis (IRAC)  
  Government regulation  
  Human resource management  
  Torts  
  Labor law  
  Property  
  Corporations |
| 4. Integrate information technology tools to streamline business processes.    | 1, 6                | IS 330 BSM 405 BSM 495    | **Leverage Technology**  
  Database structures  
  Information management  
  Office suite  
  Operations  
  Enterprise Resource systems  
  Statistics  
  System characteristics  
  Value of IS  
  E-business planning  
  Systems development life cycle  
  IT security measures  
  Database structures |
| 5. Evaluate a company’s marketing strategies and make recommendations.        | 2, 5                | MK 300 BSM 495            | **Marketing/Client Focus**  
  Customer relationships  
  Marketing strategy  
  Marketing ethics and social responsibility  
  Consumer behavior  
  Marketing research  
  Business communications |
| 6. Recommend improvements that align with the company’s strategy, goals, and culture. | 1, 3, 6             | BSM 405 BC 302 BC 303 BSC 407 BSC 402 BSM 495 | **Strategic/Critical Thinking**  
  Business strategy  
  Inference versus fact  
  Fallacies in reasoning  
  Argument development  
  Analyzing alternative  
  Critical evaluation  
  Ethical leadership  
  Social responsibility  
  Critical thinking  
  Business strategy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Outcomes</th>
<th>CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Required Assessments</th>
<th>Core Concepts, Knowledge, and Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Integrate foundational knowledge of business functions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BC 302, BC 303, BSM 405, BSM 407, BSM 495, BSC 401</td>
<td>Technical Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research report, Research project, Ops. improve. plan, Econ. analysis paper, XM exam, Financial statement analysis</td>
<td>Accounting, Finance, Operations, Law, Marketing, Management, Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Access and evaluate relevant information to guide business decisions.</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td>BC 302, BC 303, MK 300, BSM 405, BSM 495</td>
<td>Research Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research report, Research project, Marketing plan, Ops. improve. plan, Case analysis</td>
<td>Information literacy, Critical thinking, Formulate research plan, Library databases, Information evaluation, APA format, Search engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deliver powerful presentations and produce examples of effective business writing for diverse audiences.</td>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>BC 302, BC 303, BC 306, MK 300, BSM 405, BSM 495</td>
<td>Communication/Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research report presentation, Research project presentation, Marketing plan pres., Ops. improve. plan, Case analysis</td>
<td>Analyze arguments, Inference, Inductive reasoning, Deductive reasoning, Oral and written communications skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lead and manage diverse teams.</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
<td>BC 301, BC 306, BSC 407, BSM 405, BSM 495</td>
<td>Leadership/Teaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce teaming, Introduce leadership, Virtual teaming paper, Ops. Improve. plan, Econ. analysis paper, Team decision-making assignment</td>
<td>Team leadership, Followership, Ethical leadership (moral compass), Leading a virtual team, Technology roadmapping, Leading cross-functional teams, Leading telecommuters, Time management, Multitasking, Collective decision making, Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evaluate the ethical implications of business decisions.</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 6</td>
<td>BC 306, BSC 403, BSM 495</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intro, Case study, Case analysis</td>
<td>Innovation, Appreciative inquiry, Social responsibility, Environmental responsibility, Stewardship, Self-awareness, Accountability, Business ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Program Review**

NWCCU Standards 2.A.2, 2.B.1, and Policy 2.2 require the assessment of the goals of educational programs to be codified in clearly defined institutional policies and procedures. This is done via continuous self-assessment embedded in CityU’s program review process. Continuous improvement of academic programs is increasingly a critical component of ensuring quality educational experiences for students.

The Program Review policy and procedure define CityU’s approach to program review. Programs assess CityU Learning Goals and program learning outcomes using direct evidence of student learning on a regular timeline, and these data become a core component of the program review process (Appendix G). A program review calendar (see Exhibits) is regularly updated.

The continuous self-assessment process is intended to capture and build on the multiple assessment and improvement activities under way in each school and program, ensure consistency across schools and programs where essential, and explicitly link program review to the standards set forth in CityU’s Academic Model.

The official policy on continuous improvement in educational programs is included in Appendix G. Major program review reports are available in the Exhibits.

### Annual Learning Outcomes Assessment Reports

In the 2008–2009 academic year, CityU’s Academic Assessment Committee was charged with receiving annual reports from degree programs documenting their learning outcomes assessment processes, and how they use data from outcomes assessment in program improvements. The Academic Assessment Committee, one of the standing committees of the Academic Affairs Council, provides support for learning outcomes assessment processes to be regularized in each program. As such, it is the appropriate venue for reviewing the implementation of learning outcomes assessment in each degree program.

The Academic Assessment Committee used CityU’s Plan, Act, Assess, and Revise (PAAR) model for continuous improvement to institutionalize assessment of the CityU Learning Goals (see Figure 2.10).

**Direct Evidence of Student Learning**

It is important to understand the measures in place to produce evidence of student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals identified in the Academic Model; therefore, this section illustrates the types of

---

**Figure 2.10: The PAAR Framework for Assessment of CityU Learning Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAAR Cycle</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Related Policy and/or Process</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td>Define learning outcomes for all CityU graduates</td>
<td>Program review, New program approval process</td>
<td>Academic Model with CityU Learning Goals was approved in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Act</strong></td>
<td>Embed CityU Learning Goals and assessment strategies in programs and courses</td>
<td>Curriculum development, Curriculum review, Program review</td>
<td>Ongoing, as programs are reviewed, revised, and developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train faculty in teaching skills related to CityU Learning Goals</td>
<td>Adjunct orientation and training</td>
<td>Began in 2007–08; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assess</strong></td>
<td>Analyze student performance and other evidence related to CityU Learning Goals</td>
<td>Program review, Curriculum development, Faculty review</td>
<td>Began in 2006-07; ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revise</strong></td>
<td>Make improvements based on analysis</td>
<td>Program review, Curriculum development, Faculty review</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 2.11: Types of Direct Evidence of Student Learning in CityU Programs

| Program                                                        | Type of direct evidence used                                                                                                                                 |
|                                                               |                                                                                                                                                          |
| Associate and Bachelor of Science in General Studies           | Capstone project, portfolios of student work                                                                                                               |
| Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology                         | Capstone project — service learning, portfolios of student work                                                                                           |
| Bachelor of Arts in Education                                  | Pedagogy assessment, completed by field supervisors, of state principal surveys regarding the skills of recent graduates; portfolios of student work                   |
| Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood Education                  | Pedagogy assessment, completed by field supervisors, of state principal surveys regarding the skills of recent graduates; portfolios of student work                   |
| Bachelor of Arts in Management                                 | Capstone project — series of case study analyses that provide evidence that students have learned and can use the content of the management core of the program           |
| Bachelor of Science in Accounting                              | Capstone tools including case study analyses, business simulation exercise, nationally normed business skills examination                                   |
| Bachelor of Science in Business Administration                 | Capstone tools including case study analyses, business simulation exercise, nationally normed business skills examination                                   |
| Bachelor of Science in Communications                          | Capstone project — communications plan, portfolios of student work                                                                                       |
| Bachelor of Science in Information Systems                     | Capstone project — software project development or business proposal for development of a student-defined project/product                                |
| Bachelor of Science in Marketing                               | Capstone project — compare/contrast marketing analysis                                                                                                    |
| Master in Teaching                                             | Pedagogy assessment, completed by field supervisors, of state principal surveys regarding the skills of recent graduates; portfolios of student work                   |
| Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master of Counselling  | Scores on comprehensive, case-based exams, ratings of skills by field experience supervisors                                                               |
| Master of Arts in Leadership                                   | Capstone projects include practicum, research project, and journal article submitted for publication                                                        |
| Master of Business Administration                              | Capstone projects including business simulation, business plan, and separate capstone projects for each of the emphasis areas in the program                     |
| Master of Education in Educational Leadership                  | Capstone project, presentations, ideal school plans, evaluations by mentors, portfolios of student work                                                       |
| Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction/Professional Certification, Technology, or Individualized Study | Capstone project, portfolios of student work                                                                                                           |
| Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling                 | Capstone project, scores on comprehensive exam, ratings of skills by field experience supervisors, portfolios of student work                                 |
| Master of Education in Reading and Literacy                    | Capstone project, scores on comprehensive exam, portfolios of student work                                                                               |
| Master of Science in Computer Systems                          | Capstone project — comprehensive programming project at the end of the program                                                                           |
| Master of Science in Information Security                      | Capstone project — action research project, portfolio of student work                                                                                   |
| Master of Science in Project Management                        | Capstone project — three-part action research project, portfolio of student work                                                                           |
| Master of Science in Technology Management                     | Capstone project — three-part action research project, portfolio of student work                                                                           |
evidence being collected and how they relate to the CityU Learning Goals. It also shows how the program learning outcomes align with and support the CityU Learning Goals, so that the assessments used to provide evidence of student learning for program outcomes also provide evidence of student achievement of CityU Learning Goals.

As faculty design new programs or revise existing programs, they identify appropriate means of collecting direct evidence of student learning related to the program outcomes. In *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide* (Jossey-Bass, 2004), Suskie defines direct evidence of student learning as “tangible, visible, self-explanatory evidence of exactly what students have and haven’t learned” (p. 95). Suskie also provides examples of direct evidence of student learning (p. 96).

Figure 2.11 on the previous page shows the type of direct evidence used in the summative assessment(s) highlighted for each program. Much additional direct evidence is gathered at the course level where various CityU Learning Goals are embedded, as documented in the Program Design Guides in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

Figure 2.12 summarizes the progress made to date in each program in the outcomes assessment process. This process begins with the construction of program outcomes that align with the CityU Learning Goals. These outcomes are developed in consultation with industry advisory groups in order to ensure their relevance. The next step is to design summative assessments that provide evidence of student achievement of the program outcomes, such as a capstone business plan, an internship, or a portfolio of student work. The third step ensures that these assessments are implemented to assess individual student work at the culmination of a program. The fourth step requires program faculty to aggregate and analyze data collected from evidence of student learning, with an emphasis on ensuring all locations where the program is offered are represented; and the final step requires programs to provide documentation of how the faculty have used the analysis of learning outcomes data to implement program improvements. This process is captured in annual student learning outcomes assessment reports provided by each program director to the appropriate dean and to the Academic Assessment Committee. The annual reports from the 2008–2009 academic year are included in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

CityU has constructed an index that enables the tracking of progress by functional program and further provides the university with an ability to summarize program performance and success at the institutional level as well as analyze functional performance across programs. A point value is assigned to each step in the process. Programs earn a score based on the total point value of the steps completed. Using this system, a program with no activity in outcomes assessment would earn zero points; a program that has a mature process in place would earn a maximum of 15 points. The program scores are totaled to provide a composite score for the institution.

This index provides the university an important essential meta-analysis capability. For example, one such analysis last year identified a comparative deficiency in U.S.-based programs in achieving the desired demonstration of incorporating a global perspective into the curricula. This finding led to a specific revision of the curriculum in all U.S.-based programs to enhance attention to global awareness.

The index is based on the annual learning outcomes assessment reports presented to the Academic Assessment Committee. This was a new requirement in the 2008–2009 academic year, in order to ensure that assessment activities were taking place and to share best practices across programs. This also allowed the initial analysis of student learning related to the CityU Learning Goals across the academic programs. This analysis is presented following the index.
**City University of Seattle Learning Goals Outcomes Assessment Index as of July 2009**

Please note: This index focuses specifically on the integration and assessment of CityU Learning Goals. Programs may be at different stages regarding the assessment of specific program outcomes.

### Existing Programs — Albright School of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Defined Outcomes to Support All CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Identified Summative Assessment Providing Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Assessed Individual Student Learning</th>
<th>Aggregated and Analyzed Data at Program Level (including all locations)</th>
<th>Documented Program Improvements</th>
<th>Sum of Points per Program</th>
<th>2008-09 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Preparation Programs (BA Education, Master in Teaching)</strong></td>
<td>(1 point)</td>
<td>(2 points)</td>
<td>(3 points)</td>
<td>(4 points)</td>
<td>(5 points)</td>
<td>(15 points possible)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment (both)</td>
<td>Principal Survey/Cooperating Teacher Survey (MIT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio (BA Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBI Principal Survey (both)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed. Guidance and Counseling</strong></td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed. Leadership</strong></td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Portfolio (multiple elements)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed. Reading and Literacy</strong></td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Portfolio (multiple elements)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beginning in 2009–10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Ed. Curriculum &amp; Instruction</strong></td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Albright School of Education Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Composite Score (total possible = 75) | 70 out of 75 | 93% | 100% |
### Existing Programs — Division of Arts and Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Defined Outcomes to Support All CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Identified Summative Assessment Providing Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Assess Individual Student Learning</th>
<th>Aggregate and Analyze Data at Program Level (including all locations)</th>
<th>Documented Program Improvements</th>
<th>Sum of Points per Program</th>
<th>2008–09 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Applied Psychology</td>
<td>(1 point)</td>
<td>(2 points)</td>
<td>(3 points)</td>
<td>(4 points)</td>
<td>(5 points)</td>
<td>(15 points possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Communications</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beginning in summer 2009–10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies (AS and BS)</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Professional Trends and Issues Paper (AS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beginning in winter 2009–10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Trends and Issues Literature Review (BS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflection and Assessment Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division of Arts and Sciences Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Score (total possible = 60) 45 out of 60 75% 75%

### Existing Programs — School of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Defined Outcomes to Support All CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Identified Summative Assessment Providing Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Assess Individual Student Learning</th>
<th>Aggregate and Analyze Data at Program Level (including all locations)</th>
<th>Documented Program Improvements</th>
<th>Sum of Points per Program</th>
<th>2008–09 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Accounting</td>
<td>(1 point)</td>
<td>(2 points)</td>
<td>(3 points)</td>
<td>(4 points)</td>
<td>(5 points)</td>
<td>(15 points possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
<td>Business Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School of Management Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Score (total possible = 45) 45 out of 45 100% 100%
### Existing Programs All Schools and Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Score (total possible = 180)</strong></td>
<td>145 out of 180</td>
<td>81% 92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New or Significantly Revised Programs

(Only scored through step two as steps three through five require completing students)

#### School of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Defined Outcomes to Support All CityU Learning Goals</th>
<th>Identified Summative Assessment Providing Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Assess Individual Student Learning</th>
<th>Aggregate and Analyze Data at Program Level (including all locations)</th>
<th>Documented Program Improvements</th>
<th>Sum of Points per Program</th>
<th>2008–09 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA Management</td>
<td>(1 point)</td>
<td>(2 points)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(3 points possible)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Technology Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New or Significantly Revised Programs Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Score (total possible = 18)</strong></td>
<td>18 out of 18</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CityU programs are actively engaged in assessing student learning related to the six CityU Learning Goals. This section provides an overview of the analysis of progress in student learning as documented in the annual student learning outcomes assessment reports presented to the Academic Assessment Committee. These reports are also presented to the school deans, and the analysis of progress across programs is reviewed by the Academic Affairs Council and the provost. The annual learning outcomes assessment reports are included in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices.

**School of Management**

Programs submitting annual learning outcomes assessment reports:

- Bachelor of Science in Accounting
- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration
- Master of Business Administration
- Master of Science in Project Management

As of June 2009, four degree programs in the School of Management had presented their annual outcomes assessment reports to the Academic Assessment Committee: the Bachelor of Science in Accounting, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Master of Science in Project Management, and the Master of Business Administration. These programs represent over 90 percent of School of Management students by unduplicated head count, fall quarter 2008–09. (The Bachelor of Arts in Management, Bachelor of Science in Marketing, Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, and Master of Science in Technology Management were new programs without completing students in 2008–09. The Master of Science in Information Security began in fall 2009–10.)

Most programs in the School of Management require students to complete a capstone project that summarizes and integrates learning across the program, and applies it to the kinds of situations typically encountered in professional settings. For program-level assessment, a sample of these capstones are made anonymous and reviewed by qualified faculty from outside the program using rubrics related to program outcomes. This process allows for a determination of the percentage of capstones reviewed that meets or exceeds the performance standards set by faculty.

**Bachelor of Science in Accounting and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration**

Results from the review of capstone projects in the BS Accounting and BS Business Administration programs indicate that completing students are achieving most program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals at or above the target levels established by program faculty. Accounting and Business Administration students take their capstone course (BSM 495) as the last course in their program. This course is taken in conjunction with all BSBA students in an effort to give them exposure to, appreciation of, and experience working with students in different majors and diverse perspectives. The methodology used for the capstone review remains the same. Final projects were collected from spring quarter 2008 BSM 495 courses from all locations. An appropriate random sample of projects was selected for review. Each project was reviewed by two evaluators (selected by the program director from a pool of qualified faculty members external to the capstone course) using a detailed rubric of program outcomes. Results are presented in Figure 2.13.

In both 2006–07 and 2007–08, student achievement of program outcomes related to the CityU Learning Goals of professional identity, critical thinking, and communication skills met or exceeded targets. In 2006–07, achievement related to ethical practice and global perspectives also met or exceeded the targets, but dropped below the threshold in 2007–08. Course revisions, faculty preparation, and other strategies are in place to address this change.
The MBA was in transition between old and new curriculum, as the result of a program review conducted three years ago, and implemented in phases across the multiple locations in which the program is offered. Results of evaluating capstone projects in the old version of the program also illuminated poor alignment among the old capstone project, the program outcomes, and the CityU Learning Goals. As the new curriculum was implemented, a new capstone model was put in place, in which students produce a business plan using software that allows for construction in stages and better comparability (see Figure 2.14). The first review of this new capstone in the spring 2008–2009 academic year showed students achieving the program learning outcomes at high levels. Each program outcome is more tightly related to one or more CityU Learning Goal(s), indicating that students completing the new MBA curriculum are also achieving these goals at high levels.

The assessment results for the MS in Project Management were analyzed as part of that program’s major program review (see the continuous improvement of academic programs described earlier in this section). The capstone for the MSPM program is a thesis in the field of project management. In June 2008, a review was conducted of completed theses in the MSPM program by an independent consultant who holds a Project Management Professional credential from the Project Management Institute. This consultant was not involved in the design or instruction of the MSPM program or courses. The review encompassed theses written by cohort students in the classrooms in Washington State, in the TEI program in Piraeus, Greece, and those completed by online students. The theses completed from June 2006 to July 2007 were reviewed. A total of forty-eight completed theses were reviewed against the twelve MSPM program outcomes (see Figure 2.15). It should be noted that a thesis, by design, is an opportunity for a
**Figure 2.14: MBA Capstone Results**

**MBA Student Score Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>1 - Poor</th>
<th>2 - Fair</th>
<th>3 - Proficient</th>
<th>4 - Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communicate effectively both orally and in writing with internal and external stakeholders.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lead individuals and organizations to achieve business missions and goals in a global environment.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Build, lead, and participate in productive and diverse teams.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leverage managerial effectiveness through recognition of individual strengths, values, and business philosophy.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use people skills to manage diverse work environments and navigate organizational politics.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capitalize on business opportunities in a rapidly changing environment by thinking critically and applying quantitative procedures and tools.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recognize when information is needed; find, evaluate, and use it to support continuous professional and organizational development.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Manage projects successfully through effective resource allocation, use of technology, and cross-functional awareness.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.15: MSPM Theses Review Results**

**MSPM Theses Review: 48 Students, All Locations & Delivery Models Combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of student theses scored at each level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PM process knowledge</td>
<td>14 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project initiation – goals, timetables, budgets</td>
<td>20 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project team management</td>
<td>31 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project communications</td>
<td>19 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project planning</td>
<td>27 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project monitoring and tracking</td>
<td>31 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PM software use</td>
<td>22 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legal/financial/accounting management</td>
<td>24 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Proposal/plan evaluation</td>
<td>7 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project life-cycle understanding</td>
<td>4 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Decision making</td>
<td>25 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Effective presentation</td>
<td>11 - Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student to take one area of study and research it deeply. Therefore, a thesis as a capstone project is not designed to provide evidence of student learning in all program outcomes. However, it would be expected that a review of forty-eight theses across a variety of topic areas would provide a generalized sense of how well students are accomplishing program outcomes in aggregate.

The primary conclusion of faculty conducting the review was that the thesis paper produced by students was not well aligned with the program outcomes, making the results difficult to use. Because of the timing of the program review, its curriculum had not yet been aligned with the CityU Learning Goals. Results of the evaluation of student theses, when they could be matched with CityU Learning Goals, were not encouraging. This led to the comprehensive revision of the curriculum, starting with the redefinition of program outcomes, and identification of a new approach to learning outcomes assessment, in which students will produce a portfolio of work based on action research. This should provide much better evidence of student learning in the next assessment cycle.

Albright School of Education

Programs submitting annual learning outcomes assessment reports:

- Teacher Certification programs: Bachelor of Arts in Education and Master in Teaching
- Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction — Professional Certification
- Master of Education in Educational Leadership
- Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling
- Master of Education in Reading and Literacy

As of June 2009, all six degree programs in the Albright School of Education had presented their annual outcomes assessment reports to the Academic Assessment Committee: the two Teacher Certification programs (BA Education and Master in Teaching) and the four Master of Education specialties (Curriculum and Instruction — Professional Certification; Educational Leadership; Guidance and Counseling; and Reading and Literacy). The BA in Early Childhood Education is a new program in fall 2009–10.

Many of these programs must respond not only to CityU’s standards regarding student learning assessment, but also to standards and expectations established by the state of Washington’s regulations regarding teacher preparation and education. This adds complexity to the task of trying to align outcomes with assessments to produce evidence of student achievement. Moreover, most programs use a standards-based, developmental approach in which students receive instruction, support, and individual coaching until they can demonstrate meeting standards. Summative assessments therefore often wind up with 100 percent “pass” rates, making it difficult for faculty to make distinctions about student learning that will assist them in improving their programs.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS: BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION AND MASTER IN TEACHING

The Bachelor of Arts in Education and Master in Teaching programs have three major assessments in common: Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA), Essential Dispositions, and Standards-based e-portfolio. The fourth major assessment in the BA Education program is the positive impact on student learning project, while MIT candidates accomplish an action research project. The PPA is a state-mandated assessment developed jointly by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) and the Washington Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (WACTE), while CityU faculty developed all rubrics for the other three assessments. Cooperating teachers and field supervisors directly evaluate BA Education and MIT teacher candidates with the Essential Dispositions rubric at the conclusion of each internship, so the assessment has both formative and summative elements. Candidates receive ongoing formative assessment throughout the
program. During internships, field supervisors provide feedback on candidates’ performance in teaching activities through observation forms and field experience reports. Candidates conduct ongoing self-assessment through reflection, journaling, critical incident reports (BA in Education), professional development goals, and draft professional development plans. During course work, candidates receive ongoing formative assessment through rubrics identified in course syllabi. For example, during all teaching methods courses, candidates receive feedback on written instructional plans. A major aspect of the PPA is the written instructional plan a candidate prepares prior to delivering a lesson, evaluated by the field supervisor.

Data on the major assessments is collected annually as candidates complete the program. The Teacher Certification Programs Assessment Committee aggregates data across all sites for overall program analysis and disaggregates data by site and program for analysis at the site level. The TCP Assessment Committee reviews aggregated data and develops a program-level improvement plan for the following academic year. In addition, each site reviews disaggregated data specific to its local operations and develops a site improvement plan for the following academic year.

TCP expects 100 percent of all candidates who enter student teaching to complete all requirements successfully and earn teacher certification:

- Passed WEST-B (state-mandated requirement for program entry)
- Passed WEST-E (state-mandated requirement for program completion; TCP requires completion prior to beginning student teaching)
- Passed PPA — all fifty-seven items “met” (state-mandated requirement)
- Passed Essential Dispositions rubric (TCP requirement; all items scored 2 or higher)
- Passed BA Ed. or MIT Standards-based e-portfolio rubric (all standards “met” as determined by faculty advisor)
- BA Education candidates successfully completed positive impact on student learning project (all items on presentation and report rubrics 2 or higher — candidates reaccomplish until they meet standard)
- MIT candidates successfully completed action research project (all items on presentation and report rubrics 2 or higher — candidates reaccomplish until they meet standard)
In the 2007–2008 academic year, program completion ratios were as follows:

- BA Education — 60 completed/0 did not complete
- One-year MIT — 107 completed/1 did not complete
- Two-year MIT — 83 completed/0 did not complete
- Alternate Routes — 40 completed/0 did not complete

In the Teacher Certification programs, the use of the state-mandated Performance Pedagogy Assessment during student teaching provides evidence that candidates have achieved outcomes related to CityU Learning Goals of strong communication and interpersonal skills and diverse and global perspectives. The positive impact on student learning project in the BA Education and the action research project in the Master in Teaching provide evidence of achievement of outcomes related to critical thinking and lifelong learning. The Essential Dispositions rubric and the presentation of the candidates’ electronic portfolios demonstrate achievement related to professional competency and ethical practice.

**Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction**

The Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction program was revised in 2007–2008. Program plans and Course Design Guides define the alignment of the CityU Learning Goals with the Curriculum and Instruction program/course outcomes. Program outcomes align with all six of CityU’s Learning Goals. Due to the implementation of the state of Washington’s external and uniform assessment system, some of the program outcomes will be revisited, revised, and reviewed for consistency with both the state of Washington’s standards for professional certification and CityU’s Learning Goals between summer 2009 and winter 2010.

In the M.Ed. Curriculum and Instruction, candidates complete a portfolio and present it to faculty as evidence of professional competence. Assessments were conducted by a team of three facilitators and the program coordinator. Of the 117 electronic portfolios that were submitted for Cohort 5 completers, 51 were assessed a second time using the Assessment of Portfolio for Professional Certificate rubric, and of the 51, five were assessed a third time to determine whether or not the candidate’s portfolio met standard. Three of the five were accepted after revisions were made, and two candidates were required to resubmit their entire portfolios. In each case, the program coordinator worked with the candidate and his/her facilitator via phone conferences, and reviewed each section of the portfolio that did not meet standards. The collaboration with candidate, facilitator, and program coordinator provided anecdotal data that were included at the annual faculty/facilitator meeting. Barriers to candidate success were identified and programmatic practices amended, including identification of resources intended to remedy candidate readiness for the Teacher Professional Certification program.

Candidates must produce a coherent written analysis of practice, conduct a successful presentation to demonstrate achievement of communication skills, and lead professional growth team meetings as evidence of interpersonal skills. Critical thinking is demonstrated through reflective and analytical entries in the portfolio that show the candidate’s positive impact on K–12 student learning. Candidate participation in a professional learning community (facilitator-led regional study-group cohort) and completion of professional growth activities identified in the approved professional growth plan provide evidence of ethical practice. Evidence as presented in portfolio entries of building and maintaining a supportive learning community for all students in the candidate’s instructional context shows learning related to diverse and global perspectives. Analysis of the positive impact on K–12 student learning, and ongoing analysis of professional development goals, professional accomplishments, advocacy, and contributions provide evidence of commitment to lifelong learning.
MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

In the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, which is offered in Washington and in British Columbia, the CityU Learning Goals lend themselves naturally to merge with the outcomes of the educational program. The programs are based on the six Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, which have been adopted by forty-five states and are widely accepted internationally.

In the U.S. program, the first major summative assessment is the e-portfolio, which has four parts: log, reflections, assessment, and evidence pages. There is a different e-portfolio for the K–12 Educational Leadership program and for the Executive Leadership (superintendent’s credential) program, but they are both based on the ISLLC Standards. The e-portfolio is first completed at the end of the first course in the sequence of emphasis courses and updated again at the end of the M.Ed. If a candidate continues to internship, the e-portfolio is updated at the end of the emphasis courses and at the end of each quarter during the yearlong internship. The second summative assessment is the final PowerPoint presentation summarizing the total experience of the student either in an internship or in a terminal M.Ed. program. The presentation summarizes the experiences during the internship or the M.Ed. program, synthesizes what was learned, and presents a professional growth plan or goals for the future. A third summative assessment includes two plans for an ideal school. The fourth summative assessment is the completion of a file that includes mentor evaluations and all of the documents for state certification. The e-portfolio includes experiences and reflections that demonstrate meeting all of the state standards and all of the CityU Learning Goals.

Data were collected and summarized on the PowerPoint presentations for 2007 at all three sites. Every student received a grade of 3.0 or higher, which was the expectation. Summary data was collated for all of the candidates’ assessments of meeting the ISLLC Standards and outcomes for the four domains for 2005–06 and 2006–07. Summary data were collated for the evaluation of the internship candidates by their mentors for 2005–06 and 2006–07. All documents for state certification are evaluated by the field supervisor, the mentor, and the Educational Leadership faculty before the CityU certification office requests certification from the state. Each instructor and field supervisor continually evaluates the candidates’ performance, and if a candidate is not meeting standard, that candidate is contacted and required to make adjustments. Students are continually given feedback on projects, papers, presentations, logs, reflections, assessments, and their professional growth plans. The evaluation of candidate performance during the internship will also be accomplished by the P.O.L.E. 360 survey, which contains feedback from colleagues and supervisors on meeting the ISLLC Standards. Summary data for 2009 will be provided by the developer of the survey.

Growth on the ISLLC Standards is assessed by individual students and approved by the mentor and the field supervisor. Results for 2005–06 and 2006–07 show that all students grew significantly during these two cycles and that they met the goals of the program. Mentor evaluations for the starting and ending quarters for the 2005–06 and 2006–07 school years showed that each mentor rated the students affirmatively and the ratings demonstrated competence and growth on the standards at the end of the year. A summary of the P.O.L.E. 360 results for 2008–09 (included in the program’s learning outcomes assessment report in the Evidence of Student Learning section of the Appendices) showed that students were growing in positive directions and that they assessed themselves fairly accurately.

In the British Columbia programs, the portfolio assessment is an oral presentation to a panel of adjudicators using an attached rubric based on the six goals and the leadership dimensions used in the province of British Columbia. This formative assessment enables the student to reflect on his/her learning and to set up goals for improvement. The comprehensive exam tests for student mastery of the major learning
outcomes. Each course has an oral presentation in which the six CityU Learning Goals are assessed: thinking skills, critical inquiry, professional competence, written and verbal skills, lifelong learning, and ethical behavior. A major research project is a formative assessment that demonstrates student progress in research and analytical thinking. The Leadership Practice Inventory is a self-assessment, peer-assessment instrument designed to measure growth over the two years of the program.

In British Columbia, the Teacher Qualifications Service (TQS) randomly selects research projects (minimum of five) to evaluate student writing skills and knowledge; work is judged by a panel. The Degree Quality Assessment Board of British Columbia (DQAB) sends a team of three inspectors to examine student mastery, success rates, quality of work, research, and the meeting of standards. Samples of 10 percent are randomly selected along with interviews with staff and students. The overall quality of the program continues to be high in terms of students' achievement and student placement. Students continue to mature as leaders and all of them are meeting the ISLLC Standards. Faculty follow each student after the program in order to assist them in obtaining a new job, and they are beginning to track this data as part of the outcomes assessment process.

**MASTER OF EDUCATION IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING**

In the M.Ed. in Guidance and Counseling program, assessing student learning has been challenged by lack of common assessment tools at the various sites. With the new curriculum development process and the feedback from the last OSPI visit, program faculty revisited all program and candidate learning assessments. They developed a common expectation of four summative assessments in each three-credit course with the exception of practica and internship support courses. Each of these assessments has a corresponding rubric. A paper portfolio is submitted and reviewed during the candidate’s exit interview. A comprehensive exam is also given at the end of the program. The program director aggregates data across all sites for overall program analysis and plans to disaggregate data by site by summer 2010 (see Figure 2.16).

A preliminary analysis of student performance related to the CityU Learning Goals indicated strengths in the area of professional competence, as evidenced by data showing 99 percent of graduates

---

**Figure 2.16: Master of Education in Guidance and Counseling Major Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Assessment</th>
<th>When is data collected?</th>
<th>How is data collected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Skills Tapes</td>
<td>Courses 620, 515, and 514 (start 4/09)</td>
<td>From an audio or video recording (three graders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance Paper</td>
<td>Course 513 (start 5/09)</td>
<td>Written paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External reader (start 5/09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>At the end of the program</td>
<td>Proctored exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One grader for all sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Portfolio</td>
<td>At the end of the program</td>
<td>Exit interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe, Analyze, and Reflect Paper</td>
<td>EGC 504</td>
<td>External readers (start 4/09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plans and Presentation</td>
<td>EGC 510</td>
<td>Instructors submit grades for this assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation of Internship III</td>
<td>EGC 623</td>
<td>Field supervisors and cooperating counselors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
secure ESA (Educational Staff Associate) certificates as counselors. Communication skills are evidenced in ten of the courses that require a paper or presentation, and seven courses require collaborative work that is related to building interpersonal skills. In at least seven courses, papers are required that include specific analytic tasks supporting critical thinking, but greater emphasis on drawing logical conclusions and evaluating implications of actions and decisions is needed. In support of developing ethical practice, the ASCA (American School Counselor Association) code of ethics is integrated into courses; successful performance on Essential Dispositions rubric also provides evidence of meeting this learning goal.

Increasing standardization of ethical scenarios used in online discussion will improve the ability of program faculty to analyze student performance in this realm. Professional Education Advisory Board members and instructors supported the importance of greater emphasis on diverse and global perspectives, leading to the adoption of a new text entitled “A Social Justice Advocacy Framework for Professional School Counselors.” Program leadership also seeks to increase the diversity of faculty and to increase support for struggling minority candidates in the program.

In relation to lifelong learning, candidates attend one professional conference, and starting in fall 2009, candidates will draft professional development plans and take a culminating seminar course.

**MASTER OF EDUCATION IN READING AND LITERACY**

Currently, the Reading and Literacy program is in a major transitional period. This has occurred for a few reasons. The Washington State competencies for Reading and Literacy have recently changed and evolved, which means that courses need to change and evolve to meet these new standards for the endorsement portion of the degree. Several leadership changes over the past year have left parts of the program disjointed. For these reasons, a program redesign was undertaken, along with numerous course redesigns, to ensure all state competencies as well as university and program outcomes are successfully completed at or above a proficient level. This proficiency was set at a 3.0 (on a 4.0 grade scale) on all assignments directly correlating with a competency or outcome. Candidates demonstrate this proficiency through a variety of ways including research papers, assignments, model lessons, presentations, formal and informal assessments, and

---

**Figure 2.17: Master of Education in Reading and Literacy Major Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Assessment</th>
<th>When is data collected?</th>
<th>How is data collected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Research Project</td>
<td>First and third quarters of first year</td>
<td>Written paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating Research Project</td>
<td>Fourth quarter of first year</td>
<td>Written paper and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Unit</td>
<td>First quarter of second year</td>
<td>Lesson plans and student examples of best work, presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERA</td>
<td>First quarter of second year</td>
<td>Lesson plans and written paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>End of program</td>
<td>Written exam and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Portfolio</td>
<td>Each quarter with final submission the fourth quarter of second year</td>
<td>CD collection of all major assignments and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Learning Log</td>
<td>Each quarter with final submission the fourth quarter of second year</td>
<td>CD collection of all major assignments and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST-E Exam (for Washington students)</td>
<td>Upon completion of program</td>
<td>State-mandated test; results sent two to four weeks after completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thoughtful reflections (see Figure 2.17). All pieces of evidence, starting with the 2009 cohort, are saved on a CD that is collected at the end of the program. The program director aggregates data across all sites for overall program analysis, and plans to disaggregate data by site in summer 2010.

Recent changes have been implemented to refocus the artifacts students place into a portfolio and how they are used to evaluate student learning. An analysis of student learning related to the CityU Learning Goals based on the old portfolios revealed strengths and opportunities for improvement related to each. Regarding professional competency and professional identity, strengths include a 91 percent pass rate of the state-mandated WEST-E exam for students in Washington. The program will improve orientation and rubrics used to evaluate candidate portfolios, as well as providing web-based portfolios for candidates to use after program completion. Regarding communication skills, the program requires candidates to achieve at least a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale on all writing assignments and assessments. Oral communication and collaboration are improved through activities such as mock school-board presentations, collaborative group assignments, and mock assessments in class, which are conducted before actual student assessments. Candidates sometimes struggle to meet the expectations for written work, and the program will implement more writing support and use of the Smarthinking online writing lab.

Regarding critical thinking, more assignments emphasize analysis and higher levels of thinking; the actual implementation of learning into a candidate’s classroom is also evaluated. Evidence regarding ethical practice and service is collected by assessing how well candidates complete state competencies at the proficient level and requiring them to address the development of family partnerships and learning communities. Program faculty are working on integrating content regarding ethical practice into all courses. The implementation of a newly redesigned course, Education and a Global Society, addresses diverse and global perspectives, and as with ethical practice, faculty are working to integrate global perspectives across the program. The emphasis on providing candidates with lessons, units, and assessment tool kits they can apply immediately in their own classrooms, and the requirement for ongoing reflection and self-assessment support development of skills for lifelong learning.

**Division of Arts and Sciences**

Programs submitting annual learning outcomes assessment reports:
- Associate of Science and Bachelor of Science in General Studies
- Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology
- Bachelor of Science in Communications
- Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology/Master of Counselling

As of July 2009, all four degree programs in the Division of Arts and Sciences had submitted their annual learning outcomes assessment reports: the two General Studies degree programs, the BA in Applied Psychology (BAAP), the BS in Communications, and the MA in Counseling Psychology/Master of Counselling program.

**ASSOCIATE OF SCIENCE AND BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN GENERAL STUDIES**

The Associate of Science and the Bachelor of Science in General Studies present unique challenges in developing program assessment strategies. The General Studies program at City University is an individualized program that enables students to construct a set of courses from programs offered throughout the university to fulfill either the associate’s degree or bachelor’s degree. Because of the wide variety of courses that can be used to fulfill these degrees, the capstone courses required of all students must serve as the vehicle for assessing achievement of learning outcomes.

In 2008, there were 55 students who completed their capstone projects in GS 295 and 28 students who completed their capstone projects in GS 495.
The students assessed and reflected on their leadership styles, trends in their professional fields, and CityU degree program. The results were analyzed by the faculty who supervised the capstone course.

All six CityU Learning Goals (professional competency and professional identity, strong communication and interpersonal skills, critical thinking, commitment to ethical practice and service, diverse and global perspectives, lifelong learning) are addressed in CityU courses and specifically in the GS capstone requirement through reflection and assessment papers. The first round of review of the capstone projects indicate that the course needs to be redesigned so that evidence produced by students is better aligned with the CityU Learning Goals. The requirements for the GS capstone courses date back to at least 2004. They are in need of change. A portfolio requirement is needed in each of the courses to make it more relevant to the student, and the capstone requirements for GS 295 and GS 495 are too similar and need to be more differentiated.

**Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology**

Students in this program complete a portfolio at the end of their studies that includes samples of their work and artifacts from their culminating community service projects. Students receive ongoing feedback on formative assessment throughout their BAAP program, and receive copies of graded summative assessments with detailed feedback from instructors. Students receive feedback from peer review of their community projects as well as feedback from supervisors at sites where they completed projects.

In addition to collecting review data from the faculty teaching PSY 498, the course in which students submit their portfolios, a faculty member who did not teach that course analyzed portfolios and community projects. While community projects were all rated as being at standard or exceeding standards, analysis of portfolios revealed serious concerns. None of the portfolios was rated at standard, mostly because they were missing various documents demonstrating professional growth and reflection on future professional goals.

A sample of thirteen portfolios was collected and analyzed. Out of the thirteen portfolios, one was rated as *does not meet standards*, eight were rated as *approaching standards*, and four were rated as *meets standards*. None of the portfolios was rated as *exceeds standards*. The majority of the portfolios collected for the analysis addressed the following CityU Learning Goals — professional competency and identity, critical thinking, and communication and interpersonal skills. Commitment to ethical practice, diverse and global perspective, and lifelong learning were not present in all portfolios.

Analysis of the portfolios showed that most of the students do not understand what to include in the portfolio to demonstrate their learning and professional growth as they go through the program. They simply select papers that they believe are their best papers. However, those papers are not necessarily addressing various CityU Learning Goals. Similarly, they do not show alignment with program outcomes. Additionally, students do not complete thoughtful reflection on their professional growth and future goals. Their goals might be listed, but there is a lack of specificity about how they plan to achieve them. It would be unfair to blame students for those weaknesses of their portfolios, but definitely it is something that needs improvement, especially since throughout the program students complete many papers that address CityU Learning Goals in alignment with program outcomes.

Portfolios also show that students’ communication and writing and APA skills are fairly good, but still need improvement. That issue should be addressed in several classes before students are in their final class, PSY 498. Those skills should be taught in PSY 311 and mastered throughout the entire program. In addition to clarity of instruction for the portfolios, there is also a problem with their format and collection. Some students continue to send hard copies of their portfolios, which contributes to losing them or losing items from them. Some students include original documents
and samples of work, and request the return of those portfolios. For those reasons, there is a need for clarity about what should be the format of documents included in the portfolios. Revised instructions for students will be implemented in the 2009–2010 academic year.

Students demonstrate achievement of professional competence and professional identity through the design and implementation of their community project as well as professional portfolio. Lack of clarity about what needs to be included in the portfolio seems to be an area needing improvement. Review of the portfolios showed that skills related to written communication are in need of improvement. Critical thinking is evaluated in the reflection paper of the practicum project and in the students’ self-reflection about their learning and goals. Commitment to ethical practice and service is demonstrated in the community project and the professional portfolio. Working with diverse populations is addressed in assessments and/or discussion questions. The successful completion of PSY 315 projects, the community project, and professional portfolio demonstrate lifelong learning goals. Lack of a professional reflective component in portfolios seems to be an area for improvement. Therefore, future portfolio instructions should clearly specify the need for reflective essays of students’ learning in the program and deliberation on future goals.

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN COMMUNICATIONS

Since the Bachelor of Science in Communications program began taking students in fall of 2006, there have been few summative assessments completed. In 2007–08, there were five students who completed their practicum projects and earned their BS in Communications degrees. The results were analyzed by the instructor who supervised the practicum. The students also had their project supervisors complete an assessment form.

In the Bachelor of Science in Communications program, the development of the portfolio and the preparation and completion of a practicum project allow students to demonstrate learning related to professional competence and professional identity. In the practicum project, students create individual communications-focused projects, such as communications plans for employers, a chronicle of the development of a new community newspaper, or a comprehensive grant proposal for a local fire department. Portfolios all include reflection papers of their projects and of the communications program. They also put together a portfolio of course work, résumé, and practicum project documents. The practicum project and portfolio of course work serve as the vehicle for assessing the rest of the CityU Learning Goals as well.

The initial review of a small group of graduates demonstrated the need for more specific guidelines for the practicum and portfolio to improve their usefulness as program assessment tools. For example, the instructions for the portfolio should clarify exactly what needs to be included (one of the projects from COM 320, 321, or 418 must be included, as well as a research paper from a 300-level class, and one from a 400-level class). The format for submission of the portfolio and project needs to be clarified for students. Revised instructions for students will be implemented in the 2009–2010 academic year.

MASTER OF ARTS IN COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY/MASTER OF COUNSELLING

The Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology (Master of Counselling in British Columbia and Alberta, Canada) has two major, summative assessments wherever the program is offered (currently in the United States and Canada): comprehensive examinations and internship evaluations by clinical supervisors at internship sites. The comprehensive examinations (oral and written) are given at the end of the second year of the three-year program. Students must pass these examinations before they can begin internships and thesis work in the third year. These examinations provide evidence of student learning in all courses taken prior to the examinations. Internship evaluations are completed by clinical supervisors at the end of each quarter.
of internship (at least twice), including a final evaluation at the completion of internship hours. These evaluations provide evidence of student learning at the end of the program. The initial evaluations by clinical supervisors may be considered formative in nature along with their informal, verbal feedback to students in weekly supervision sessions. The final internship evaluations are summative (see Figure 2.18).

Evidence of achievement of program outcomes related to the CityU Learning Goals is collected through analysis of student performance on the faculty-developed, case-study-based comprehensive examination and final evaluations by clinical internship supervisors. Data on the major assessments were collected for 2005–2007 for the 2008 program review. It will be collected annually hereafter. The program director and members of the MACP/MOC faculty aggregate data across all sites for overall program analysis and disaggregate data by site and program for analysis at the site level. The program director and program coordinators are currently reviewing aggregated data (and where available, site-level data) and have developed a program revision plan for the current academic year.

Data collected over the last several years show consistently high levels of student accomplishment on program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. In the 2007–2008 academic year, for example, an analysis of final evaluations by clinical internship supervisors showed that all students being evaluated met or exceeded standards for achievement of program outcomes related to five of the six CityU Learning Goals; only one student evaluated in that period did not meet standards related to professional competence. The chart displayed above compares internship supervisor ratings for 2007–08 by the locations at which the program is offered.

**Summary of Analysis of Progress in Student Learning Related to CityU Learning Goals**

This analysis of the first year of program assessment reports reveals the strengths and challenges inherent
in CityU’s approach to outcomes assessment. CityU’s centrally developed curricula allows for strong alignment of CityU Learning Goals, program outcomes, and assessments. Faculty spend a significant amount of time designing authentic assessments that provide evidence of student learning on program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. The emphasis on authentic assessment means that summative assessments are generally highly relevant to the professional settings in which students will work. Students invest time and energy in completing the assessments as a result of this relevance. However, this approach also adds complexity to the process of evaluating assessments and distilling results into information that lends itself to program improvements; moreover, it makes comparisons across programs and to national data sets difficult.

The linking of program learning outcomes to the CityU Learning Goals reinforces the emphasis on authentic assessment. Rather than “layering over” another set of learning outcomes and another set of assessment tools, which would risk disconnecting the CityU Learning Goals from the curricula and instruction, this approach requires faculty to emphasize the connections between them. Core skills like critical thinking and information literacy are not afterthoughts in curriculum design; they are intrinsic to the curricula in each program. It is necessary to establish clear, concise, and valid connections between the program learning outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals. In many of the program assessment reports, faculty found this to be quite a challenge. The initial tendency in some programs to say that each program learning outcome related back to all six of the CityU Learning Goals is changing as faculty are refining program and course outcomes, focusing on what it really means to align with the CityU Learning Goals, and identifying the best ways to collect and analyze direct evidence of student learning.

The experience of the past year shows that the best way to infuse the CityU Learning Goals into program level outcomes is to drill down to the course level, ensure a connection between the course outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals, and then carry that connection forward to the program level. This is done by first establishing a solid link between course outcomes and related CityU Learning Goals. Next, it is important to ensure that the assessments used to measure those outcomes do, in fact, provide evidence of achievement on both the course outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals. The committees established within each to evaluate and approve curricula are systematizing a process to ensure that whenever a CityU Learning Goal is specified in a course, course documents clearly show how the evidence of achievement of CityU Learning Goals is to be gathered and assessed within that course. This process naturally supports the link between the program outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals once it is properly established at the course level.

Where there is good quantitative data, in programs with summative assessments that are well aligned to program outcomes, analysis shows student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals is generally strong. If there are areas of weakness, they seem to be in the areas of ethical practice and diverse and global perspectives. As programs identify these areas, the faculty work to determine the best interventions, resulting in plans to update curricula, better prepare instructors, and/or better align assessment tools.

**Student and Alumni Perception of Achievement of CityU Learning Goals**

While the analysis of direct evidence of student learning appropriately receives far more attention and emphasis, CityU also reviews secondary evidence as a supplement and complement to the analysis of primary evidence. The university conducts annual surveys of its students that ask for their perceptions of how well programs support their learning in the areas related to the CityU Learning Goals. It surveys its alumni every two to three years, including parallel questions about learning in the areas of the CityU Learning Goals.

In the Student Satisfaction surveys conducted
in the 2007–08 and 2008–09 academic years, students generally rated their perceptions of their studies’ contribution to achieving the CityU Learning Goals positively. Figure 2.19 compares the results from year to year, indicating that student perceptions are trending up in each area.

The items receiving the lowest positive ratings by students in both years are those related to diverse and global perspectives (“my studies prepare me to work effectively in international and/or multicultural settings,” and “my studies improve my ability to work in diverse cultural environments”). This mirrors the analysis of direct evidence of student learning in the undergraduate business programs. The high positive ratings on items related to critical thinking (my studies improve my ability to think critically about information and problems) and information literacy (my studies improve my ability to find, evaluate, and use relevant information) reflect the strong emphasis on building these skills into the curriculum in all programs over the last several years, including the incorporation of librarians in curriculum design teams.

Consistent with authentic assessment findings, overall, at least 70 percent of students responding to the survey in 2008–09 gave positive ratings to all of the items related to the CityU Learning Goals.

In addition, in spring 2008, CityU surveyed alumni regarding their perceptions of the outcomes of their CityU education. Nearly one thousand alumni participated. Of those who responded, 64 percent indicated they were employed in a field related to their CityU degree; 74 percent indicated their CityU education directly contributed to their professional advancement; and just over half indicated their incomes had increased as a direct result of their CityU education.

In relation to the CityU Learning Goals, participating alumni were asked to indicate how well their studies at CityU prepared them in all six areas (see Figure 2.20). Although many completed their education prior to the development of the Academic Model and the articulation of the CityU Learning Goals, most alumni indicated their programs did a good job of improving their knowledge and skills in these areas. This served as a good validation of the assumption that the CityU Learning Goals were an articulation of the university’s existing mission and well aligned with
its historical practice. The results from alumni mirror the results from current students, with the areas receiving the lowest number of positive ratings being those related to diverse and global perspectives. Both of these indirect measures of student learning indicate the university has made substantial progress to date, with room for improvement to ensure that all students who successfully complete its programs do so with high levels of learning in these areas.

CityU’s learning outcomes assessment process is driven by its mission and values. The mission and values are incorporated into learning goals established at the institutional, program, and course levels; these goals are integrated into curriculum design and program delivery. The framework provided by the Academic Model (see Appendix E) and the Philosophy of Assessment (see Appendix F) informs curriculum design and program delivery as well. CityU’s program review policy requires programs to analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning on a regular basis, forming the basis for continuous improvement. These improvement plans are then implemented to improve student learning, and their results are captured in the next round of data collection and evidence.

Figure 2.20: Spring 2007–08 Alumni Survey on CityU Learning Goals

Since 2005, CityU faculty and academic leadership have remained focused on implementing a comprehensive approach to assessing student learning related to the CityU Learning Goals (previously referred to as institutional learning outcomes). Since 2005, CityU has taken the following actions:

- All degree programs have aligned their program learning outcomes with the CityU Learning Goals.
- All degree programs have established summative assessment tools to provide direct evidence of student learning related to the CityU Learning Goals.
- All degree programs with data from completing students undertook analysis of that data and determined potential program improvements.
- All degree programs with data from completing students reported on their progress to the Academic Assessment Committee.

These actions led to the first integrated summary of student learning related to the CityU Learning Goals across academic programs. The initial summary indicates relatively good levels of achievement and suggests
many potential improvements to the process, including strengthening the alignment of evidence all the way from the course level to the program level to the CityU Learning Goals. These lessons will be applied as programs go through their second year of annual student learning outcomes assessment reports in 2009–10. Student perceptions of how well their academic programs deliver learning in the areas of the CityU Learning Goals are also generally good and improving.

CityU remains committed to refining its learning outcomes assessment strategies, using the direct evidence of student learning to improve programs, and ultimately ensuring that student learning is consistent with the university’s mission to change lives for good by providing high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.

**ACADEMIC POLICIES**

CityU’s academic policies are designed to support its mission and values, combining flexibility and access with rigorous academic standards. They are organized into categories of admissions, degree requirements, transfer and award of academic credit, prior learning, distance learning, student mobility, and cancellation of courses and programs.

**Admissions**

City University of Seattle’s undergraduate degree and certificate programs are open to applicants who hold high school or equivalent or GED diplomas, who have demonstrated English proficiency according to the standards set forth in CityU’s English Proficiency policy, who adhere to any program-specific admission requirements, and who may benefit from postsecondary education.

Undergraduate students are required to demonstrate that they have met the requirements for college writing and college math as defined by the City University of Seattle Catalog prior to enrolling in upper-division undergraduate course work. This can be done through successful completion of courses at CityU that are designated as meeting college writing and college math requirements; through transfer of directly equivalent courses from other accredited or recognized institutions; through recognized standardized tests such as CLEP and DANTES; via the course challenge process; or through CityU’s Prior Learning Assessment process.

Students who enter City University of Seattle as candidates for associate’s or bachelor’s degrees or for undergraduate certificates may already have completed courses at other educational institutions, as documented by official transcripts. For courses to be transferred into undergraduate programs, students must have achieved 2.0 or better decimal grades or “C” or better alpha grades.

Students also may have participated in events outside of a classroom that would qualify as learning experiences worthy of credit. CityU awards appropriate academic credit for such experiences provided they are placed within a well-defined educational plan that is part of a structured degree program.

Through acceptance of transfer credit, CityU acknowledges advanced standing toward degree and certificate programs. Transfer credit may include the following:

- Appropriate courses satisfactorily completed at regionally accredited or nationally recognized institutions
- Acceptable scores on standardized examinations in college-level subjects
- Completion of formal noncollegiate-sponsored instructional programs
- Courses from military service schools as evaluated by the American Council on Education (ACE) and other agencies
- Credit earned from an institution that has an approved joint, dual-delivery or articulation agreement with CityU
- An evaluation of prior experiential learning at the postsecondary level
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
City University of Seattle offers its programs around the world and also attracts a high number of international students. To ensure international student success, English proficiency must be verified. If it cannot be verified, or if a student cannot meet the English language proficiency requirements, he/she can participate in English support programs.

Non-English-speaking students who participate in City University’s undergraduate programs must demonstrate English proficiency by scoring 540 on the TOEFL (or an equivalent score on a similar approved exam). If a student fails to demonstrate proficiency at this level, he/she has the option to enroll in ESL training. The student will be placed anywhere from ESL level 1 to 6 depending on his/her TOEFL score. That student must complete and pass all remaining sections of ESL before he/she will be allowed to enroll in any academic programs. Currently, ESL courses are taught in Bellevue, WA, and at CityU locations in Slovakia and Switzerland.

Similar to the process for undergraduate students, non-English-speaking graduate students must demonstrate English proficiency (at a TOEFL of 567 or equivalent score on a similar approved exam) prior to enrolling in any academic program, with one exception. A graduate student, who has scored 540 or higher on the TOEFL may enroll in the Assisted MBA program. This program combines each academic course with a two-hour language support section taught by an ESL instructor who coordinates his/her activities with the instructor who is teaching the content course. The goal of the language support section is to provide English support on the topics and assessments that are part of the content course. The language support section is not so much on the content and assessments of a specific course but, instead, is on improving overall English to help students reach the appropriate level of English proficiency. This program will still provide the language support that these students need but will push students to be able to improve their English within the first three terms. Failure of the English section in any of the first three terms will require ESL training before the student will be allowed to continue in the academic program. A pilot of this program began in fall 2009.

Degree Requirements

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES
CityU offers the Associate of Science in General Studies, which includes a component of General Education and allows students to identify a specialized area of focus. It also offers the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees with disciplines including business, management, marketing, accounting, information systems, communications, education, psychology, and general studies.

Each of CityU’s baccalaureate degrees is structured in two parts: General Education requirements and requirements for the major. Most bachelor’s degrees also designate electives, minors, and/or emphasis areas. Because CityU’s bachelor’s degrees are primarily delivered as degree-completion options at the upper-division level, in some programs electives are limited. The specifics of each undergraduate degree are covered in the school and division profiles.

GENERAL EDUCATION
General education is a fundamental part of an undergraduate education. General education introduces students to a broad range of knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and natural sciences. It also ensures that students develop the requisite skills that make them effective learners in their upper-division study and contributing citizens of their communities. City University of Seattle constructs its General Education requirements in alignment with
its mission and commitment to expand educational opportunities around the world.

CityU recognizes the importance of general education for any student earning an undergraduate degree at the university. 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 math, five credits of college writing, 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, the natural sciences, the social sciences, mathematics, and English composition. These courses are managed centrally in Bellevue by the Division of Arts and Sciences. A sampling of these courses is offered each term in the United States (primarily online); however, these courses are offered more often in CityU’s European locations to allow students to enter the BS in Business Administration as freshmen and complete two years of lower-division study. Thus, the number of European students taking General Education courses is far higher than the number of U.S. students.

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 the requisite skills to become more effective learners in upper-division study. CityU has addressed the first need by requiring a standard distribution of lower-division General Education credits across various general study disciplines.

Traditionally, the three broad areas of General Education include, but are not limited to, the disciplines below:

**Humanities**
- Communications
- Languages
- Music
- Speech
- Drama/Theater
- Literature
- Philosophy/Logic
- Theology

**Social Sciences**
- Anthropology
- Ethnic Studies
- History
- Political Science
- Sociology
- Economics
- Geography
- Linguistics
- Psychology

**Natural Sciences/Mathematics**
- Astronomy
- Botany
- Computer Science
- Mathematics
- Oceanography
- Quantitative Logic
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Geology
- Meteorology
- Physics
- Statistics

Students working toward an Associate of Science in General Studies must complete 30 quarter credits in General Education including:
- College Writing Composition, 5 credits
- College Math (College Algebra), 5 credits
- Humanities, 5 credits
- Social Sciences, 5 credits
- Natural Sciences/Mathematics, 5 credits
- Electives (from any of the required areas), 5 credits
The distribution requirements for students pursuing a baccalaureate degree in General Studies are:

- College Writing (Composition), 5 credits
- College Math (College Algebra), 5 credits
- Humanities, 15 credits*
- Social Sciences, 15 credits*
- Natural Sciences/Mathematics, 15 credits*

* Some credits may be satisfied with upper-division courses, which are part of the student’s program.

College Composition is fulfilled in courses that stress written communication, and must be at least equivalent to the university’s ENG 211 course. College Mathematics must be at least equivalent to the university’s MTH 155 course. Students must complete courses in at least two separate disciplines within the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences/mathematics.

General Education requirements may be fulfilled in any combination of:

1. City University of Seattle lower- or upper-division courses, as designated; some undergraduate programs allow students to satisfy certain General Education requirements through upper-division course work
2. Courses completed at other recognized institutions
3. Standardized examinations in appropriate subjects
4. Prior Learning Assessment (PLA)

CityU meets the second goal of the General Education program, providing the opportunity to learn essential skills and abilities, by embedding and assessing General Education–related learning outcomes into all of its undergraduate degree programs. These outcomes are incorporated through the integration of City University Learning Goals in classes. In many undergraduate programs, courses meeting General Education requirements are embedded into the third year, in order to best serve the needs of adult students.

Through the combination of distribution requirements and embedded outcomes, CityU ensures that it offers undergraduate students exposure to the breadth of knowledge that characterizes a general education and the opportunity to learn the skills and abilities that are essential to engaged citizens in the twenty-first century.

In response to its changing student population, its growing international presence, and its strategic priorities, CityU is undergoing an examination of its General Education credit distribution requirements. An important consideration is creating stronger links between General Education and the upper-division courses. CityU is reviewing the content and outcomes that make up the suite of General Education courses to determine if such topics can be covered in a way that makes them more directly relevant to the upper-division courses in the student’s major.

In addition, CityU is exploring the best way to design and deliver a baccalaureate degree in a three-year time frame, to build on its global connections, expand its undergraduate offerings, and better align with similar degrees in Europe. This may mean combining General Education requirements into “modules” that require the same level of work, offer the same number of credits, and allow the students to complete them in intensive learning experiences.

**GRADUATE DEGREES**

CityU’s graduate programs in business, management, technology, counseling, and education align with its mission and focus on degree programs that are professional in orientation and practitioner-based. Each graduate program is described in some detail in the school profiles. In general, CityU master’s degrees are designed for two or more years of study, at a minimum of 45 quarter credits. CityU offers the Master of Arts, the Master of Education, the Master in Teaching, the Master of Business Administration, the Master of Public Administration, and the Master of Science in various disciplines, as described in the school and program profiles.
All degree programs at CityU are developed around a set of learning outcomes that align with the CityU Learning Goals. Learning outcomes in graduate programs set higher expectations for student achievement than those in undergraduate programs. Each graduate program requires a substantial research-based project or capstone product that is used to assess student achievement of the learning outcomes for the program. These projects and products align with the professional nature of CityU’s graduate programs by requiring students to integrate learning across their course work and apply it to real-world situations in ways that are directly relevant to their professional aspirations.

Descriptions of each graduate program in the City University of Seattle Catalog provide information on admission requirements, degree requirements such as credits required, and rules regarding the transfer of credit and academic standing.

Admission to CityU graduate-level degree and certificate programs requires that applicants hold four-year or approved three-year bachelor’s degrees or equivalent from accredited or otherwise recognized institutions. Graduate students must have submitted transcripts providing proof that they hold bachelor’s degrees before they will be allowed to register for courses in a graduate degree or certificate program. In addition, financial aid processing is not possible without a posted bachelor’s degree.

International students must have submitted transcripts indicating proof that they hold bachelor’s degrees prior to the issuance of the U.S. Immigration Form I-20 for study in the United States, or prior to the issuance of the Letter of Admission for study in Canada.

In accordance with CityU’s mission to maintain high academic standards while providing open opportunities to those who want to learn, students may pursue master’s degrees without four-year baccalaureate degrees from accredited or otherwise recognized institutions, but only in rare instances. Three-year degrees from selected countries are accepted. Other factors may influence acceptance of less-than-four-year degrees for admission.

If a student has neither a four-year nor an approved three-year degree and requests admission, the dean of the appropriate school will determine if the student may be offered Special Admission. When a request is received, it is first reviewed by the registrar, then the dean, who will make a determination based on the following criteria:

- The student has completed more than 135 undergraduate credits from an accredited or otherwise recognized institution and achieved a GPA equal to or greater than the minimum GPA admission requirements of the program.
- The student has provided three letters from references in managerial or professional positions who can attest that the student (a) has five years or more of relevant leadership experience; (b) has the speaking, writing, and quantitative skills to communicate, analyze, and problem-solve at a college level; and (c) maintains high ethical standards.
- The student submits a written statement outlining a significant project he/she has handled, citing how he/she has specifically exhibited college-level skills in communication and problem solving.
- The student is required to have a personal interview (or phone interview, when a personal meeting is impractical) with the dean or designee. If determined to be eligible for acceptance, the student will be provisionally accepted, with full acceptance pending successful completion of two master’s courses in the program. Successful completion means a 3.0 or higher in each course.

**Transfer and Award of Academic Credit**

CityU’s policies address the awarding of credit. One CityU quarter credit is equivalent to a minimum of ten hours of course work, plus an additional twenty hours of time spent studying, researching, and completing assignments.

Associate degrees require completion of 90 approved quarter credits, of which a maximum of 65 may be transferred in; a minimum of 25 credits must be earned in any mode, at any delivery location, in
enrollment residency at CityU. For military students within the Associate of Science degree of General Studies, a maximum of 85 approved quarter credits may be transferred in; a minimum of five credits must be earned in enrollment residency at CityU.

Bachelor’s degrees require completion of a minimum of 180 approved quarter credits, of which a maximum of 135 may be transferred in; a minimum of 45 upper-division credits must be earned in any mode, at any delivery location, in enrollment residency at CityU.

For a second degree, major or emphasis, an additional 45 approved upper-division credits may be transferred by way of substitution, direct equivalency, or waiver. Students must still complete 45 credits in residency with CityU.

Additional program-based requirements are documented in the City University of Seattle Catalog.

Master’s degrees are a minimum of 45 approved quarter credits. 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 credits toward a CityU master’s degree program, depending on the program. The 12 credits may be through substitution, direct equivalency, or waiver, and be equivalent to courses, as determined by similar course numbers, titles, or content. Course credits must reflect grades of 3.0 (B grade) or better. Certain degrees and program emphases may have specific transfer credit restrictions, such as those listed under each school below. Requests for exception must be obtained through the dean of the appropriate school.

To obtain a master’s degree, students must earn the total required credits in residency or “inside enrollment” at CityU, with up to 12 approved transfer credits allowed through substitution, direct equivalency, or waiver. This includes courses taken in any of its delivery formats. For a second degree, major, or emphasis, an additional 12 quarter credits or equivalent may be accepted in transfer. There are some exceptions to the above transfer credit policy as a result of dual delivery, bilateral, joint delivered, and partnered agreement with articulation between CityU and another institution.

Up to 12 quarter credits may be transferred into the Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree providing that:

- credits were earned at a recognized, accredited institution;
- credits older than six years have been approved by the Dean of the Albright School of Education;
- credits were for 500-level courses or the equivalent, as noted on the outside transcript, or as stated in the outside institutional catalog;
- credits were for courses that earned a 3.0 (B grade) or higher;
- credits satisfy the requirements of the appropriate degree and program emphasis.

From the maximum of 12 transfer credits, dependent on the program, up to six may be applied to satisfy the M.Ed. elective requirement. The additional six transfer credits may be accepted only if the registrar verifies that they are directly equivalent to prescribed M.Ed. course requirements. Credits earned in non-education business subjects and/or through an MBA degree program are not transferable into an M.Ed. degree program.

Course work transferred into the Master of Arts degree in Counseling Psychology or Master of Counselling in Canada must be directly equivalent to the appropriate CityU course or be degree equivalent as determined by the Dean.

Certificate programs, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, require that a minimum of 75 percent of the required course work is earned in any mode, at any delivery location, in enrollment residency at CityU.

Transfer Credit from Directly Equivalent Courses

Direct equivalence refers to a course successfully completed at another recognized institution, judged to be the same as a CityU course in terms of content,
duration, level, and credit value. Students may petition to receive transfer credit for any course. If approved as a direct equivalent, credit is granted, eliminating the need to take the corresponding course.

Within a dual delivery, bilateral, joint-delivered, or partnered agreement by means of articulation with another institution, by approval of the provost, and the appropriate school dean, CityU may exceed this transfer policy.

Through transfer credit, CityU acknowledges advanced standing toward degree and certificate programs. Transfer credit may include the following:

- appropriate courses satisfactorily completed at regionally accredited or nationally recognized institutions;
- acceptable scores on standardized examinations in college-level subjects;
- completion of formal noncollegiate-sponsored instructional programs;
- courses from military service schools as evaluated by the American Council on Education (ACE) and other agencies;
- credit earned from an institution that has an approved joint, dual-delivery, or articulation agreement with CityU;
- an evaluation of prior experiential learning at the postsecondary level.

Credits may be transferred from nonregionally accredited technical or vocational institutes. Similar specialized institutions that have been recognized by CityU will be evaluated on the basis of a 16.5-to-1 ratio for lecture/theory classes taken after 1/1/1996, and a 90-to-1 ratio for laboratory classes or practica. A maximum of 90 lower-division credits may be attained in this way.

In the awarding of credit for noncollegiate-sponsored instruction, CityU follows recommendations as determined and published by the Office of Educational Credit of the American Council on Education (ACE) and by the various state education departments’ Programs on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONSI). Upon request, the university also provides its own evaluation of noncollegiate-sponsored instruction that has been undertaken through local businesses, public agencies, health care and hospital facilities, and any organizations that regularly conduct formal, evaluated, in-house courses judged to be relevant to or congruent with CityU’s degree programs.

Credit by Examination

CityU participates in several nationally recognized standardized testing programs. Such exams are designed, monitored, scored, averaged, and validated by prestigious and authoritative educational testing agencies and enjoy wide acceptance throughout higher education. Information is available from the Office of Admissions and Student Services. A list of the examinations recognized by CityU follows.

**College Entrance Examination Board Advanced Placement Examinations (CEEB-AP)**

The Advanced Placement Examinations were designed by the College Entrance Examination Board to enable students to pursue college-level studies while still in secondary school. They were specifically intended to stimulate both students and teachers to higher achievement and to help eliminate the needless duplication of studies later in college. Examinations in thirteen different areas, such as biology, chemistry, classics, and European history, are available.

Advanced Placement exams are graded on a five-point scale in which one is the lowest and five is the highest. Students must achieve a minimum score of three to receive credit at CityU.

**College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)**

Sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) affords students the opportunity to obtain lower-division credit in a variety of college subjects, as well as through a series of general examinations that cover broad areas of general collegiate
education. Preparation for CLEP exams may be based on self-study or prior formal instruction.

By successfully taking the CLEP General/Subject Examinations, it is possible to achieve up to 90 lower-division credits. CityU does not apply CLEP examinations to upper-division course requirements. CLEP examinations that duplicate lower-division course work previously transferred for credit will not be accepted.

**EXCELSIOR COLLEGE EXAMINATIONS (ECE)**

Formerly administered by ACT-PEP, the battery of Excelsior College Examinations currently consists of forty examinations designed for the recognition of college-level learning acquired outside the classroom. Excelsior College Examinations are now administered via computer at Prometric Testing Centers in the United States, Canada, and the U.S. territories. The tests are also administered worldwide in paper-and-pencil format through an agreement with the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) program.

The tests are composed of multiple-choice, essay, and mixed-format items. ECE tests are available in many areas of the arts and sciences, business, education, and nursing. Scoring is designed to estimate the ability level of the student’s knowledge of the subject matter.

**DEFENSE ACTIVITY FOR NON-TRADITIONAL EDUCATION SUPPORT (DANTES) AND UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INSTITUTE (USAFI)**

The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), formerly a U.S. Department of Defense organization, was created to provide opportunities for military personnel on active duty to continue their education. USAFI ceased operation in June 1974, and since that time Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) has assumed most of its testing functions and its educational support activities, such as the record-keeping and transcript services, including testing programs through which college credit may be earned. CityU awards credit for the following DANTES examinations:

- Subject Standardized Tests (DSSSTs)
- End-of-Course Tests
- Subject Examinations

**CREDIT FROM DIPLOMA NURSING SCHOOLS**

Registered nurses applying to CityU bachelor’s programs may be awarded up to 90 lower-division credits based on an evaluation of their diploma school records, or for satisfactory scores on standardized examinations such as the Nursing Mobility Profile II, ECE (formerly ACT-PEP) exams, or both.

**Transfer Credit from Institutions Outside the United States**

The Registrar’s Office frequently receives transcripts from foreign institutions that require research to determine whether CityU can accept their degrees or credits for transfer. Foreign institutions and schools must be recognized by an articulation agreement (which is a specific agreement with CityU), by the Ministry of Education in the foreign country, or by a valid, recognized accrediting body in the United States.

The status of foreign institutions is verified by use of such accepted resources as the *International Handbook of Universities* (20th edition, August 2008), and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) International Education Services. The Foundation for International Services (FIS) is a recognized institution that determines the U.S. equivalent of international education and provides translations services. CityU accepts degrees/credits from the foreign institutions whose accreditation is confirmed by FIS. CityU always verifies that a school continues to be accredited or was recognized at the time the student received his/her credential.

The Registrar’s Office requires the following documents from international institutions: a notarized
copy of the transcript (and diploma, if applicable), a notarized translation of the transcript (and diploma, if applicable), and proof of English proficiency as set forth by CityU policy.

TRANSFER CREDIT FROM THIRTEENTH-YEAR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Applicants who hold thirteenth-year credentials, such as the Matura, Abitur, and Advanced Level (A Level), as tested through Cambridge International Examinations of Cambridge University and International Baccalaureate (IB) may receive transfer credit toward advanced standing at CityU. Appropriate thirteenth-year transfer credits may fulfill up to 25 of the 30 required lower-division General Education credits toward an associate's degree and up to 45 of the 55 required lower-division General Education credits toward a bachelor's degree.

Military Credit

Learning acquired through military service schools that offer college-level work, as determined and evaluated by the Office of Educational Credit of the American Council on Education (ACE), will be credited toward undergraduate degrees. The credit recommendations of the Office of Educational Credit and Credentials (OECC) are contained in the Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services. Military credit requests are normally submitted on an AARTS or SMART transcript.

Army-enlisted ratings (AER), Navy-enlisted ratings (NER), Coast Guard–enlisted ratings (CGR), military occupational specialties (MOS), and similar military designations, plus courses completed in the Defense Language Institute (DLI), which have been evaluated by ACE, are also accepted for credit.

Prior Learning Assessment

Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) is critical in supporting the accessibility portion of City University of Seattle's Academic Model, in addition to our broader mission and vision. Many students in the working adult demographic of the CityU student population see it as an efficient means to complete their undergraduate education in a reasonable period of time. It is also one of the most cost-effective means available for earning credit. City University of Seattle's portfolio processes and procedures were designed to be in keeping with the standards for assessing prior learning as published by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning.

When students first express interest in taking advantage of the PLA portfolio process, they are initially coached by an academic advisor regarding their potential candidacy. They must then submit both a résumé and a program plan to the PLA program manager for review prior to registering for PLA 200, which is a five-credit course that prepares them for the portfolio evaluation phase of the process. This screening process is designed to assure that only the candidates with the greatest likelihood of success actually register for the course. The program manager looks for a fit between the student’s experience and the remaining credits needed in the program plans. The students are also asked to self-assess their writing skills, as effectively translating knowledge to learning outcomes is key to the process.

Once approved for the PLA process, the students then take PLA 200. This course helps them to develop the building blocks of the portfolio that they will later submit for evaluation. It includes completion of essays for two courses out of the nine maximum, or 45 credits (25% of degree requirements), allowed via PLA for undergraduate degrees only. Upon completion of the balance of the essays that they wish to submit for evaluation, they then register for the final phase of the PLA process.

Faculty are selected, if available from the existing CityU pool of faculty, who have appropriate qualifications for assessing the learning expressed in each essay. Appropriate qualifications generally include a master’s degree in a related field, in addition to professional experience, and familiarity with the course in question. The PLA program manager
coaches all faculty in how to review the essays with a particular emphasis on the identification of learning, not just experience.

Most students submit essays for regular CityU courses and faculty who regularly teach those classes are preferred for these evaluations. From time to time, students submit essays for courses offered at other regionally accredited institutions. This is because CityU does not offer a full complement of lower-division General Education courses or a very wide array of electives. As with all courses for which PLA credit is sought, the student must submit a syllabus with learning outcomes against which the essay is evaluated. The equivalent of a passing grade must be evident.

Course challenges are another means of earning credit for prior learning at City University of Seattle. Students register for a course challenge with their academic advisor. The operations manager informs the appropriate course manager, who then identifies a qualified faculty member to write an appropriate course assessment, as well as grade it when it is completed.

Distance Learning

CityU offers programs of study taught in a variety of formats to allow optimal access and flexibility for students. Although this variety of formats covers a range of fully in-class formats, fully online formats, and formats that combine the two (mixed mode), these formats can be organized into two main categories:

- **In class:** Courses meet 51 percent or more of the time face-to-face and may be supplemented with online instruction.
- **Distance learning:** Courses meet less than 51 percent of the time face-to-face, using the online environment as the primary teaching and learning “space.”

City University offers a number of its programs in the online format, using Blackboard as its learning management system. All programs are required to be approved for their online delivery by the School Curriculum Council. CityU has created a set of criteria that ensures rigor of programs and the quality of instructions.
To provide consistent experience, all courses are set up in Blackboard and preloaded with the materials prepared by Course Design Teams. Instructors are asked to provide extra help to students with disabilities to ensure that they are able to access course materials. The majority of online classes start in the second week of the first month of the quarter. Instructors gain access to their shells seventeen days prior to a start date of their course. They are expected to personalize shells; however, they are not allowed to change the general feel or look of the shells so as to ensure students in all sections have access to the same educational materials. Students gain access to the shells three days prior to a start day of the course. They can use those days to orient themselves to a specific course.

CityU defines a session or week in an online class as time between Monday 12:00 a.m. and Sunday 11:59 p.m. Students are expected to post their initial responses to discussion board questions and problems between Monday and Wednesday; they are also expected to post their replies to other students and responses to any additional questions their instructors ask them between Thursday and Sunday. These rules ensure an ongoing discussion that is essential for learning in the online environment.

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY**

To ensure students’ success in online courses, CityU has created guidelines for instructors. Instructors access their virtual classroom seventeen days prior to start day of the class to update announcements, faculty information (including office hours and ways students can reach them), discussion board questions, course syllabus, information and materials such as supplemental articles, study guides for students, etc. Instructors are required to greet all students by responding to each introductory posting and sending a personalized welcome letter to all students on the first day of class. In addition, instructors are expected to be actively involved in the students’ learning process through timely responses to their direct inquiries and by facilitating online activities. Therefore, instructors access their course on four separate days during the school week (Monday through Sunday) and preferably all seven days. Online instructors are asked to notify their faculty manager about any emergencies preventing them from active participation in course activities for two or more days. Instructors are required to update the gradebook weekly and grade and return all papers and assignments electronically within seven days of submittal. In general, they are expected to spend approximately one hour per week per each credit in their online classes, in addition to any work that they have for grading students’ work, preparing for classes, etc.

CityU requires its instructors to provide high-quality instruction in online classes via virtual lectures, supplemental materials, and their comments in the discussion board activities. Instructors are encouraged to supplement their courses with current events, most recent articles and data, hands-on activities, case studies, etc.

**GUIDELINES FOR STUDENTS**

To ensure students’ success in online courses, CityU has created guidelines for students. Students are expected to order textbooks and class materials two to four weeks prior to the start of class and access their virtual classroom as soon as they are given access (i.e., three days before the course starts) in order to review the announcements, faculty information, and course documents, such as Syllabus or Course Guide, and any additional materials and information prepared by instructors. Students are expected to stay actively involved in the learning process through frequent and timely postings on the discussion board, responding to and interacting with fellow students, and turning assignments in on time. Students should be prepared to work at least one hour per each credit per week completing online activities and approximately three to five hours per credit hour per week outside of their virtual classroom. Students are asked to access their course on four separate days during the school week (Monday through Sunday) and submit at least one quality posting or response on each of these days.
LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES
Each Blackboard shell has a library area from which students can access library and electronic databases. CityU librarians are trained to provide links from course shells to various electronic resources. Students can contact library personnel over the phone, chat, e-mail, and through the Ask a Librarian support feature.

FACULTY SUPPORT
All CityU Teaching Faculty are required to take the Blackboard training course. This self-paced course introduces them to basic features in Blackboard, such as uploading documents, facilitating discussions, creating announcements, and managing the gradebook. Instructors who have used Blackboard in other educational institutions can take a competency exam to demonstrate their basic Blackboard skills. Additionally, instructors are required to complete the New Faculty Orientation (NFO), which introduces some aspects of online instruction and its best practices. After completion of the NFO, new instructors are mentored in their first quarter of teaching by experienced online instructors. CityU has an internal Blackboard support group that consists of technical Blackboard specialists as well as faculty. This group addresses a variety of issues and requests sent by any faculty at CityU and also provides some training materials for faculty.

STUDENT SERVICES
Recruiting and advising teams at CityU have been trained to provide students or prospective students with accurate information about online courses. These teams understand how online courses are delivered and what is expected of students. They also are familiar with specific requirements such as attendance, and they monitor those requirements to make sure that students do not fall behind. For example, if a student is absent for two consecutive weeks from classes, advisors contact them to verify their status.

City University provides 24/7 technical support for both students and instructors. The Help Center can be contacted via the CityU website, e-mail, chat, and/or the toll-free number.

New students in the United States and Canada are enrolled in a noncredit course that orients them to CityU. This self-paced online course introduces students to CityU and its programs. It also familiarizes students with online learning and issues such as academic integrity and etiquette in online classes, etc. Finally, it allows new students to practice different activities in the online environment, such as submitting a post, replying to a post, sending an e-mail, etc.

Students enrolled in the orientation course may also evaluate their readiness to take online courses. It is clearly stated however, that the results of this self-evaluation are not a predictor of success or failure in an online program, but a tool that helps students identify their weaknesses.

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT
CityU evaluates the effectiveness of its online education programs to ensure their quality in the same way as it assesses effectiveness of any program. CityU is still working on the issue of authentication of students taking classes. While participation in class activities and submission of assignments have not posed any credibility issues, online testing is still an issue to be examined.

Student Mobility
Over the past three years, CityU has engaged in a series of activities under the umbrella of “student mobility.” Student mobility is defined as the ability of a CityU student in any location to study for one quarter at CityU in another country while paying the original home country tuition. For example, a CityU student in Bulgaria may elect to study in the United States for one quarter while paying Bulgarian tuition rates, which are priced to be affordable in the local economy. Should a student choose to stay on in the second country, he or she must then fully transfer to the new location and pay that second location’s regular
tuition rates starting in the second term of study. The mobility program is part of CityU’s strategic focus on becoming a leading global university, and its commitment to encourage more frequent exchanges of CityU students between regions.

CityU’s student mobility program serves students who elect to participate for a single quarter out of a personal desire to study in another country. The program is currently limited to CityU’s European operations, which represents the largest number of CityU students outside the United States. Due to tuition differences, the program has largely been one-way, with students in eastern and central Europe coming to study in the United States. Since the 2005–2006 academic year, approximately fifty-one students have participated in the mobility program, the majority from CityU’s partnership programs in Slovakia and Bulgaria.

Lessons learned over the last several years have led to inclusion of the following activities in CityU’s plans:

• Locating affordable short-term housing near CityU’s main campus in Bellevue, available for three to four months.
• Providing scholarships for the neediest students to help offset the higher cost of living compared to their home countries. For example, currently, Bulgarian students have the strongest need for additional monetary support when participating in the program. They come from one of the lowest-priced tuition locations.
• Improving coordination of course offerings to pool mobility participants to achieve minimum class sizes, to ensure students can take the required number of courses to maintain their visa status, without unduly slowing their progress toward degree completion.
• Improving orientation within the sending country regarding the living and educational experiences the student will encounter, for example, attending class with a largely working adult population.

In order to participate in the mobility program, students need to be enrolled in an academic program (ESL would not qualify), be in good academic standing (2.0 GPA for undergraduate and 3.0 GPA for graduate studies), and meet all international student admission criteria. CityU will then issue the immigration documentation (international student application form, copy of valid passport, financial statement, sponsor statement, proof of English proficiency). The financial statement requirement takes into consideration the lower tuition that mobility participants pay in their home country.

To prepare students for the experience of studying in the United States, the designated student services contact in Europe (housed in CityU’s Bratislava, Slovakia, location) meets with students in person before they come and talks to advisors in other countries when they send students. When students are accepted, CityU mails an acceptance package, including the following:

• acceptance letter with a brief description of the entry process and visa application process;
• pre-arrival brochure (includes planning the arrival, what to bring in terms of clothing, money, documents, etc.);
• information sheet as to how to pay for the SEVIS fee, how to apply for a visa, and what to expect at the port of entry;
• housing brochure;
• information sheet on how to set up the My.CityU.edu portal account;
• information regarding cell phone setup;
• map of Bellevue with restaurants and hotels;
• Washington State tourism brochure;
• information about optional arrival services (e.g., hotel reservation and airport pick-up for a fee).

All new students also receive an e-mail from the coordinator at the Bellevue location regarding the international student mentor program. If students would like to be assigned a mentor, the mentor information is provided before arrival.
All new international students, including those in the mobility program, are required to attend the international student orientation. During orientation, the CityU Counseling and Career Center promotes its services, and representatives from the international student health insurance plan explain the plan and talk about medical care in the United States in general. The international student mentors also participate in orientation offering their peer-advising services and providing information about student activities. Following orientation, the International Student Office provides additional services such as workshops on culture shock and opportunities to learn about the public transportation systems between Bellevue and downtown Seattle.

Cancellations of Courses and Programs

Degree/certificate programs may be closed for a variety of reasons. Students who remain in discontinued programs are provided the opportunity to complete the original program requirements after the date of program closure. A course teach-out schedule is provided to all eligible candidates. As appropriate, students will be provided with parallel updated courses that are applied to their degree requirements. Undergraduate programs can be completed up to three years after program closure, and graduate programs up to two years after closure, provided that students maintain active enrollment and do not stop-out for more than two consecutive terms. Returning students who have stopped-out for more than two consecutive terms in a discontinued program may be provided with a different program plan that is as closely related as possible to their original program. Students eligible for teach-out are notified in writing of the teach-out schedule and also receive an updated program plan including the substitute courses.

When a course is cancelled within an open degree/certificate program, an appropriate new course substitution is provided and the old course discontinued immediately. Exceptions to this practice are technical courses that require significant prerequisite or content knowledge. In these cases, students continue in the current course track to completion. Cancelled courses that are not aligned with specific degree/certificate program requirements are discontinued immediately.

The policies and procedures for adding or discontinuing courses and programs are included in the regular policy review cycle.

CONCLUSION

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, CityU is first and foremost a teaching university. Its mission to expand access to education and its history of serving underserved populations drive the way it designs, constructs, and delivers its academic programs; and it increasingly relies on direct evidence of student learning as the primary means for evaluating the effectiveness of its academic programs.

CityU’s commitment to expanding access by removing unnecessary barriers to entry means that it must serve a population of students with various levels of academic preparation. It means finding the right balance between access and structure to provide sufficient academic support through the appropriate combinations of course work, prerequisite requirements, and tutoring services.

Its commitment to access means multiple locations and delivery modes, and this drives its use of common curricula to ensure consistency of quality and student experience. The common curricula also allow it to ensure high levels of relevance via the use of industry and professional advisory boards that provide input into program design. The careful alignment of learning outcomes and assessments at all levels — university, program, and course — is possible because of this centralized model. CityU’s continuous improvement processes have led it to revamp its approach to program and course design, integrating regional variations, and promoting the ability of faculty to design learning activities relevant to their student populations.

CityU’s history of serving working adults returning
to complete an undergraduate degree or earn a master’s degree led to a very flexible approach to general education. As it added programs serving younger students who required full freshmen and sophomore years, it has grappled with this approach, recently clarifying how the CityU Learning Goals provide a framework for assessing student learning related to general education competencies. This will continue to evolve over the next few years as CityU serves more diverse student populations at home and abroad.

CityU’s decision to embrace authentic assessment of student learning is aligned with its commitment to practitioner-based education, to the application of theory to practice, and to preparing students for real-world work environments. It adds layers of complexity to the learning outcomes assessment process, leading most programs to establish summative capstones and/or portfolios of student work that demonstrate evidence of student learning. The analysis of this evidence and applications to program improvements are in various stages of maturity in the various academic programs; what is remarkable at this stage of CityU’s evolution is the way this approach is embraced and supported by most of its faculty. As practitioners themselves, they see the value of requiring students to complete projects, internships, and other assignments that come as close as possible to what they will do in their professions. They are willing to engage in the complexity of analysis that follows.

Challenges lie ahead. Keeping curricula relevant, ensuring rich faculty engagement across multiple international locations, supporting students from different backgrounds with different levels of preparation, and providing high-quality instruction in all sites and delivery modes — these are just a few of the ongoing challenges CityU has uncovered and addressed through its self-study process. It will continue to embrace these challenges in the spirit of its mission, with a renewed dedication to delivering the promise of high-quality, relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.

**REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION**
- Profiles of each program, including degrees awarded last three years, Program Design Guides, and annual learning outcomes assessment reports - *Evidence of Student Learning*
- Academic Model - *Appendix E*
- Philosophy of Academic Assessment - *Appendix F*
- Program Review policy - *Appendix G*
- Student Satisfaction Survey - *Appendix B*
- Alumni Survey - *Appendix C*
- Inventory of degree programs added and deleted last three years - *Appendix H*
- Policies - *City University of Seattle Catalog*

**ON-SITE EXHIBITS**
- Major program review reports last two years
- End-of-Course-Evaluation forms and summaries
- Most recent reports from specialized accreditation reviews (International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction)
- Grade distribution studies
- Teaching Faculty and Administrative Faculty job descriptions (includes service requirement)
Standard Three

Students
City University of Seattle was founded with the mission of promoting access to education. For its first two decades, the university’s core student constituency consisted of working adults, largely located in the geographical region of the Pacific Northwest. As a result, student support services were developed to reflect this more mature, independent, and commuter-based population. CityU’s focus was on removing perceived operational barriers to attendance, like registration services, rather than the developmental needs of a younger student in the transition to professional practice.

In the mid-1990s, the university experienced a small shift as it began to provide undergraduate programming to an increasingly younger, traditional-age student body, especially as it expanded its presence internationally. However, student support services continued to retain the original focus on the adult learner, and instead relied contractually on partners to deliver support services to the younger students in programs abroad, utilizing the partner’s existing infrastructure.

Today, working adults remain a significant portion of the student body in the United States, Canada, and China, where the majority of students are in graduate programs. In Europe and Mexico, the student population is predominately undergraduate and reflects a younger age demographic that is more aligned with a traditional university attendance experience. Over time, support services have increasingly grown to incorporate more self-service features, staff qualifications have improved, and support service departments have been more aligned; but the function and role of student support services looks largely unchanged since the university’s founding.

As the university works toward a future vision that involves an increased number of international undergraduate students, as well as an increased number of transfer students from local community colleges in Washington, the nature of student support services will be affected. For the first time in the university’s history, the role and scope of student services will have to change. Explorations of a future that includes facilitated access to housing, short-term mobility (study abroad) across sites, and increased numbers of full-time students will precipitate changes in every department whose purpose it is to support the student experience.

### STUDENT PROFILE

Over the past decade, as the size of the operations in Europe has grown, the university’s student population has developed into two distinct service groups, the largely part-time working adult population in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Breakdown</th>
<th>Europe Undergraduate</th>
<th>Europe Graduate</th>
<th>Switzerland Undergraduate</th>
<th>Switzerland Graduate</th>
<th>Canada Undergraduate</th>
<th>Canada Graduate</th>
<th>United States Undergraduate</th>
<th>United States Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Level Breakdown</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States and a smaller subset of full-time, traditional-age students who attend primarily in Europe at the undergraduate level. The average age of a CityU student worldwide is 34, however, there is a significant difference between the European sites and the North American sites. (Note: CityU has established four regions in its financial and students data systems. These regions are the United States, Canada, Europe, and Switzerland. The first three were established to accommodate currency differences and accounting practices; the Switzerland region was established when CityU began its current operation in Zurich to ensure proper tracking and facilitate accounting. In this section, Figures 3.1–3.3 reflect these four regions.)

CityU as a whole reflects the national trend of serving an increasing female student population. Worldwide, 56 percent of students are female. At the graduate level that percentage increases to 58 percent and at the undergraduate level it falls to 53 percent. However, there is a marked difference in gender distribution between the regions and between the schools. The European sites offer business and technology programs and experience a greater male student population, while the North American sites have a higher proportion of female students due to a large number of education and human services programs.

### STUDENT POLICIES

#### Admission and Enrollment

Admissions criteria for programs, academic sequencing, and prerequisite requirements are developed by the faculty of the individual programs and school. 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 CityU Catalog.

In accordance with its mission, CityU maintains an open enrollment philosophy for most programs. However, as a transfer institution, incoming undergraduate students seeking to complete a bachelor’s degree must have completed a minimum of one year of study (either at their prior institution[s] or at CityU) before starting upper-division course work. Assessment of student performance in 2006–07 led

---

**Figure 3.3: Gender Distribution in Regions and Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright School of Education</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albright School of Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switzerland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to more formalized course sequencing for students in Europe at the lower-division level in order to build English and mathematical computations skills. In the United States, it resulted in enforcement of completion of English composition and college algebra before commencing in upper-division study. A current question is whether to implement competency assessments during the admissions process to help place students in the appropriate courses for their skill levels in composition and quantitative skills. Faculty are analyzing possible approaches that would maintain CityU’s adherence to its mission of expanding access, while strengthening its ability to provide the appropriate academic support for its students.

All graduate study requires a posted bachelor’s degree. Highly specialized professional preparation programs may have additional entrance requirements, such as in teacher preparation and the standardized basic skill tests required by most states.

Admissions criteria are consistent by program worldwide. Issues over the course of the past year have arisen regarding adherence to or difference in admissions criteria for specific programs in China and Greece related to English proficiency. The academic department has implemented a review of the practices and put forth a compliance plan. In 2009, the Master of Counselling program in Alberta, Canada, was required to implement additional admissions criteria in the form of course prerequisites in order to achieve approval from the Ministry of Advanced Education and Technology. The impact of this difference on program consistency is being closely monitored.

The Admissions Table (Figure 3.4) shows the applications received, admitted, denied, withdrawn, matriculated, and enrolled for the previous four academic years. CityU’s mission and commitment to removing barriers to enrollment is reflected in the very low numbers of denied admissions.

Once admitted, students may be oriented in a number of ways based upon chosen instructional format or based upon specific program delivery designs. Cohort programs typically provide a large group orientation designed to kick off the start of a program. Locations

with a single fall start for incoming students, e.g., Pravetz, Bulgaria, hold fall orientation for new students in a large group format. Programs that allow entry at any term, and those serving online students, deliver orientation through the student’s assigned advisor in a 1:1 format. Online student orientation is augmented by a web-based Student Orientation course. This course was implemented in 2008 and designed to create more consistency to the orientation experience of new students and to the establishment of academic expectations.

Upon admission, each student is assigned a student advisor, whose primary role is to guide the student through university processes, ensure that the student progresses through the program of study in the prescribed manner set forth by the respective academic programs, and generally monitor student progress toward established academic goals. This approach has generally met the needs of a largely adult population taking programs in which courses and sequences are largely prescribed.

Highly intense professional preparation programs, e.g., education and counseling, have assigned a more traditional faculty advisor to the student to facilitate academically related progression through the programs. The responsibilities of the faculty advisor may be different from program to program. In Europe, faculty serve in a more traditional advisement role and provide additional academic guidance and support to undergraduates. Most remote locations for short-term-delivered programs or “off-site”-delivered programs have resulted in periodic advising visits and reliance on electronic communications.

Students who fail to progress academically move through a progression of probationary notification ending in dismissal. Policies governing this process are documented in the university’s catalog. Quarterly reviews of dismissal and readmissions decisions are made by the registrar, Vice President of Admissions and Student Services, deans, and program directors, where applicable.

Graduation requirements are also documented in the university’s catalog. Upon acceptance to a
Figure 3.4: Admissions Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Application</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2008/09</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Applications</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate Applications</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Applications</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate Applications</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree Applications (includes ESL)</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculated</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note, due to the reporting structure, “new” students reported in Enrolled are students who have never enrolled in the university prior to first term of attendance. A minor number of Admitted students are categorized as returning students for reporting purposes if they had previously graduated from a CityU program.

Continuing Education applicants do not go through a formal admissions process and are processed at time of enrollment only.
program of study, all students are issued a program plan documenting the course requirements necessary for graduation. Degrees and certificates are evaluated and processed centrally to ensure the uniformity of application of standards.

**Financial Aid**

The majority of financial aid is awarded to U.S. students through federally supported programs. CityU’s loan default rates for its U.S. students are 2.1 percent for the last year reported — a very low rate compared to peer institutions. Default rates are typically closer to 10 percent for institutions in the United States. This is reflective of CityU’s largely adult population that takes debt and repayment more seriously than a traditional-age population of students.

Students in Europe often have access to government student loans/grants. Continued access to these funds often requires the university to continue to meet government regulations such as ensuring students take a full-time credit load. Recent developments in Canada have removed access to government-based loans for students in the province of British Columbia. Even so, adding a full-time Master of Counselling program in Vancouver will likely allow the students enrolled in the program access to StudentAid BC funds. CityU is looking for more ways in the primarily part-time programs to provide financial support to its working adult population.

The university has a number of institutionally funded scholarship programs, primarily supported through institutional tuition discounting. Scholarship programs include:

- The Diversity Scholarship program, targeted specifically to increasing diversity in the teaching ranks in Washington State
- The General Scholarship fund, providing both merit- and need-based scholarships to students in the United States and Canada
- Scholarships for Tomorrow’s Careers, providing funding to Washington State community college transfer students, as well as working adults who have been recently laid-off
- International Student scholarships, which include a range of scholarships promoting transfer from Washington State community colleges, to support of students in financial need, and support of students who serve in leadership roles in Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE)

Scholarships are available from the same pool of funds for the United States and Canada. Slovakia awards a small amount of need-based scholarships annually through tuition discounting as well. The goal is to increase this annual institutional-awarded amount to 3 percent of the operating budget by 2012.

Recent initiatives to raise funds from external sources are also under way through the Alumni Relations and Development Office to increase non-institutional-funded scholarships. CityU recently received a grant of nearly $100,000 from T.G. Associates to support minority teacher candidates with scholarship money and to build a mentor assistance program.

**Career Services**

Over the years, CityU has had several iterations of a career resource center, even eliminating the function completely in 2003. In 2007, the function was reintroduced and merged with the existing Counseling and Career Center to maximize resources and personnel support. The career component of the center is currently staffed by a supervised counseling intern.

The focus of the center is to find, develop, and provide access to larger community resources around employment rather than to provide traditional career counseling. These resources are available through the university portal (My.CityU.edu) to all students worldwide. Additional job resources are also made available to students and alumni alike through the CityU alumni website. The on-site staff is able to provide in-person practice and support services through e-mail or phone, as well.

In Slovakia, CityU provides additional resources
to local students in order to help graduates find their first professional position. Staff at the center located in Bellevue and staff in Slovakia are collaborating to develop jointly used materials and resources.

Individual, specialized professional preparation programs, such as teacher certification, may also provide program-delivered career resources, such as reference management, through an outsourced service or through on-site employer presentations.

As the university expands programming to an increased number of undergraduate students, career development resources and support will need to be more fully developed. More traditional in-person counseling services may need to be provided in the future.

**Health Services**

Due to the largely commuter nature of the student population, regardless of location, CityU does not provide health care services. It does provide limited access to mental health counseling services through the Counseling and Career Center in support of providing internship opportunities to supervised students in the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology program in Bellevue. The university can provide referrals and information to students in other locations as needed. A comprehensive resource list on mental health topics is available on the CityU portal under Student Resources. International students are able to purchase health insurance through contracts with private companies arranged through CityU.

**Housing**

CityU itself has not provided housing to students in the past. Several international partners provide its students with access to their own managed housing. However, for the first time, during the 2008–2009 academic year, this has changed with the piloting of university-sponsored apartments in Bellevue and Zurich, Switzerland. In both cases, the university rented standard apartments and subleased to a small group of international students. This initial foray into providing university-sponsored housing was connected to CityU’s long-term goal to increase the number of international students attending its programs by creating the structure necessary to increase study abroad opportunities among sites.

Students participating in the Bellevue pilot were a small group of students from a partner institution in mainland China. Furnished apartments within walking distance to the teaching site were provided to four female students and three male students. At the end of the academic year, students elected to opt out and seek other housing arrangements, partly to seek cohabitation arrangements and partly to seek cheaper lease options. The university is currently reevaluating the best way to provide access to affordable and convenient housing to international students in the United States.

CityU’s operation in Zurich also provides approximately ten apartments (flats), in largely residential areas within thirty minutes of the site via public transportation. Serving approximately fifteen students at present, the goal is to serve forty students by the end of the 2010 academic year. A part-time housing manager, with prior student housing management experience, is employed to arrange the sublets and take care of maintenance. All housing units meet Swiss standards of health and safety; many are newly renovated and have wireless access. The university also takes responsibility for cleaning all rental units once a week.

No food service is provided by the university to those in the housing pilots or at any university-managed teaching location.

**Cocurricular Activities**

CityU does not provide cocurricular activities and programs or student recreational athletics at this time.

The International Student Office manages occasional student activities and will be offering more activities as part of the five-year international plan to increase international student attendance in the United States. All activities are voluntary and typically take
place off-site, such as nature tours or local professional sporting events. At the request of our international student mentors, the university is currently evaluating the endorsement of student participation in intramural sports teams through local municipalities. These, among other extracurricular activity suggestions, are being enfolded into a more cohesive statement of purpose, including the university’s role in supporting/sponsoring extracurricular activities and CityU’s tie to overall student development.

The institution does not have any student media organizations and does not participate in intercollegiate athletics. It is a periodic sponsor of nonhosted-student-intramural activities like club soccer.

**Bookstore**

CityU does not operate its own bookstore. In the United States, the operation is contractually outsourced to eFollett, a division of Follett Higher Education Group, and in Canada to Nuskule, Inc. In Europe, due to the high economic impact of textbook purchases to the average student, the university provides the majority of textbooks as rentals directly to the students. In Switzerland, CityU is currently piloting the incorporation of books as part of tuition fees rather than requiring students to purchase through a bookstore entity.

**STUDENT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**

Student programs and services, managed by the Office of Admissions and Student Services, range from recruitment to graduation and encompass most activities that occur outside of instruction. The division is aligned with CityU’s strategic goal one, to promote excellence in learning and teaching, and strategic goal two, to expand the reach of university programs. The major responsibility for the activities that come under Standard Three lies within the Office of Admissions and Student Services, headed by the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services. Implementation of the standards also extends across CityU’s international locations, and the assurance of compliance in this arena lies with the International Division, headed by the chancellor.

Over the past several years, in an effort to improve services and alignment among functions that support students outside of the classroom, multiple departments have been incorporated into the Admissions and Student Service division. Historically focused on recruiting and enrolling students, the department now incorporates the functions of financial aid, registrar, marketing, counseling and career services, and student disability support services as well. Due to the regulatory nature of student disability accommodation, Student Disability Services only supports U.S. and Canadian students.

Each department is headed by a director who has the appropriate academic and/or work experience necessary to manage the operation of the unit assigned. All positions hired within the operational units follow standard university protocol for position development, skill requirement, and annual evaluation. All student service positions require some college course work (see Figure 3.5). Staff who are directly involved in the academic advising of students are required to hold a master’s degree, a requirement implemented for all new hires to improve the quality of advisement provided to graduate students. Due to the university’s tuition benefit provided to all staff, most student service personnel have an advanced degree or are actively pursuing completion of an advanced degree.

### Figure 3.5: Student Affairs Staff Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The individual departments are allocated a specific budget developed on an annual basis for each fiscal year (July 1–June 30). A department’s staffing allocation is determined based upon one of two primary measures, student head count or established production levels. For example, staffing for advising teams is based upon the maximum number of active students a 1.0 full-time equivalent advisor is able to support effectively, including regular communication regarding academic progress. In the Registrar’s Office, the size of the evaluator team is based upon the ability to maintain an average 95 percent or above target on a fourteen-day turnaround for incoming evaluations and final degree audits. The Marketing department is the one exception, as its staffing is function-based rather than service-based.

Every department within the division is required to have a procedural manual including standard operating procedures (SOPs). These departmental procedures and SOPs have a direct tie to the university-level academic, financial, admissions, and student rights and responsibilities policies, and are designed to facilitate standardization of service and compliance with institutional policies. For the departments that have additional external compliance requirements, departmental procedures and SOPs are designed to aid in fulfilling the external compliance requirements in addition to internal institutional standards. For example, the Counseling and Career Center must comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; the Student Financial Aid Office must observe U.S. Department of Education regulations; and the International Student Office must follow U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement regulations. An annual review of the policies related to the CityU Catalog drives most Admissions and Student Services departments’ review of departmental procedures and SOPs.

Performance metrics related to the division, department, and institution-wide goals exist for each department. Historically, student service departments relied strictly upon measures of enrollment and annual student surveys to evaluate how well services were meeting expectations. Departments within the division are at varying developmental stages in constructing evaluation measures, but have made significant strides over the last three years. This development ranges from initial gathering of benchmark data to regularly disseminated metrics reported weekly, monthly, or quarterly across the institution, such as actual credit hours or enrollments compared to budget projections.

In addition to improving the alignment between the support functions by combining student service functions under one umbrella, the strategic focus for the division over the past several years has been to
1. implement self-service functions, and 24/7 access to those functions worldwide, creating equitable access to services regardless of location or mode of delivery, i.e., on-site or online;
2. increase integration with partner locations to ensure access to equitable services based upon the student population needs;
3. improve the quality control checks and balances when student service functions are outsourced to partners; and
4. develop metrics and assessment tools to aid in the evaluation and development of services.

With the implementation of a new student data system in 2005, self-service access by students and faculty to university services was introduced. These services included such items as online registration, online posting of grades by faculty, access to class and attendance rosters, and access to student records. Domestic and Canadian adoption of services by both students and instructors alike is pervasive. However, the institution continues to struggle with adoption in most other international locations. Students continue to rely on traditional face-to-face services and faculty continue to rely on paper- and mail-based exchange of information. The recent setup of a CityU-owned site in Switzerland and the immediate implementation of these functions should provide a model for new locations in the future. Continued development of strategies and support for uniform adoption in other areas is ongoing.
The greatest challenge to the university as a dispersed network of locations in multiple countries is to provide equitable services to students at all locations while recognizing their diverse needs. For example, largely undergraduate, full-time student populations in Europe require more faculty interaction for program advising and need expanded career service upon graduation. Students in the United States and Canada who are predominately an employed, graduate, professional student body are less engaged with CityU outside the classroom.

The solution for many of the university’s international locations has been to rely on contractual agreements with partner institutions to deliver student services while focusing internal institutional resources on the U.S. and Canadian regions. The one exception to this practice is CityU of Seattle in Switzerland, operated directly by the university with no institutional partnership. This contractual solution has met with varying degrees of success. In Slovakia, where CityU has a strong presence, services are closely aligned to those delivered in the United States and Canada. The student service procedures and SOPs of the partner institution, Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM), in most instances are undifferentiated from those of CityU due to the unique nature of the relationship. Student services personnel employed by VSM, but serving CityU students, consider the role dual and make no differentiation between the two student populations in the support they provide.

As the institution has expanded its presence in surrounding countries, oversight of student service functions has historically been narrower, and most recently has been incorporated into both the regional dean and the local Director of Academic Affairs (DAA) roles. With the introduction of the DAA role, discussions have focused on establishing basic standards of student-service delivery to be uniform across the locations. This is a work in progress as the institution has begun to improve expectations as each partner contract comes up for review. Ongoing discussion continues to center around how to ensure external personnel are effectively engaged and aligned with the institution’s internal staff. Success in this endeavor will be largely dependent on the matrixed management by the respective vice presidents and by the Vice President for European Operations as they supervise the day-to-day delivery operations and the staff positions.

As CityU has expanded its constituency, increased the number of undergraduate programs, and incorporated more online elements across all delivery formats, it has had to expand services to address the changing needs of its students. A number of support services have been implemented over the past four years, designed to augment the student’s academic experience.

In 2005–06, based upon concern from the faculty regarding the performance of undergraduates in the introductory writing courses, the university contracted with Smarthinking, an online tutoring service, to provide ten free hours of tutoring each year to every student worldwide. Tutoring is available for writing, mathematics, statistics, and accounting. Specialized tutoring for the English writing center is available for second language students. An online service was selected in part due to the growing number of online students. Use of the service remains concentrated in the United States and Canada; however, it is available to all students regardless of program or location.

In 2007, Disability Support Services was incorporated into Student Services with a focus on moving to more electronic delivery services of materials to improve access and turnaround for students at a distance in the United States and Canada. An ongoing goal related to serving visually impaired students, for example, is to move completely to internally generated MP3 files rather than outsourced audio files created by external readers transcribing texts.

With the increased integration of online instruction across all delivery formats and student demand for improved technical support services, in 2008 CityU contracted with an outside service to provide first-level 24/7 technical support worldwide. With additional self-help resources and phone and chat services,
90 percent of student technical issues are resolved upon the first contact. An ongoing challenge continues to be reinforcing with international students that the service is available for use regardless of location.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

Over the years, the university has attempted a number of formats to encourage student participation in governance of the institution. The most successful participation has been with students involved on a programmatic level, such as program advisory boards, or in ad hoc, short-term activities, such as focus groups. The least successful has been in creating a student government in Bellevue. This is in large part due to the commuter nature of the population served.

Engagement and organization of student governance groups are more predominant in our foreign locations serving more traditional undergraduates and often is integrated with the local partner institution’s regulatory requirements. For example, legislation in Slovakia requires the establishment of a governance body including students who, among other roles, must approve tuition increases.

As a result of lack of participation, CityU moved toward more “open communication” mechanisms to solicit student involvement in the issues and operations of the university. The president and members of the senior leadership have “open door” policies. The president, senior leadership, and directors, when visiting outlying locations both domestically and internationally, meet with students directly to solicit feedback and input on issues of concern to students. These discussions are reported for follow-up and conclusion.

As a result of lack of participation, CityU moved toward more “open communication” mechanisms to solicit student involvement in the issues and operations of the university. The president and members of the senior leadership have “open door” policies. The president, senior leadership, and directors, when visiting outlying locations both domestically and internationally, meet with students directly to solicit feedback and input on issues of concern to students. These discussions are reported for follow-up and conclusion.

Faculty are involved in student program policies through the institutional Policy Committee, which meets on an annual basis to review all institutional policies governing students. Lack of more traditional “student programs” does not limit faculty involvement in student services. Examples include the dual appointment of the Director of the Counseling and Career Center as a faculty member in the MA in Counseling Psychology program and as faculty representation on the Scholarship Committee.

STUDENT RECORDS

All records relating to the admission, transfer of credits, or awarding of credits worldwide are maintained in a central Registrar’s Office located in Bellevue, Washington. Paper records are stored in fireproof filing cabinets, and electronic student data records in the enterprise resource planning system (PeopleSoft) are backed up on tape and stored at an off-site facility as part of the university protocol for electronic data. Upon completion of attendance, paper copies of student records are scanned and archived using the same protocol.

Additional procedures to maintain records are in place to meet the requirements of any government approval agencies in countries where CityU operates. For example, the Province of British Columbia has additional standards related to student access to academic records for fifty years, necessitating a contractual arrangement with the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board for archival maintenance of records should the university cease to operate.

Access to student records, electronic or paper, are tightly monitored and in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations. Access to records is based upon job function. This access to records causes some limitations to university practices of outsourcing student service functions to partner institutions. At this time, many of the partners do not have direct access to student records but rather amended data access to targeted information. This remains an area of issue as the university continues to have a light staffing footprint in many areas — the struggle to balance security of student records with the outsourcing of services.
INSTITUTIONAL ADVERTISING, STUDENT RECRUITMENT, AND REPRESENTATION OF ACCREDITED STATUS

City University of Seattle’s core marketing function for the United States and Canada is centralized in Bellevue under the supervision of the Director of Marketing and Vice President of Admissions and Student Services. All materials used in recruiting, advertising, and promotion are developed under the guidance of a centralized team to ensure accuracy and consistency of representation. The university’s Accreditation, Local Approvals, and Marketing Policy and its related procedure govern the promotion of programs and locations. Statements regarding regional accreditation and approval are boilerplate statements and required to be used uniformly across all publications. Statements regarding local country approvals are established and cleared by the appointed accreditation liaison officer in the President’s Office prior to use and implementation in printed documents.

Recruiting and promotional materials developed in the United States are sent to CityU’s operations in Slovakia and Switzerland for localization. This localization typically involves the addition of information regarding the partner institution (if applicable), changes to the program delivery description, and language translation for parents of students.

In Europe, the Vice President for European Operations is responsible for the further dissemination, coordination, and use of materials at partner locations in Romania, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, and Greece. In China, Australia, and Mexico, the international chancellor is responsible for this function. Similar to Slovakia and Switzerland, localization is applied to the materials. All materials, prior to use by partner institutions, require the approval of the Vice President for European Operations and/or the international chancellor.

The International Student Office (ISO) in the United States also contracts, under the operational supervision of the Associate Director of Recruitment and the Director of the International Student Office, with agents for the recruitment of international students to study at CityU. The ISO provides a basic tool kit of materials for use by agents. In addition, all agent agreements require that “the contractor agrees that it will submit copies of any and all materials, written or electronically made (such as videos, tapes, Internet home-pages etc.) that represents the University or bears the University’s name or logo to the University’s authorized representative for approval. The contractor agrees that it may not use any material to promote the University; until such material has been approved by the University’s approved representative” (see reference sample of agent contract in the Exhibits). Agent materials are approved by the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services.

CityU utilizes one annual catalog across all locations. The CityU Catalog serves as both the catalog and institutional student handbook. The catalog is printed and distributed via paper or CD to new students and posted on the public website and student portal (My.CityU.edu) for all students. The CityU Catalog also serves as the official publication for all institutional policies and procedures governing students. (CityU Catalogs for 2008–09 and 2009–10 are available in the Exhibits.)
Recruiting for programs is handled by three primary methods: (1) in the United States and Canada directly through the Admissions and Student Services department by those assigned the role of admissions advisor, (2) through contract in the role of agent for international students coming to the United States, and (3) through contractual partnership in the university’s international locations.

In the United States, student recruiting is conducted by qualified employees assigned the role of admissions advisor in the Office of Admissions and Student Services, and is supervised by the Director of Recruitment reporting to the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services (see job description of admissions advisor in the Exhibits). The primary responsibility of this role is to assess all prospective students to ensure that they have the academic potential and financial ability to remain enrolled through graduation. The admissions advisor assists potential students with the application process through submission of the application documents, at which time applicants are assigned to a student advisor who is responsible for transitioning the student into course work and through graduation.

In Canada, new student recruiting is assigned to the role of advisor reporting to the Senior Director of Advising in the United States (see job description for the student advisor in Canada in the Exhibits). The advisor position in Canada has a dual role in Admissions and Student Advisement. Recruiting expectations for the position are the same as those of the admissions advisor in the United States.

The U.S. model of separating recruiting and advising, implemented in 2007–08 in the United States, has not been applied to Canada at this time due to the size of the operations and the nature of the programs being delivered. Both programs offered in Canada, the Master of Education and the Master of Counselling, have high faculty engagement in the admissions process. The goal for Canada as it grows is the replication of the U.S. recruiting model.

In the United States, international agents are contracted with for the purpose of recruiting students to study in the United States. These agents may be foreign individuals or foreign institutions whose responsibility is to recruit qualified candidates. The role of agent and/or institution is to promote targeted university programs and facilitate application to the university. CityU in all instances maintains control over the admission and selection of candidates (see agent contract in the Exhibits).

Individual foreign agents are required to apply for consideration and are screened by the Director of the International Student Office and the Associate Director of Recruiting for the International Student Office (see agent application in the Exhibits). Reference checks are conducted with other U.S. institutions and a financial background check is conducted through the U.S. Commercial Services. CityU is selective in its appointment of agents as the primary focus is the recruitment and selection of students who have the academic potential and financial ability to remain enrolled through graduation. Agents are issued an initial two-year contract and evaluated annually based upon both the quality of the applicants referred as well as feedback from recruited applicants themselves on the accuracy of information and quality of support related to the application process.

Oversight of agents is managed by the Associate Director of Recruiting, ISO, and includes initial training, regular correspondence, and yearly visits when possible.

Selection of foreign institutional agents is at this time vetted and the contracts managed through the International Chancellor’s Office, as many are part of larger institutional agreements (see institutional contract in the Exhibits). Coordination of the referral and the student’s application and admissions process is the responsibility of the International Student Office.

In 2006–07, CityU engaged in a partnership contract with Barker Educational Services Team for the recruitment of students in the United States to online programs. Notification of nonrenewal of this contractual relationship was issued in August 2009 and the last intake of recruited students through the contract is being conducted in fall 2009–10. Regular assessment
of the quality of applicant and evaluation performance of students recruited in this manner determined that these students were not as academically prepared as those coming directly through the institution’s recruiting staff and a large number of students were pursuing the associate’s degree rather than full-transfer programs.

In the university’s locations outside the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and Slovakia recruiting is contractually assigned to the partner institution with whom the university collocates. Contracts require that the partner institution follow the standards of CityU in the process of recruiting. CityU maintains control over the admission and selection process in all cases. All admissions materials and documents are processed through the assigned CityU managing location: Slovakia for Bulgaria, Romania, the Czech Republic, and Greece; the United States for Mexico, China, and Australia.

CONCLUSION

CityU’s approach to student services is based on fulfilling its mission. For most of its history, student support services were implemented to reflect its more mature, independent, and commuter-based student population. CityU has been consistently focused on removing perceived operational barriers to attendance. Over time, it has improved staff qualifications, incorporated more self-service features, and better aligned its support services departments, but the function and role of student support services looks largely unchanged since CityU’s founding.

In the United States, Canada, and China, CityU’s student body consists of a majority of adult students in graduate programs. In Europe and Mexico, the predominately undergraduate student population reflects a younger age demographic. As the university works toward a future vision that involves an increased number of younger undergraduate students, the role and scope of student services will have to change. CityU plans to reach out to younger domestic transfer students and international undergraduate students, who seek similar aspects of the college experience such as a campus feel, social activities, academic support, and a richer connection to the community in which they live, work, and study.

As CityU continues to strengthen its international presence and examines new opportunities to grow, it will also create more systematic ways to ensure its standards and expectations for student support are implemented consistently across all its locations. Explorations of a future that includes facilitated access to housing, greater short-term mobility (study abroad) options across CityU sites, and increased numbers of full-time students will precipitate changes in every department whose purpose it is to support the student experience.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION
- Organization chart for Admissions and Student Services - Appendix I
- Student retention and rate of degree completion reports - Appendix J

ON-SITE EXHIBITS
- International student recruiting agent contract and application
- Student Handbook (City University of Seattle catalog)
- Admissions advisor job descriptions (United States and Canada)
- Contracts with partner organizations for international offerings
- Student financial aid statistics
- Most recent state and federal reviews of financial aid
- Mission, goals, goal attainment, and impact of unit
- Institutional publications required by Campus Security Act, Drug Free Schools and Colleges Act, the Drug Free Workplace Act, and the Student Right-to-Know Act
Standard Four

Faculty
City University of Seattle is unique in most ways, including the students it teaches, the multiple domestic and international locations where it teaches, and the faculty it hires to do its primary teaching. CityU relies on active and retired practitioners in the field to teach its students. This use of expert practitioners fits perfectly into the Academic Model and mission of the university: to provide students with a desire to learn a lifelong relevant, high-quality education. The practitioner-faculty model fits with the professions for which the university is preparing its students: management, education, technology, counseling, and communications. The related courses lead directly to professional jobs, so using professionals in the field who are well trained in pedagogy, have expertise in their subject matter, and are steeped in the practice of their profession aligns well with the educational objectives CityU promotes and career-minded students seek.

The use of well-qualified and trained practitioner-faculty also works well because as they focus their efforts on teaching, the program directors/program coordinators — those full-time Administrative Faculty who supervise the Teaching Faculty — focus their efforts on ensuring the courses and programs are appropriately staffed and supervised, the curriculum is contemporary, and the instruction is of the highest quality. The curriculum’s uniform nature means courses are structurally the same regardless of the instructor, mode of delivery, or location, with course information and materials built into a common online learning management platform (Blackboard). This allows the Teaching Faculty to build upon their own and each other’s expertise and fosters a teaching community that is connected and committed.

**Faculty and Locations**

CityU is currently located in two U.S. states, Washington and Hawai’i, and teaches in eleven distinct educational sites. In Canada, CityU is represented in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia at four separate locations. City University of Seattle also offers instruction in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Romania, Slovakia, Switzerland, China, Australia, and Mexico. The dispersion of instructional sites and the use of a variety of delivery systems are a manifestation of the university’s mission, which is to make education convenient to all and provide educational opportunities to anyone, anywhere.

At the end of the 2008–2009 academic year, CityU employed a total of sixty-two Administrative Faculty in its North American locations. This administrative leadership group comprises the faculty/program directors and faculty/program coordinators, most of whom have 1.0 FTE appointments. The size of the academic program dictates the extent of leadership necessary to provide effective oversight and administrative support. Faculty/program directors report to the deans of their respective schools, and these Administrative Faculty generally are responsible for the hiring, training, and supervising of the program Teaching Faculty. As subject matter experts, they also oversee the development of the curriculum in their programs and, with their faculty and the use of outside experts, oversee the development and revision of courses in the curriculum, all of which is processed through the normal academic approval processes.

Recently, the university recognized the need to develop and maintain a comprehensive database of faculty credentials including qualifications, years of teaching both at CityU and at other institutions, as well as scholarship and prior work experience. This database will serve many needs but primarily will provide a source for tracking the growth and strength of CityU’s teaching population.

CityU boasts a cadre of well-qualified faculty (see Figure 4.1). One hundred and sixty faculty members (in the United States and Canada) hold a doctoral degree as their terminal degree and 813 hold a master’s degree. By design, CityU’s Academic Model is primarily a practitioner model, which by definition means that the university draws upon instructors who
are actively engaged in practicing their professions or are retired after many years of dedicated commitment to their chosen disciplines. Before an instructor is hired, his/her highest degree is confirmed to assure he/she possesses the minimum professional qualifications that are necessary to teach at the university. Any changes in a faculty member’s degree status are confirmed through a request for an official transcript. (Appendix K shows the number and source of terminal degrees of faculty.) Résumés are screened by the supervising faculty to ensure the relevance and currency of professional experience.

Because of its emphasis on teaching by experienced practitioners, CityU considers professional experience an important aspect of faculty qualifications (see Figure 4.2). An analysis of 641 active faculty records compiled for the 2008–2009 academic year showed that on average, each faculty member held 4.6 professional positions related to the subjects they teach, at an average length of 5.7 years per position. The average number of years of professional experience was just over twenty-six, with nearly all faculty members having more than ten years of professional experience related to their subject areas. This indicates a substantial level of professional experience in the faculty cadre, reinforcing the strength of CityU’s practitioner model.

CityU does not have a permanent tenure system, rather, it employs its faculty on teaching contracts. The average years of experience at CityU of those in key leadership positions (faculty/program directors) is 6.45 years, with a high of over eighteen years of professionally relevant service. Teaching Faculty average 4.76 years with the institution (see Figure 4.3). During the 2009–2010 academic year, the university is designing a three-level title system that will allow progression and promotion opportunities for Teaching Faculty, based on the quality of instruction, currency, and scholarship linked to teaching practice. This system is intended to be in place in time for the 2010–2011 academic year.

Teaching experience and work experience as practitioners of their profession enhance the academic qualifications of the university’s faculty (see Figure 4.3). In addition to the teaching experience at CityU, the Teaching Faculty bring with them on average five years of additional teaching experience. For example, within the Albright School of Education approximately 86 percent of CityU’s instructors have experience as teachers and/or administrators in the K–12 system.
and are, therefore, providing student access to decades of practical knowledge and expertise about elementary and secondary educational systems. In the Division of Arts and Sciences, all instructors in the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology are practitioners in the counseling field. Within the School of Management, instructors come well prepared, with the majority having more than ten years of experience in the workplace, applying the concepts and methods that they use at work and now teach in the classroom.

Recruitment and Appointment

The university typically attracts an abundance of qualified applicants for faculty positions. Quarterly, the Human Resources department of CityU reports on the amount of time it takes to fill open Teaching Faculty positions. The average is approximately ten working days, although there have been selected programs that required more time and effort in advertising and recruitment. Over a year ago, the university installed a new position of faculty recruiter within the Human Resources department to help the schools replace and strengthen the pool of Teaching Faculty. The incumbent made remarkable strides in engaging and supporting the faculty/program directors and coordinators in their hiring activities. In addition, applicable policies and procedures have been written, approved, and communicated clarifying roles and accountability for the hiring of Teaching Faculty (see Exhibits).

The recently updated Employment Policy outlines compliance with federal and state employment laws, pre-employment screening, extending job offers, definition of temporary employment, current employee application policy, and where responsibility lies for following the policy in hiring qualified individuals. This policy is reviewed and updated periodically, and is posted in an accessible location internally. Checklists for hiring managers have been developed to guide them through all steps of the process. Official job descriptions and recruiting postings and advertisements define the minimum qualifications for each vacancy. In support of the Employment Policy, the Human Resources department has written detailed internal procedures outlining the normal steps involved in recruitment and appointment of faculty in the United States and Canada. CityU evaluates qualifications for Teaching Faculty to ensure appropriate academic background, degrees and/or professional experience, to carry out their assignments in accord with the university’s mission and goals.

CityU requires online applications and résumés/CVs for every Teaching Faculty member. Hiring managers and/or the faculty recruiter review these for compliance with the minimum qualifications and specific position requirements. After a successful interview, a candidate is invited to prepare and deliver a twenty-minute teaching demonstration. The candidate may choose any topic; as long as it is related to the subject he or she might be teaching. Those participating and evaluating the candidate’s teaching demonstration include academic administrators, faculty members, and when possible, students. Typically, there are at least five or six CityU representatives observing the teaching demonstration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Years of Experience at Institution</th>
<th>Total Years of Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>983</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demonstration. At the conclusion of the teaching demo, the candidate is debriefed, and then the evaluators meet to discuss the demonstration and determine if the candidate is approved.

Prior to employment, every job applicant can view information on CityU’s public website regarding the institution, as well as an official Teaching Faculty job description. The description includes essential duties and responsibilities, minimum qualifications, preferred qualifications, physical demands, and working conditions. At the time of hire, each faculty member receives a recently revised Annual Agreement that outlines conditions of employment. Nomination of an individual to teach results in confirmation of educational credentials in Human Resources to ensure compliance with posted minimum qualifications.

All employees are given access to the current version of the Employee Handbook, which includes sections on employment, hiring, compensation, employment verification and testimonials, and employee evaluations and wage adjustments. CityU also prides itself on its orientation program for its entire staff. The policies on ethics, sexual harassment, and related conduct policies are emphasized in these employee orientations.

After hire, faculty members are required to participate in a New Faculty Orientation before they enter the classroom, real or virtual, which includes a review of their responsibilities in the areas of compliance with ethics standards, harassment prevention, and safety. This mandatory New Faculty Orientation includes four parts: Introduction to CityU; Blackboard Basics; three-week mentor-led, online, interactive orientation; and ongoing support and evaluation through their first quarter teaching. This is a special part of CityU’s approach to ensuring high-quality teaching, as every faculty member in essence gets a mentor through their first class to watch their instruction and provide them guidance as the quarter progresses. Also, prior to teaching, each faculty member is provided a very thorough review of the work assignment, including a Course Guide, an Instructor Guide, a Syllabus, a model Course Schedule, and a list of required and recommended resources. The program director/program coordinator enters the class shell throughout the quarter to monitor faculty and student engagement.

For the European sites, there is a standard recruitment and appointment process in place for local hires, which applies to both full-time and part-time faculty positions. Once a potential faculty member is identified, an interview is conducted with the candidate usually by or in coordination with a regional dean, an associate dean, or a program level coordinator. The interview typically explores the candidate’s professional background, teaching experience, and his/her interest and motivation for teaching with CityU. For non-native English speakers, the interview also serves as an indication of whether the candidate’s English language skills are acceptable to teach in an English language environment. In some rare instances, interviews might be conducted by telephone.

Similar to the process in the United States, a candidate is invited to prepare and deliver a twenty-minute teaching demonstration. At the conclusion of the teaching demo, the evaluators meet separately to provide feedback about and discuss the candidate’s potential suitability as a CityU instructor. Typically, the highest ranking academic administrator leads this discussion and solicits input from all of the participants. After a consensus is reached about whether to approve the candidate for a teaching position, the group debriefs the teaching demonstration with the candidate. As a result, the candidate is either approved or not approved for teaching, or in some cases, might be asked to prepare another demo in the future. The teaching demonstration forms that are filled out by the participants go into the candidate’s file.

This process applies to the European sites including Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Switzerland, and the Czech Republic. CityU’s partnership in Greece has operated more independently with limited CityU oversight on hiring decisions, though they follow the same guidelines for hiring as the other European sites. Considering the fact that CityU’s representation is limited to site visits by the regional dean three to four times per year, hiring decisions are made locally. However, the regional dean conducts interviews and
oversees teaching demonstrations of potential faculty whenever possible. In 2009–2010, a Director of Academic Affairs was hired in Greece to strengthen oversight of faculty and other academic matters; see a full discussion in the chapter on CityU’s international programs.

Once hired, each faculty member receives orientation and is given access to an online faculty handbook, which covers a wide range of policies, information about administrative processes, and mechanics of teaching at CityU. CityU’s New Faculty Orientation prepares Teaching Faculty for their first course with mentors to help them set up their online course shell and training on the university’s learning management system, a key element in ensuring consistency of curriculum and instruction with so many part-time faculty.

Workloads and Professional Development

City University of Seattle utilizes a faculty personnel practice that matches its mission to bring a relevant practical education to its students, no matter in which location or in which instructional methodology they choose to learn: in person, online, or mixed mode. The bulk of the instruction provided to City University of Seattle students is through its Teaching Faculty (see Figure 4.4). Faculty tend to teach multiple courses each quarter for CityU, and the range of teaching is quite broad, though the average class size remains less than fifteen students.

Because CityU relies on working professionals for the vast majority of its instruction, their renewal is addressed through their maintenance of professional competence by participating in continuing education in their fields. For example, accountants do accounting updates as mandated by licensure laws, and K–12 teachers do local in-service training each year.

Administrative Faculty also teach in the programs they manage in many instances. For these faculty, there are several programs available for internal support of continuing education and research and renewal. The tuition waiver program allows faculty to take courses offered by CityU at the university’s expense. A number of faculty have continued their education while working at City University and several have completed their doctorates in recent years. Approximately 30 percent of all university employees participate to some degree in the university’s tuition waiver program either as a student themselves or through participation by a family member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Previous Fall Term Credit Hour Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Program Director</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Program Coordinator</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salaries and Benefits

Salary surveys are periodically completed to confirm that faculty salaries are competitive and sufficient to attract and retain competent faculty. Twice annually, the university meets with its benefits brokers to evaluate benefit programs for Administrative Faculty to assure competitiveness, adequacy of coverage, appropriate utilization, cost efficiency, and service excellence. At that time, benefit changes are considered and approved and installed for the following plan year. The university also actively participates with representatives of institutions of higher learning who provide access to a pool of professionals who share information about trends and initiatives impacting pay, benefits, and other programs that affect the university and its faculty. Employee handbooks, benefit summaries, specific policies on compensation, and working conditions are also available.

Figure 4.5 shows CityU’s salary ranges in effect for the 2008–2009 academic year, for the three categories of CityU faculty: program directors, program coordinators, and Teaching Faculty.
Teaching Faculty pay schedules (see Appendix L) are periodically updated and clearly state pay levels for the level of courses and the number of credits taught. Pay is tied directly to the faculty pay schedule, assuring equitable administration.

Effective at the beginning of the 2009–2010 academic year, CityU adjusted the fee schedules for the Teaching Faculty providing graduate and undergraduate instruction. A comprehensive survey of regional adjunct pay practices at institutions of both private and public higher learning provided the impetus for change. The adjustments to the schedules also reflected that a change had not been made for a period of almost five years, even though CityU has experienced few problems recruiting highly qualified faculty. The university has committed to taking a more deliberate and proactive approach to Teaching Faculty pay recognizing that further adjustments to the fee schedule are warranted pending the availability of funding.

Benefits for Teaching Faculty are limited to participation in the university’s tuition waiver program, which is administered centrally through the Human Resources department; 31 percent of CityU employees participate in the program either directly or through the involvement of family members. This number includes Administrative Faculty. In addition, twenty-one of the Teaching Faculty members participated during the 2008–2009 academic year. Salaries and benefits for Administrative Faculty are administered the same as they are for staff. Common practices of ensuring external competitiveness and internal equity are in place, including policies on hiring and recruiting, compensation, and performance management.

### Retention

Turnover of full-time and part-time faculty within CityU was slightly less than 10 percent during the 2008–2009 academic year. Teaching Faculty turnover was much higher in 2008 and 2009 and represents the percentage of faculty who have been taken off the instructor roles for multiple reasons, most of which resulted from teaching inactivity and the development of new programs requiring an influx of new faculty members who better represented the field or programs under development (see Figure 4.6). Teaching Faculty were counted as non-retained if they were officially deactivated and made no longer eligible for a teaching assignment. In the past, the university maintained a larger pool of Teaching Faculty, many of whom have remained in the pool as a source of talented faculty despite not teaching for a period of time, should they or the university desire to re-engage in the future.

### Figure 4.5: Institutional Faculty Profile/Salary Data, Academic Year 2008–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Faculty/Program Director</th>
<th>Faculty/Program Coordinator</th>
<th>Teaching Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Salary (annualized)</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$42,500.00</td>
<td>Fee Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>$60,441.17</td>
<td>$60,087.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>$89,456.52</td>
<td>$89,456.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4.6: Faculty Turnover

#### A. Administrative Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number Termined (FT and PT)</th>
<th>Turnover %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Teaching Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number Resigned</th>
<th>Percent Resigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average 2007–2009</td>
<td>3,598</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>22.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Bureau of Labor statistics tracks “labor separations” or terminations within the United States for education and health services. During 2008, these organizations averaged 2.7 percent turnover per month or 32.4 percent per year (this percentage or “separations rate” is the number of total separations compared to the total employment). Through May 2009, the separation rate declined to an average of 2.4 percent, or an annualized rate of 28.8 percent, which may be an indicator that this trend will continue through the remainder of the calendar year.

Little information is available that would allow for effective comparisons to past levels of turnover of Teaching Faculty. However, a new process and policy for taking action on separations when they happen and identifying the reasons behind them will help the university establish an acceptable standard for measuring turnover of its Teaching Faculty. CityU began this process in 2009 and will continue to track this information in the future. In the meantime, given the industry standard and its ability to staff its courses effectively, CityU’s average turnover rate of Teaching Faculty does not appear to be cause for significant concern. CityU anticipates its annual rate to settle at something closer to 15 percent.

Internal policies and procedures are readily accessible on SharePoint, the university portal, and through the New Faculty Orientation. Employees recently indicated in a survey that changes in policies are communicated effectively and are clearly explained in a timely manner. Policies are under continual review and revision, which have driven the university to establish a centralized structure and common format for writing and seeking approval of all university policies and procedures. The Employee Handbook required updating, which was completed in December 2009. A separate and distinct Faculty Handbook has been recently revised and updated and is provided as a resource to CityU’s faculty (see Exhibits).

Faculty Affairs

**UNIVERSITY PLANNING**

Faculty members continue to provide important contributions to committees that guide the direction of the university (see Figure 4.7). For example, all faculty/program directors and coordinators are directly involved in governance, as delineated in their current job descriptions (see Exhibits). 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). Administrative Faculty also participate in the university’s Strategic Planning Committee and its semiannual strategic planning events.

The Teaching Faculty participate in governance through the Faculty Advisory Committee, which meets quarterly 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 current job descriptions for all faculty delineate their involvement in each of these areas. (See Exhibits for committees and membership.)

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

One of the university’s key strengths is the involvement of faculty leadership, Teaching Faculty, library liaisons, curriculum specialists, international representatives, and subject matter experts in curriculum
design teams tasked with developing programs and courses. Each course is peer-reviewed by colleagues in the School Curriculum Councils to ensure the highest-quality curricula and share best practices in curriculum design. Curricula are developed through a standard process and system-designed to ensure uniformity but also allow for regional and country variations, thereby ensuring consistent academic content in all delivery modes for each course. In order to minimize course development time and maximize faculty preparation time, course shells (where students, at minimum, access their syllabus, announcements, and grades) are pre-populated with course materials that can be easily organized according to the teaching style of the instructor and the learning styles of the students. This ensures consistency in instruction and evaluation, regardless of the location or mode of instruction.

Faculty Development
The professional development of faculty continues to receive focused attention. The Faculty Standards and Development Committee has several subcommittees tasked with key initiatives to promote the orientation, development, evaluation, recognition, and retention of faculty. For example, CityU’s required New Faculty Orientation provides direct support for new faculty to familiarize themselves with CityU’s policies, procedures, and philosophies, and help prepare them for their first course. Mentors are provided to each new faculty member to help them set up their course shell and navigate the learning management system (Blackboard) used by CityU.

During the 2008–2009 fiscal year, 81 percent of CityU’s new faculty in the United States and Canada completed the New Faculty Orientation (NFO) prior to their second quarter teaching, and 92 percent completed it prior to their third quarter teaching. With continued communication and leadership from the deans and primary supervisors, the 2009–2010 fiscal year provides evidence that 96 percent of new faculty have completed the NFO prior to their second quarter. This NFO continues to be revised each quarter, and will be launched worldwide in January 2010,
with a target participation of 100 percent of our new faculty completing the NFO prior to their second quarter teaching.

Through the Faculty Standards and Development Committee, faculty and administration continue to be involved in faculty development efforts. For example, representatives from each school and division (including Teaching Faculty), library services, international locations, and the Human Resources department participate with the Office of Curriculum and Faculty Development Support Services in the planning of regional faculty conferences offered each fall in multiple locations and online. The Office of Curriculum and Faculty Development Support Services partners with Library Services to continuously improve the Virtual Faculty Lounge, which allows faculty to engage in research and discussions on topics of interest relating to teaching and learning, and contribute their own ideas and best practices. The majority of Teaching Faculty engage in professional development independently, which in turn is recorded in the faculty profiles and recognized as part of the evaluation process.

Each year funds are made available for grants to faculty to promote advancements in pedagogy. Recognizing that City University of Seattle focuses its efforts on instruction and practice, the funding it provides and the research it promotes need to be related to these objectives. The faculty are encouraged to do research in their field, and many, particularly in the Counselling program in Canada, are exceptional researchers and publish and present proficiently. The majority of those who engage in research and developmental activities do so on topics that improve teaching and the transition of teaching to practice.

**FACULTY EVALUATION**

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 (see Appendix M). All faculty members worldwide employed by and/or with teaching appointments from CityU receive a comprehensive evaluation of their performance at least once within every four-year period of service, or sooner at the discretion of the deans or primary supervisor. Teaching Faculty who only teach one or two courses a year are included in this four-year time frame. For Administrative Faculty, annual performance reviews are embedded within the university’s web-based performance evaluation and goal alignment tool, Success Factors.

The Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process is the primary performance evaluation process for Teaching Faculty, and a component of the performance evaluation process for faculty/program coordinators and faculty/program directors with teaching responsibilities. It incorporates feedback from supervisor(s) and End-of-Course Evaluations to provide a comprehensive review of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, student support, and currency.

The Developmental Faculty Evaluation is designed to provide support to faculty as needed when concerns arise in teaching assignments. These concerns can arise as the result of student comments, observations of teaching, or results on the End-of-Course Evaluations. The process will help reorient faculty to CityU’s expectations regarding excellence in teaching and learning and fostering student development. The Developmental Faculty Evaluation can be conducted when concerns arise based on a formal evaluation or between regularly scheduled evaluation activities.

Online instruction is carefully monitored by Administrative Faculty who regularly check the online course shells for indications of high levels of engagement by instructors, interaction with students in discussion boards, prompt posting of feedback and grades on assignments, and general adherence to the teaching standards discussed in the section on distance education in the Standard Two chapter.

The data collected from the Comprehensive Faculty Evaluations, Developmental Faculty Evaluations, and End-of-Course Evaluations have been used in many ways to promote ongoing development. Several internal faculty researchers evaluated the comments and scores of top-rated faculty and low-rated faculty to determine the behaviors attributed to these ratings.
The Dean of the School of Management, Kurt Kirstein (2009), compared recognized faculty with qualifying faculty data to evaluate whether there were correlations between specified criteria and higher ratings. Faculty development staff regularly review the results from evaluative instruments to determine faculty development needs and to strategically plan ongoing development and training. Primary supervisors regularly review these data to develop action plans with their faculty and to inform their hiring decisions.

**Continuous Improvement**

Recognizing that the quality of instruction has direct impact on student outcomes, during the last two years the university has embarked upon a process of defining and applying measures of the strength of its institutional faculty. The PAAR (Plan, Act, Assess, and Revise) process incorporates the recruiting, orientation, and evaluation of institutional faculty into a continuous cycle of improvement. Critical to this effort are the metrics and measures that are used to evaluate progress and establish targets for improvement. CityU is busy gathering the data and information necessary to capture these measures and establish a foundation for evaluating and improving the strength of its faculty for years to come. The process and some of the key measures are shown in the following diagram, Figure 4.8.

As one example of how City University of Seattle uses data for continuous improvement, the institution conducts End-of-Course Evaluations (EOCEs) from students at the close of every term (see Exhibits). The EOCE questionnaire was developed in-house based on research documenting behaviors associated with effective instruction. It consists of twenty-two survey items, the initial sixteen of which gather data on instructors, while the remaining six gather student perceptions of the courses as a whole. Students are asked to rate survey items on a standard Likert scale in which 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree.

CityU recently had an outside research organization analyze and interpret survey data collected at the close of the last academic year, comprising the terms from summer 2007 to spring 2008. This report compares instructor and course ratings across these three schools and by modes of instructional delivery (in class, online, and mixed mode). The ratings data for the 2007–08 academic year only include class sections that received

**Figure 4.8: High-Quality Faculty — PAAR Process**
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at least six responses to the EOCE. Data for the previous round, fall 2005 to spring 2007, included student responses from all sections in which there was at least one respondent. Not surprisingly, the student response rates for included sections are noticeably higher than the last round.

Through an earlier analysis of End-of-Course-Evaluation survey results, CityU was able to determine general strengths and weaknesses of instructor performance and use this to inform faculty development efforts. For example, from fall 2005–06 to spring 2006–07, students gave the highest ratings to survey items 1, 2, and 9:

- The instructor encourages students to participate actively in the course.
- The instructor provides opportunities for students to learn from each other.
- The instructor is knowledgeable about the subject matter.

These areas are considered strengths of the faculty at the City University of Seattle and have been shared with the university community. Celebrating positive survey results fosters the continuation of positive trends and keys instructors in to the methods that are producing positive results.

At the other end of the spectrum, students gave the lowest ratings to survey items 10, 12, and 15:

- The instructor effectively uses a variety of teaching strategies.
- The instructor provides useful feedback on my progress in the course.
- The instructor asks for periodic feedback from students to improve his or her teaching.

It should be noted that while these were the three lowest-rated survey items, they still all received an average of a 3.9 or better on a 5-point scale. It appears that communication between students and instructors may be a consistent weakness. Two of the three lowest-rated items dealt with feedback between student and instructor.

The analysis of the student perceptions of these strengths and weaknesses has informed the design and delivery of New Faculty Orientations, communications from the deans, course managers, and primary supervisors, and CityU’s Regional Faculty Conferences. Steps have been taken to provide resources through the Virtual Faculty Lounge to provide recommendations for overcoming these challenges, course managers have taken steps to monitor these weaknesses, and these items have been carefully built into the Comprehensive and Developmental Faculty Evaluations to ensure continued conversations and development in these areas.

In addition, CityU has internally published eight suggestions for best teaching practices from our top-rated faculty to provide ideas for other faculty. Another evaluation is currently being conducted on the comments from students in the classes of the lowest-rated faculty to identify specific targets for primary supervisors to be observing and evaluating to ensure that students receive the best possible learning experience.

CityU’s End-of-Course-Evaluations data are included in its institutional dashboards to track class sections that received student ratings of the overall quality of instruction of at least 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. In order to be included in the dashboard, sections had to receive at least six total responses from students.

The targets were set in 2008–09 using baseline data and vary by school:

- Albright School of Education (ASOE) — 55 percent of sections rated at least 4.5 (achieved 50% in 2008–09)
- Division of Arts and Sciences (DAS) — 60 percent of sections rated at least 4.5 (achieved 53% in 2008–09)
- School of Management (SOM) — 40 percent of sections rated at least 4.5 (achieved 35% in 2008–09)

CityU has launched an EOCE campaign in fall 2009 to share with students how their responses to these surveys are used, to reassure them of the confidentiality of their responses, and to encourage them to continue to provide feedback for continuous improvement. This campaign will include a direct e-mail to students, posters strategically placed to provide information, and a communication from course managers to all instructors to encourage students to complete
the EOCEs and include access information in their courses. It is hoped that students will see the value of these data, and will be even more responsive in the terms to come.

**Academic Freedom**

CityU has adopted the following policy on Academic Freedom. City University of Seattle subscribes to this statement from the 1940 resolution of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges:

> 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 the truth and its free exposition.

> Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher to teach. It is also fundamental to the students’ freedom to learn. It carries the duties correlative with the rights.

City University of Seattle embraces the following Academic Freedom guidelines adopted from the same resolution:

> Providing that our instructors adequately perform other academic duties, they are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. Paid research activities should be approved by City University of Seattle authorities. Instructors may freely discuss their subject in the classroom, but should be careful not to introduce controversial matters that have no relation to the subject.

> Our instructors are citizens as well as officers of an educational institution. When speaking or writing as a citizen, instructors should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but they should also remember that the public may judge CityU by their utterances. Therefore, instructors should always be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not institutional spokespersons.

**SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

As most City University of Seattle instruction is provided by active, working professionals in their field, most of the scholarship and service engagement by these faculty are practitioner-oriented. So, for example, teachers in school districts who teach for CityU provide workshop training in their schools for other teachers or present papers or participate in workshops in the teacher specialty groups within the state. Faculty who teach in the Communications and Psychology programs publish in their professional journals. A survey of faculty scholarship activities showed that faculty engage in scholarship that is supportive of the institution’s mission. Given CityU’s mission to provide a practical and applied education to students, scholarly activities support the institution by focusing on the scholarship of teaching and of practice as described in Boyer’s 1990 treatise entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, which broadened the definition of scholarship from the singular focus on the creation of new knowledge through research (see Exhibits). Boyer’s work identified four types of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Information collected from nearly six hundred Administrative and Teaching Faculty at the end of the 2008–09 academic year revealed substantial numbers of activities aligned with Boyer’s model (see Figure 4.9).

**Figure 4.9: Types of Scholarship and Scholarly Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scholarship</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>114 examples</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>147 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>134 examples</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>207 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>205 examples</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>312 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>324 examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In July 2008, the Academic Affairs Council approved a revised Institutional Review Board policy, which incorporates the policies on scientific misconduct, ethics in research, and the review protocols that faculty, staff, and students must follow when engaged in human subject research. In addition, a board has been appointed to examine the proposals that involve human subjects. During the 2008–09 academic year, the board reviewed 107 proposals concerning research potentially involving human subjects. Most of these proposals come from students in the Master of Counseling Psychology program and the Master of Education program. The board also created standard forms related to organizational consent and individual participant consent. Standard operating guidelines were developed and posted on the Academic Affairs intranet site as well as reference resources. The chairperson of the Institutional Review Board previously served as the Director of the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology program and also is an attorney. (See Exhibits.)

Financial Support

City University of Seattle encourages and supports the scholarly activity of faculty as it enhances the mission, vision, and values that are central to the university. Faculty grants to support the scholarship of teaching and learning will be made available as funding is identified and will be administered through the Office of the Provost. Grants may support research, publication, and the advancement of knowledge that contribute to the Academic Model of the university. Policies and practices governing internal research awards have been adopted by the Academic Affairs Council.

The Faculty Research Grant program provides full-time, part-time, and Teaching Faculty with the opportunity and financial or in-kind resources to explore areas related to the mission of the university and the improvement of instruction for its students. The Faculty Standards and Development Committee developed and circulated a request for proposals in late fall 2009, and awards to support research aimed at improving instruction and transition to practice will be made in winter 2010. Knowledge gained through scholarship activities funded by grants is disseminated throughout the university academic community (see Exhibits).

CONCLUSION

City University of Seattle’s practitioner-faculty model has served students in many positive ways. CityU’s first strategic goal is the promotion of excellence in learning and teaching, and it has invested significant time and resources in its initiatives related to faculty quality and support over the last two years. It tracks metrics related to the quality of instruction quarterly (scores on End-of-Course Evaluations and participation in New Faculty Orientation), and adjusts its actions accordingly to improve its results. The university has processes in place for hiring competent faculty and determining the competitiveness of faculty salaries and benefits to attract and retain its Teaching Faculty, though resource limitations sometimes curtail the institution’s ability to keep compensation fully competitive. The Teaching Faculty are exceptionally well qualified to integrate practical components of the education with the academic rigor of the course. New faculty are provided a comprehensive New Faculty Orientation that familiarizes them with CityU policies and procedures and helps them adequately prepare for their first course. The faculty evaluation process provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities as the standard requires.

Faculty have many opportunities for participation in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance, which enriches the university’s ability to better serve our faculty and students. Budgets are allocated on an annual basis for faculty grants to be used for scholarship and research in alignment with the Academic Model. The university recently revised and compiled
the Institutional Review Board policies on the use of human participants in research. These policies are as up-to-date and complete as any in the field.

CityU is dedicated to becoming aware of and supporting the needs of its faculty. The university has implemented a process for maintaining up-to-date faculty records. An updated policy for faculty grants has been approved that reflects CityU’s mission, goals, and Academic Model. Faculty evaluation processes, policy, and procedures are being updated domestically and internationally. While the process for tracking turnover of Teaching Faculty has been recently developed, requiring quarterly updates of those faculty that remain active and in the pool, plans are in place to develop a process for capturing and analyzing turnover data. Plans are also in place to secure information on current process and activities regarding faculty participation in academic advising to determine if they meet standard requirements.

CityU remains committed to providing an effective, seasoned, engaged, and qualified cadre of faculty to bring its promise of relevant, high-quality educational opportunities to life. It will continue to strengthen its abilities to recruit, select, and support outstanding faculty to provide direction to its academic programs, to contribute to the scholarly community, and to deliver excellent instruction.
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Library & Information Resources
City University of Seattle’s Dr. Vi Tasler Library, located in Bellevue, Washington, supports 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.” The library aligns its work with the university’s goals to promote excellence in learning, expand the reach of CityU programs, create a leading and globally connected university, and improve and sustain the financial health of the university. Library resources, services, and information-literacy instruction are coordinated through the Bellevue 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’s 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.

The library is highly regarded by those inside and outside the CityU community. This is evidenced by the accolade received following the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction’s 2008 accreditation team visit, which found that: “The Library, in collaboration with the programs, provides outstanding and innovative information resources services tailored to the unique needs of City University of Seattle students” (OSPI, 2008). Innovative library services include collaboration with faculty to integrate information-literacy instruction throughout the curriculum across all programs, integration of resources and services in all online Blackboard course shells, instructional tutorials and course resource guides accessible 24/7 on the My.CityU.edu portal, virtual reference services provided via instant messaging and e-mail, electronic delivery services, and extensive online resources. In 2000, the library received commendation as a result of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities’ accreditation review for its “long-term interest and initiative in advancing the array of information resources available to the entire City University community” (NWCCU report, 2000, p. 41). Library staff members also receive ongoing praise from students and faculty for the personalized, convenient, high-quality services and resources that are provided in order to support student learning.

The majority of CityU students and faculty never set foot inside the physical library but prefer to access full-text resources and services online. The library’s consolidated location streamlines its operations and resources, responds to the changing usage patterns of students and faculty worldwide, and aligns with the university’s goal to improve and sustain its financial health. The preference for accessing resources online mirrors trends at other academic libraries (Martell, 2008). In response to this trend, the library prioritizes collecting e-resources, developing online tutorials, and providing online reference and research support services via e-mail and instant messaging. These resources and services are easily accessible to all students and faculty in all programs and locations through the My.CityU portal and through integration in Blackboard course shells.

The location of the library at the administrative center of the university also facilitates librarians’ collaboration with faculty on curriculum development. Librarians serve on program design and course development teams to support the identification and integration of resources and information-literacy instruction across the university’s programs.

**RESOURCES AND SERVICES**

Services provided by the library are developed and revised with the intent of ensuring equivalent library services to all students and faculty regardless of where or when they are learning and teaching. Services
include a suite of over 80 online tutorials, more than 445 course resource pages, instructional support to develop information-literacy skills, and interlibrary loan and electronic document delivery. Reference services and research consultations are available via instant messaging, e-mail, phone, and in-person for students and faculty. CityU’s geographically distributed students and faculty can independently access the library’s services 24/7 through the My.CityU portal or Blackboard course shells in alignment with the library’s just-in-time and point-of-need service model.

Library resources, including the physical print collection and a suite of electronic resources, are accessible online through the My.CityU portal and through links in Blackboard course shells. Resources include 66 full-text databases and electronic reference sources, and the library’s online catalog, which provides access to print materials, e-books, e-journals, and freely available Web resources that are relevant to CityU’s academic programs.

Information about library resources and services is available online to students and faculty through the public website, the My.CityU portal, and the course resource page and Library button found in each Blackboard course shell. The multiple access points for information about library resources and services are aligned with the library’s just-in-time service model, facilitate the independent use of library resources by students and faculty, and are appropriate for CityU’s distributed student body.

The library employs several methods to introduce faculty to its resources and services. Welcome e-mails are sent by liaison librarians to new faculty outlining key resources and services and are customized to CityU academic programs. Liaison librarians participate in faculty conferences and training sessions. Librarians also facilitate a Blackboard discussion forum in every New Faculty Orientation session, broadening the suite of library resources, skills, and services to which faculty are introduced.

The CityU library provides a core collection of print and online materials to support the academic needs of students and faculty whenever and wherever they are studying and teaching. The distribution of print materials across the Library of Congress classification scheme shown in Figure 5.1 illustrates the alignment of the library’s physical collection with CityU’s programs in business, communications, computer systems, education, and psychology. The library’s e-books and web resources included in the online catalog are not represented in these statistics but are selected by librarians to support specific academic programs. Professional and scholarly print and online materials in the library’s collection reflect the practitioner-focused nature of CityU’s current academic offerings. Librarians use the Collection Development policy and procedures (see the university’s Policy and Procedure Manual in Exhibits) and knowledge of CityU’s academic offerings to guide their selection process for all resource types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library of Congress Classification (May 2009)</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – General Works</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Philosophy, Psychology, Religion</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Auxiliary Sciences of History</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – History: General and Old World</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, F – History: America (Western Hemisphere)</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G – Geography, Anthropology, Recreation</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H – Social Sciences (includes Business)</td>
<td>4,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J – Political Science</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – Law</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L – Education</td>
<td>6,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M – Music</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N – Fine Arts</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P – Language &amp; Literature</td>
<td>1,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q – Science (includes Computer Systems)</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R – Medicine</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – Agriculture</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T – Technology</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U – Military Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V – Naval Science</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z – Bibliography, Library Science</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Librarians’ participation on School Curriculum Councils, Program Design and Course Design Teams both facilitates gathering faculty’s resource recommendations and maintains librarians’ awareness of CityU’s evolving curriculum needs. As new areas of study are considered, librarians participate in the program proposal process in order to assess the need for additional print and electronic resources to support student learning. Program directors review and approve the materials recommended by librarians for inclusion in the program proposal budget, with funding provided if and when the program is approved by the President’s Executive Team.

Figure 5.2 lists the number and format of items included in the library’s collection as reported to the biannual 2008 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) U.S. Department of Education survey. The significant reduction in book holdings between FY2006 and FY2008 reflects the closures of Curriculum Resource Centers at several remote teaching locations (discussed later under Facilities and Access). The library continues to maintain a current curriculum collection with over 4,450 items and a collection of award-winning and content-area specific juvenile fiction (over 1,180 items) and juvenile nonfiction (over 1,380 items).

The increase in e-books and current serial titles from 0 in FY2006 to over 17,000 in FY2008 reflects the library’s prioritization to collect e-resources that are accessible to CityU students worldwide in alignment with the goals for excellence in education and developing a globally connected university. As of May 2009, the library’s online catalog included over 19,000 e-book titles and over 330 online resources including websites, PDF documents, and e-journals. Whenever possible, the library prioritizes e-book collections that permit multiple users to access the content simultaneously.

CityU library also maintains subscriptions to over 60 general and subject-specific databases and electronic reference resources. Librarians responsible for collection development regularly assess new databases and electronic reference resources to determine if they will extend full-text access for students at similar or reduced costs in comparison to current resources. Microform collections are maintained to provide full-text access to journal titles not accessible through database subscriptions. The extent of international content is also a key consideration in the selection of online database packages.

Official circulation policy and procedures for the library’s print material and e-book collection are found in the university’s Policy and Procedure Manual (see Exhibits). The library also posts a summary of the circulation policy and procedures to its Documents folder on the My.CityU portal to facilitate student access. This policy and its associated procedures were developed collaboratively by library staff to meet the needs and usage patterns of CityU’s distributed student body. Faculty feedback on the policy and procedures was gathered through the NWCCU Standard Five Committee and the Academic Affairs Council.

Librarians collaborate with faculty to create course resource pages as one step in CityU’s curriculum development process. The resources on these pages include required and recommended resources tailored to help students successfully complete required assignments and meet the learning outcomes for each course. The colocation of required and recommended resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collections in Library Catalog</th>
<th>Holdings FY2008</th>
<th>Holdings FY2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and other paper materials</td>
<td>26,086</td>
<td>46,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-books*</td>
<td>17,341</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms</td>
<td>551,080</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual materials</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current serial titles</td>
<td>31,294</td>
<td>20,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic reference sources and aggregation services (databases)**</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects number of e-books integrated in library’s online catalog
** Includes a small collection of NetLibrary e-books and the Books24x7 ITPro e-book collection
increases the visibility and ease of access to library resources for students and faculty. Students and faculty access these pages through links on the My.CityU portal, Blackboard course shells, and their Course Guide and Syllabus documents. As of May 2009, over 445 course resource pages have been created.

Learning activities are designed collaboratively by librarians and faculty for delivery within the context of specific courses to support specific assignments. This integrated instructional model is on the leading edge of best practices described by the Association for College & Research Libraries and supports the university’s goal to develop the students’ ability to find, access, evaluate, and use information effectively both within the context of their profession and for lifelong learning.

Students who need additional support locating resources to complete their course work may use the library’s Ask a Librarian reference-and-research consultation service. This service is available via instant messaging, e-mail, phone, or in person. The link to the Ask a Librarian service is accessible from most library pages and tutorials on the My.CityU portal, through the public website, and through Blackboard course shells. The Ask a Librarian service is monitored during the library’s open hours and answers to students’ questions are generally received on the same day the questions are submitted. Questions are submitted by students at all locations where CityU programs are offered.

Students who need resources that are not available through the library’s collection may request items through the interlibrary loan service in compliance with the library’s Interlibrary Loan policy and procedures. This policy and the associated procedures are included in the university’s Policy and Procedure Manual (see Exhibits). They were created with input from library staff, the NWCCU Standard Five Committee, and the Academic Affairs Council. The library also posts a summary of the Interlibrary Loan policy and procedures to its Documents folder on the My.CityU portal to facilitate student access. The library uses electronic delivery services to provide students and faculty online access to their requested materials whenever possible and in compliance with U.S. copyright law. In 2008, the library upgraded to CLIO Advanced software, which allows students and faculty to track the status of their requests independently through the My.CityU portal.

FACILITIES AND ACCESS

Library resources and services for all current CityU faculty and enrolled students are provided from the facility in Bellevue, Washington. In December 2007, the library consolidated its resources and services to the Bellevue location. Three Curriculum Resource Centers (CRCs) that primarily supported the Master in Teaching program were closed at CityU’s Everett, Tacoma, and Vancouver sites in Washington. The decision to consolidate library services and resources to the Bellevue campus was based on usage statistics and anecdotal evidence demonstrating a decline in the use of the CRCs’ physical collections and an increase in the use of online resources. In addition, the operating expenses for the CRCs were not aligned with student enrollment data and served only a portion of the students and locations where teaching certification programs were offered. The CRC closures contributed to the university’s goal to sustain its financial health by bringing expenditures into alignment with revenue, reducing the library’s budget from a high of $1.67 million in FY2006 to $1.16 million in FY2007, and helped to realign budget allocations with enrollment numbers for each of CityU’s schools in FY2008.

The library continually seeks ways to improve equitable access to its resources and services by going to where the students and faculty are online. In the past five years, this has included integrating links to key library resources and services in every Blackboard course shell, development and reorganization of content on the My.CityU portal as recently as 2008, increased participation in the curriculum development process, colocating required and recommended resources tailored to specific assignments on course
resource pages, and implementing instant message and e-mail reference services. The library has also assessed and redesigned search interfaces for select databases and the library catalog, and has implemented a service that facilitates full-text article discovery through a Journal List search and links between the library’s online databases. In 2008, Joseph Janes, associate professor at the University of Washington’s iSchool and nationally renowned columnist for the *Library Journal*, praised the library’s efforts and success in extending access to the library’s resources and services beyond the physical location in Bellevue, Washington.

Issues with timely access to online library services in some of CityU’s international locations are being addressed through changes in business processes that resolve timing differences in student registrations. The library is participating in early conversations with the Information Technology department regarding the migration of the library from the My.CityU portal to an integrated online student services page that will make access even easier by pushing relevant content to students based on their location and course of study.

The library in Bellevue no longer arranges for nor financially supports cooperative arrangements with other libraries. Additional library services for students in Canadian programs are overseen by programs in that region and include reimbursement for community cards to specific academic libraries. Additional library services available to students in European programs include the VSM Library in Slovakia and CityU of Seattle in Bulgaria Library. The libraries in Slovakia and Bulgaria maintain independent budgets, staff, physical collections, and websites that include links to online resources accessible through the My.CityU portal as well as original content tailored to meet their students’ needs. As a service to students, the library in Bellevue includes information about these local arrangements on its Circulation Policy and page in the My.CityU portal, and promotes these local resources when answering reference questions for students in these locations. Of course, all CityU Bellevue library services are available to registered students in all CityU teaching locations.

The library’s consortial partners include Orbis Cascade Alliance, Washington State Digital Library, Pacific Northwest FirstSearch Group, and Online Computer Library Center (OCLC). Purchasing full-text online resources through these consortia extends the library’s budget, providing access to a wider variety of resources than would be possible if they were purchased directly from vendors. The library has three reciprocal interlibrary loan (ILL) agreements with the University of Southern Mississippi, the University of Miami Law Library, and the Nova Southeastern University. It coordinates the majority of its interlibrary loan requests through OCLC. A priority is placed on borrowing from free or low-cost lenders.

**PERSONNEL AND MANAGEMENT**

City University of Seattle’s Dr. Vi Tasler Library employs eight professional staff with Master of Library and Information Science degrees, one administrative assistant, two library technicians, and two library assistants. This distribution of professional and support staff is appropriate for providing online resources, services, and an integrated instruction program to CityU’s distributed students, faculty, and staff.

Library services are coordinated by the Director of Library Services. The Director of Library Services leads the department’s strategic planning process, aligning departmental goals with the university’s mission and vision, and collaborates with academic deans to ensure the quality and relevance of library services. The Director of Library Services and/or other library staff participate in the following university committees: Academic Affairs Council, Curriculum Quality Committee, Academic Assessment Committee, Academic Technology Committee, Faculty Standards and Development Committee, and Strategic Planning Committee. The instruction coordinator, systems librarian, electronic resources librarian, and technical services coordinator report to the Director of Library Services.

To support the online delivery of library resources
and services, three of the professional staff are dedicated to maintaining the integrated library system (Voyager), creating and maintaining online content on the library’s My.CityU pages, and overseeing cataloging and interlibrary loan services. The librarians responsible for this essential portion of the library’s work are the systems librarian, the technical services coordinator, and the electronic resources librarian.

The systems librarian is primarily responsible for ensuring that the library’s integrated library system (ILS), Voyager, functions as it should to support the library’s circulation, cataloging, and acquisitions work. The systems librarian serves as liaison to CityU’s Information Technology department and supervises the library assistants. Library assistants who report to the systems librarian help maintain the library’s physical collection, provide circulation support, manage serial renewals, and process new book orders.

The technical services coordinator is responsible for maintaining the accuracy and usability of the library’s catalog and oversees the purchasing, cataloging, and processing of serials and new materials. The technical services coordinator serves as the library’s backup systems librarian and supervises the library technicians. A significant portion of the library technicians’ work is to provide interlibrary loan services in the most efficient way possible. Library technicians also provide copy cataloging support for new acquisitions.

The electronic resources librarian oversees consortial partnerships, database contracts, renewals, and access. The electronic resources librarian collaborates with other librarians to design and create Flash-and text-based tutorials, as well as course resource pages; organizes and updates the library’s My.CityU pages; and serves on the university’s SharePoint Subcommittee and Blackboard Operations and Standards Committee.

The instruction coordinator develops and oversees the implementation and assessment of the library’s integrated instruction program, supervising the liaison librarians’ collaborative work with faculty on program design and curriculum development teams, and serving on the Curriculum Quality Committee and School Curriculum Councils. The librarians reporting to the instruction coordinator are the primary liaisons between the library and academic programs, are active participants on the School Curriculum Councils, and work closely with faculty to assist in the development of curriculum.

While many integrated instruction programs developed by academic libraries consist of a stand-alone course for credit or a single course within an academic program that provides time for a one-shot instructional session with a librarian, CityU is designing a fully integrated information-literacy program that develops students’ skills across the entire program. This program is aligned with the Association of College & Research Libraries’ best practices.

Librarians have made significant progress designing and implementing this innovative instruction program, but challenges remain. One significant challenge for librarians is the unusually high number of programs and courses under simultaneous review as CityU transitions to the new curriculum development process.

According to Table 16 of the most recent (2006) National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) U.S. Department of Education academic libraries survey (http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008337), the median number of library staff per 1,000 FTE students per quarter is 7.5 at master’s degree institutions. The CityU library employs
12.75 staff, translating to 5.6 staff per 1,000 FTE students, which is significantly below that of other institutions. Though the institutions that were included in the NCES survey are not all similar to CityU, since they include major research universities that tend to have more library staff, the goal should be for CityU to at least meet the minimum standard in the lower quartile for master's degree institutions of 5.1 staff members per 1,000 FTE students. This increase in staffing would allow the library to increase the level of support that it provides for curriculum design and better balance the workload of current library staff. Since this is a significant increase in staffing, the intent is to phase in new staff over the course of several years.

The library's budget has declined from a high of $1.67 million in FY2006 to $1.13 million in FY2009. The most significant reduction of 31 percent in FY2006–2007 resulted in cuts to library materials and personnel lines. Personnel costs account for 65 percent of the library's total FY2008–2009 operating budget. The amount allocated for materials in the budget is 28 percent. While the average cost of library materials and personnel has increased each year, the CityU library budget has not kept pace. Fluctuations in the university's revenue have also resulted in spending freezes, which impact the library's ability to maintain a current collection. The library already maximizes its purchasing power through consortia such as the Orbis Cascade Alliance.

Acquisition allocations in FY2009 (23% Albright School of Education, 18% Division of Arts and Sciences, and 59% School of Management) are closely aligned with enrollment (29% ASOE, 19% DAS, and 52% SOM). As new areas of study are added, the library's budget will need to be increased in order to provide adequate support. For example, if a doctoral program is added, the budget includes increases in the library acquisition budget as well. The distribution of funds may also need reassessment, as online resources that support SOM programs tend to cost more than those for ASOE and DAS programs.

Data that can be used to help determine the sufficiency of the CityU library budget is mixed. According to data (http://www.orbiscascade.org/er/membership.html) from the Orbis Cascade Alliance, a consortium of academic institutions in Oregon and Washington, the expenditures for library acquisitions per FTE student for the 2005–2007 academic years averaged $106.81. With an average of $52.42 per FTE student, CityU is spending significantly less on materials to support student learning than other academic institutions in the Pacific Northwest. Though several members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance are research institutions with large acquisitions budgets, many of the institutions in the Alliance are small private and community colleges that are similar to CityU in the number of FTE students. While there is no indication that the students are not being adequately served by the library, the library's budget should be increased annually at a rate at least equal to the rate of inflation in order to maintain a current collection, keep up with the escalating cost of materials, and hire and retain qualified staff.

Despite the extensive workload and annual budget reductions, all library staff members have had multiple opportunities for professional growth from a variety of sources. The library funds one annual professional membership for each librarian as well as attendance at one local or national professional conference or online training. Sample conferences attended by librarians over the past three years include LOEX-of-the-West (Library Orientation Exchange), OnlineNW, EndUser (Voyager ILS), ACRL National (Association of College & Research Libraries), ACRL WA Conference at Pack Forest, and American Library Association conferences. Librarians report that programs offered at national conferences frequently focus on more traditional library services than those offered by CityU and provided limited benefit to our staff. As such, librarians have identified free or low-cost webinars and local events to attend that are more relevant through organizations such as the Blended Librarian Online Community, Copyright Clearance Center, Washington State Library, University of Washington iSchool, and more.
Library technicians and library assistants have also attended local professional development events including BCR Library Network webinars, the OCLC Western Training, NW Interlibrary Loan & Resource Sharing Conference, and the NW EndUser Conference.

The library’s semimonthly staff meetings serve as an additional venue for staff development.

**EVALUATION AND PLANNING**

Libraries traditionally rely on quantitative measures to track and evaluate their resources and services. Traditional quantitative measures include use statistics for circulation, databases, reference, interlibrary loans, instruction sessions and other types of resources and services. While these numbers provide some information about how the library is being used, they do not explain why use increases or decreases over time, or how the library can best improve its resources and services to respond to the needs of students and faculty.

At CityU, evaluation of library resources and services is increasingly drawn from a variety of quantitative and qualitative sources including usage statistics for online and print materials and services, Ask a Librarian reference responses and inquiries, quarterly instant message reference sampling, faculty feedback through collaborative curriculum development and participation on cross-departmental committees, and CityU’s annual Student Satisfaction Survey. Decisions regarding the continuation of resources and how to improve or develop library services are based on the information gathered through these sources. While the library would like to complete qualitative usability studies with students and faculty to further inform improvements in resource delivery and services, CityU’s primary emphasis on increasing student responses to the End-of-Course Evaluations and the annual Student Satisfaction Survey take precedence over new studies.

Over the past five years, the library has seen a general decline in all usage statistics it collects as represented in Figures 5.3–5.8. This decline may be accounted for by a combination of factors including lower student enrollments in the university’s U.S. base, improved tools for accessing content online, student preference for accessing resources through search engines such as Google, and the continually evolving information landscape that facilitates online access to e-journals and other resources.

**Figure 5.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Collection Circulation Statistics*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>5,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>7,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>9,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Library catalog does not track usage of online resources included in the catalog that do not circulate.

Year-to-year statistical comparisons of database usage are difficult because the library’s core collection of databases has changed over time in response to changes in vendor content, changes in CityU’s curriculum, and the acquisition of new online resources. Librarians review usage statistics for specific databases and e-book collections each year, prior to renewing contracts. Products that see low use may be discontinued to redirect funding toward online resources that better meet student and faculty needs.

**Figure 5.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Database Use*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>92,775</td>
<td>81,758</td>
<td>61,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches</td>
<td>421,885</td>
<td>449,060</td>
<td>523,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Text Articles</td>
<td>186,574</td>
<td>218,056</td>
<td>192,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drawn from vendor reports that vary in the type of statistics reported.

The library is currently limited in the statistics that CityU’s IT department is able to collect regarding the use of My.CityU portal pages. Information is
available regarding the use of the *Ask a Librarian* page linked on the public site and on the My.CityU portal, and for the use of the library’s instructional tutorials (see Figure 5.5). The library’s public website was redesigned in 2008, reducing the number of tutorials linked to the page, which may account for the change in use between AY2007–2008 and AY2008–2009. As the library’s instructional tutorials are integrated into more courses, use of these resources should continue to increase.

**Figure 5.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public website</td>
<td>10,119</td>
<td>11,875</td>
<td>16,051</td>
<td>10,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My.CityU portal</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>6,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6 details the total number of items requested through interlibrary loan by students, faculty, and staff. The library filled 92 percent of requests in AY2008–2009, which is high for academic libraries with average fill rates of 84–91 percent, according to the 2003 *ARL Bimonthly Report*. Unfilled requests represent items that libraries do not lend, such as master and doctoral theses or rare monographs owned by few libraries worldwide. Whenever possible, library technicians and librarians work with students and faculty to find alternate sources of information that will satisfy these unfilled requests. Reductions in the number of interlibrary loan (ILL) requests per year, as represented in Figure 5.6, may be attributed to reductions in enrollments and the increasing relevance and accessibility of the library’s print and electronic resources.

Statistics on the use of the library’s e-mail research support, which launched in 2002 and is accessed through the *Ask a Librarian* service, are tracked by the vendor, QuestionPoint. Figure 5.7 provides an overview of the number of questions received through the online patron form or by a librarian’s direct entry, and the number of answers sent. The type of questions received include requests to renew library materials, requests for specific materials students are unable to locate independently, and requests for research tips, recommendations, and support. The majority of student questions are answered with a single response, however, some require ongoing communication between the student and librarian due to their complexity. Instant message reference statistics are gathered through a sampling process during a one-week period each quarter with fourteen sessions documented in November 2008 and nine sessions documented in May 2009. Librarians review sample e-mail and instant message transcripts on a quarterly basis as part of a peer review process intended to identify question trends, share strategies for improving the quality of responses to students, and develop standards and scripts for professional responses to student inquiries.

The overall number of questions received has been declining since 2006. The decline in use of the *Ask a Librarian* service may be accounted for by the decline in use of interlibrary loan requests.
in student enrollments over the past five years, the introduction of self-help tutorials that students can access 24/7 as needed, the launch of the instant messaging reference service, or students’ preference for and satisfaction with information they find through a search engine such as Google. CityU’s decline in the number of reference transactions mirrors trends in other academic library settings (Martell, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (Jan.–Dec.)</th>
<th>Patron Form Questions</th>
<th>Direct Entry Questions</th>
<th>Total Questions Received</th>
<th>Answers Sent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>2,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods for evaluating the library’s impact on student learning from CityU’s integrated information-literacy instruction program are in the early stages. The primary focus of the library’s instruction program over the past two years has been aligning its work with CityU’s new curriculum development process and collaborating with faculty to develop course resource pages and information-literacy learning activities. The library serves a support role in developing student skills that demonstrate achievement of CityU learning goals related to finding, evaluating, and using information effectively.

The library’s goal is to participate in 100 percent of all Program Design and Course Design Teams. As of June 2009, librarian participation in developing course resource pages is near 100 percent. Participation on Course Design Teams provides librarians with faculty observations of gaps in students’ abilities to find, evaluate, and use discipline-specific information and resources. With this knowledge, librarians can best help develop relevant learning activities to address the gaps in student learning and skills related to information literacy. For the period between January and June of 2009, librarian participation in the development of learning activities for Instructor Guides and Blackboard course shells was below 50 percent with librarians working on 104 Instructor Guides out of 247 courses.

Three factors contribute to the challenge in reaching the library’s goal of working with faculty on 100 percent of the Course Design Teams to develop learning activities. The first is the amount of curriculum under simultaneous revision and limited library staff to develop learning activities for appropriate courses. The second is that faculty are accustomed to relying on librarians solely to supply access to course resources and it is a significant shift to think of librarians as partners in instructional support. The third is that the curriculum development process is new and continues to evolve. Course development by teams and the creation of Instructor Guides are new elements of the curriculum development process at CityU and have been more difficult to achieve than anticipated by the Curriculum Quality Committee (CQC). Implementation of an online curriculum development system and ongoing discussions with CQC will continue to build faculty understanding of the library’s role in curriculum development and facilitate collaborative course development with improved access to course documentation by all team members.

As the number of programs and courses under simultaneous revision decreases and CityU’s curriculum development process matures, librarians will shift their emphasis from creating course resource pages to designing more learning activities and participating in online course shells. To ensure students at all locations are taught these skills, some learning activities will be required components of course work. Assessment of student learning as a result of these activities will be integrated with the formative and summative assessments for identified program or course outcomes.

The CityU Student Satisfaction surveys administered in 2002, 2003, 2008, and 2009 include
qualitative questions regarding library resources and services. Questions focus on whether or not students feel the library’s resources and services are sufficient for their research; whether or not students feel they have learned to find, evaluate, and use information effectively; and how frequently students have used specific types of resources and services.

Overall, students feel the library provides the necessary resources and services for them to be successful in their courses and that their studies have improved their ability to find, evaluate, and use relevant information (see Figure 5.8). Survey comments clearly indicate that where there was a lower level of satisfaction with library resources and services in 2008 and 2009, it was directly related to a high response rate from students impacted by the closure of the Curriculum Resource Centers in December 2007. Other comments indicate a few students do not like paying return postage for items mailed to them, and some students continue to find it difficult to use the library's online resources.

Results from the surveys also show an increase in the frequency of use of specific types of library resources and services including the library catalog, online databases, online and in-person research help, tutorials, and course resource pages.

The decrease in ILL services indicates fewer students needed to request materials from other libraries. This decrease could be attributed to the library’s efforts to increase the currency, relevance, and accessibility of its own collection, or to lower enrollments in programs that are traditionally high users of interlibrary loan services, such as the Master of Counselling program in British Columbia, Canada.

The 2009 survey also asked students to indicate if they used a library other than CityU’s to complete the majority of their research, with 51.9 percent responding that they do. Anecdotal comments from students and faculty indicate that when students have access to online resources from another library that they are already familiar with using, they prefer to continue to use the resources they know rather than accessing a new system to support their research.

City University of Seattle’s Dr. Vi Tasler Library participates in the university’s annual strategic planning process. The quantitative and qualitative feedback described above informs the development of the library’s strategic goals. The library further aligns its departmental goals with the mission and goals of the university. Librarians within the department are identified as leads for each of the library’s strategic goals based on relevance to their job duties, and they coordinate their work with appropriate departmental and university staff (see Figure 5.9).

Figure 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityU Library has the resources I need (agree &amp; strongly agree)</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies improve my ability to find, evaluate, and use information (agree &amp; strongly agree)</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using research help one or more times</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using catalog one or more times</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using online databases one or more times</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using tutorials one or more times</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using course resource and subject guides one or more times</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using interlibrary loan service one or more times</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students using a library other than CityU’s one or more times to complete majority of research</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key stakeholders and milestones are identified for each goal along with specific actions necessary to achieve the goals. Progress on these goals is tracked monthly through a departmental report and is summarized in the Strategic Plan on a quarterly basis. After the quarterly reports are completed, any recommended revisions to the established milestones are integrated into the plan. This strategic planning process is aligned with the university’s four-step PAAR (Plan, Act, Assess, Revise) model for achieving key outcomes. Quarterly results posted to the president’s SharePoint site illustrate the library’s progress on achieving all its strategic goals, which are largely on-target to meet the established milestones, with few, if any, revisions.

Looking to the future, CityU library will continue to align its work with the university’s goals and strategic initiatives. Library staff will continue to seek innovative ways to leverage technology and communication tools to effectively reach CityU’s distributed students and faculty. The library will seek ways to expand access to resources and services, and to integrate feedback from faculty and students in the design and delivery of its resources and services. As economic conditions improve, sufficient funding should be restored to the library’s budget so that acquisition funds keep pace with annual price increases and staffing levels can be increased to adequately support librarians’ curriculum work in support of student learning.

### Figure 5.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Services Strategic Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote excellence in learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1A — Provide faculty with new tools to meet the institutional learning outcomes by creating interactive tutorials/learning objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1B — Increase student learning in support of the Academic Model by collaborating with faculty to integrate information-literacy instruction and library resources into the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1C — Improve ability of course designers to integrate information-literacy competencies into the curriculum in support of the Academic Model by creating information-literacy learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1D — Provide easier access to e-resources by adding links to online resources to the library catalog and by collocating serial records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand the reach of CityU programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2A — Increase awareness of current library resources and services by identifying and using new internal and external tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a leading and globally connected university</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3A — Improve library service to students and faculty outside the United States by revising the library’s portal pages in order to make them more international in focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve and sustain the financial health of the university</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4A — Optimize the use of support staff time by offering more self-service options to students through an upgrade to (interlibrary loan) library software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4B — Improve efficiency of operations and prepare for the 2010 NWCCU accreditation visit by documenting policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4C — Save student and staff time by improving the integrity of the library catalog databases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City University of Seattle's Information Technology (IT) department shows its dedication to the university's mission “to change lives for good by offering high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn” by empowering faculty, staff, and students in the use of technology that improves the delivery of quality education. The IT department accomplishes this through the strategic planning, deployment, maintenance, and evaluation of the university's technology services.

CityU’s goal of providing education to anyone with a desire to learn creates a distributed educational environment that extends outside of the U.S. borders to include the strategic use of online classes and partnerships with educational institutions throughout Europe, Asia, Mexico, Canada, and Australia. The IT department brings these distributed learning environments together and helps facilitate the consistency of courses through many of the technology systems and networks it manages.

History at CityU

CityU’s first major computer system was CASTS (Computerized Accounting and Student Terminal System), a Unisys-mainframe-based application developed in the COBOL programming language. Installed in 1988, it consisted of two separate applications, Finance and Student Administration. A manual process was used to transfer data between the two systems. In addition to these applications, CityU used Ceridian software and services for Human Resources and Payroll and a variety of other custom or third-party applications to support various systems from alumni to remote-site student services.

By 1998 the university found that even with software advancements from the vendor, the software was outdated and ineffective in meeting business practices. Key data relevant for student services and assessment were not maintained or tracked electronically. And the overall quality, availability, and flow of information needed improvement in order to facilitate decision making while eliminating inefficient manual and “add-on” systems and processes. CityU also desired to take advantage of new technologies in order to improve the campus community’s administrative interactions and empower end users using web “self-service” where appropriate. In 2003, CityU officially began the project to replace CASTS.

CityU converted its systems to the PeopleSoft HRSA, PeopleSoft Financials and PeopleSoft Enterprise Portal systems in 2005. The HRSA system is a combined HR/Payroll and Student Administration system. Common “person” data as it applies to faculty, staff, and students is maintained in a shared database that reduces redundancies and duplications. Automatic interfaces between the student receivables/general ledger and payroll/general ledger allow for seamless updates with minimal user interface and potential for human error. The Enterprise Portal provides self-service options to students for online registration, bill paying, transcript requests, and account information updates. Faculty members are able to take attendance online as well as post grades and submit them securely through the web interface.

In 2008, the PeopleSoft Customer Relationship Management (CRM) application was implemented to track applicants and provide dialog management with potential and existing students. Continuing to look to enhanced self-service options, including online financial aid award letter acceptance and new functionality such as e-Recruitment for HR, the PeopleSoft HRSA system was upgraded to the latest release in 2009. This new release of the software opens many avenues for CityU to continue to track mission-critical data and provide access and services to our community worldwide.

Information Technology Resources

CityU’s major student-facing applications are outsourced and hosted through professional data centers that provide network redundancy, off-site...
data protection, and increased service reliability. The student administration system and My.CityU.edu portal are hosted by CedarCrestone in Alpharetta, GA, which provides 24-hour technical support and full disaster-recovery systems. The Blackboard Learning Management System is hosted at Semaphore in Seattle, WA, and provides a 24-hour managed data center.

Currently, CityU’s internal locations network topology is a hub-and-spoke design with U.S. and Canadian locations on the outside and Bellevue as the hub. CityU’s U.S and Canadian locations depend on Bellevue for Internet, file and print services, and e-mail. The IT department is in the process of moving Bellevue’s hub servers to Semaphore to decrease dependence and increase availability.

**MY.CITYU.EDU — STUDENT/ FACULTY/STAFF PORTAL**

The My.CityU.edu portal system provides CityU’s students, faculty, and staff a common entry point into CityU’s systems. Students and faculty have the ability to set up their own accounts through this system using their personal information. The portal is also the central online system used to distribute university news and other relevant information to students, faculty, and staff.

The CityU portal currently provides access to:

1. Student records (accounts, transcripts, class schedules, etc.)
2. Virtual classrooms (Blackboard)
3. Library resources and services
4. Resource guides
5. Bookstore
6. 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, and Mexico. Full implementation for courses offered in Europe is under way, and should be completed by fall of the 2010–2011 academic year. 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:

1. Course information (syllabus, assignments, schedule, and course resources)
2. 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 built in-house to develop CityU’s courses and programs and to show alignment across course and program 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 2008–2009 academic year, CityU installed upgraded educational technology in a majority of its U.S. classrooms (see Figure 5.10). These upgrades included the addition of a PC or Wyse thin client 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. During the 2009–2010 academic year, the remaining U.S. classrooms will be upgraded and electronic whiteboards will be added to some classrooms.

Most 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.

At the CityU sites in Trenčín and Bratislava, Slovakia, half of the classrooms are equipped with PC and a PC projector used for lectures and class presentations. Each site has two PC projectors and laptops, which can be booked by instructors and offer wireless Internet connections. IT systems at the other international teaching sites rely on the host institution; in all cases, IT support is adequate for instruction.

LABS

Walk-in labs are available at all major site locations in the United States and Canada so that students can access either a desktop PC or thin client device. 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. The IT department is moving toward replacing all lab desktop PCs with thin client devices because of their higher availability and the ease of updating software and virus protection. Since updates are made centrally to a server, the support team no longer needs to spend large amounts of time updating the software on each individual desktop.

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, but are moving toward thin clients. The Everett site has four PCs that compose a “mini-lab” and are used for any overflow from the walk-in lab.

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 Presidium support services, providing students and instructors with 24/7 support. Presidium’s first-tier support offers live phone and computer chat support and an extensive self-service online knowledge base count. Any support

Figure 5.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Teaching Lab Stations</th>
<th>Walk-in Lab Stations</th>
<th>Mobile Projector Carts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, BC</td>
<td>Planned installation of 4 dedicated PCs winter/spring 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>14 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>7 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Seattle</td>
<td>7 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>4 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>10 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, Washington</td>
<td>3 classrooms with a dedicated PC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, five 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. Due to the recent shift in how the systems are hosted and managed, there is not much current data for comparison.

**System Uptime and Reliability** - The My.CityU.edu portal and student records systems maintained nearly 100 percent accessibility during the 2008–2009 academic year, excluding scheduled maintenance and update periods. The maintenance 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. The Blackboard Learning Management System and Microsoft Exchange e-mail systems maintained 95 percent accessibility during this same time frame. The systems go through quarterly maintenance, and servers are pulled out of the load-balanced environment for repairs and upgrades. While servers are rotated out for maintenance, the application itself is still available.

**Student Satisfaction Surveys** - The CityU Student Satisfaction surveys were conducted in February–March 2008 and November 2008–January 2009 and were provided to approximately 4,000 students (see Appendix B). The winter 2008 survey had 976 total responses and the fall 2008–winter 2009 survey had 1,232 total responses. Both surveys were open to all active CityU students enrolled during those terms.

The data from the surveys show an 8 percent improvement in student satisfaction with IT systems between these two surveys, with 77 percent of students
stating they can easily and reliably access their online course materials. Ninety percent of online-only students say they can easily and reliably access their online course materials. The IT department has set a target goal to attain 85 percent and 95 percent satisfaction rates, respectively, by fiscal year-end 2010.

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, student information system, finance system, and customer relations management system are hosted by CedarCrestone and fully redundant with disaster recovery capabilities. The university’s 24/7 first-tier user support is outsourced to Presidium Inc.

CityU’s IT department maintains a small staff (15 FTE employees, which calculates to 1 FTE per 218 students) but is able to provide the university with the services and support it needs. According to the 2008 Core Data Service report (Educause, 2009), the mean number of students per IT FTE for a Carnegie MA institution is 163.25, and the median is 144.81, which would mean an IT department of 20–22 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 not a requirement here. 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, which replaces approximately 2 FTEs, and 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, the network architect, and the lead programmer analyst positions. The expense budget for IT in FY2009 was just under $3.3 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 FY2009 was $700,000, most of which was used for the upgrade of the student administration and HR systems. Other projects were the upgrade of classroom technology, the creation of a curriculum development system, and replacement of the faculty pay system. The upgrade of CityU’s Blackboard system to the most current version will begin in January 2010.

CityU’s network and security team comprises four members. Their responsibilities include maintaining and extending CityU’s network infrastructure (switches, routers, and servers); managing e-mail and messaging systems; and performing identity management and perimeter security. This group is also responsible for all telephony ordering, maintenance, and troubleshooting.

The system development team comprises seven members who are responsible for supporting the following applications: PeopleSoft Student Administration, PeopleSoft HR/Payroll, PeopleSoft Financials, PeopleSoft CRM, PeopleSoft Enterprise Portal, Blackboard Learning Management System, Microsoft SharePoint intranet portal, the custom-built curriculum development system, and several other miscellaneous systems.

The desktop support team comprises three members who are responsible for acquisition of staff, faculty, and lab desktop equipment including PCs, thin client devices, multimedia devices, projectors, and miscellaneous other equipment; second-tier Help Center support; and installing, maintaining, and supporting all desktop equipment and software applications such as Microsoft Word, Excel, Outlook and PowerPoint; Adobe products; and miscellaneous others.
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 simplified 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.

The use of thin client technology for internal users is an important part of this strategy. Thin client users’ data are backed up on a regular schedule, which enhances data security. Hardware management is simplified; for example, if a thin client terminal stops working, the IT department can replace it easily without losing data or recreating user profiles, thus reducing users’ downtime. Updating software is simplified because new software is only installed on servers, not on individual PCs. Users can log into any terminal on the network and access their own personal desktops; users working from home log in to the same PC name in a remote session.

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 Admissions and Student Services for student data, chief financial officer 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 the university’s programs and services;
- help the university make an informed admission decision or verify identity prior to granting new students access to some of CityU’s services. (See IT Security and Privacy Policy in Exhibits.)

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

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 university councils and committees including the Academic Technology Committee and its subcommittees: the Blackboard Operations and Standards Committee, the Emerging Technologies Committee, and the SharePoint Committee. The Academic Technology Committee has as its focus 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 system. These technologies are vital to sustaining CityU’s excellence and competitiveness as an institution where teaching and learning are at the forefront. A full description of the governance committee structure is in the Standard Six chapter.
CONCLUSION

CityU aligns its library and 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. CityU’s library makes 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. Given its distributed locations around the world, and the growth in online enrollment, most CityU students and faculty never visit the physical library. They access full-text resources and services online.

CityU’s library prioritizes collecting e-resources, developing online tutorials, and providing online reference and research support services via e-mail and instant messaging. These resources and services are easily accessible to all students and faculty in all programs and locations through the My.CityU portal and through integration with Blackboard, its learning management system. The library’s consolidated location streamlines its operations and resources, responds to the changing usage patterns of students and faculty worldwide, and aligns with the university’s goal to improve and sustain its financial health. The librarians work closely with faculty to ensure inclusion of resources and instruction supporting information literacy in its courses and programs. Library staff members also receive ongoing praise from students and faculty for the personalized, convenient, high-quality services and resources that are provided in order to support student learning.

Looking to the future, CityU’s library will continue to align its work with the university’s goals and strategic initiatives. Library staff will continue to leverage technology and communication tools to effectively reach CityU’s distributed students and faculty, to expand access to resources and services, and to integrate feedback from faculty and students in the design and delivery of its resources and services. As funding can be restored to the library’s budget, acquisition funds will keep pace with annual price increases and staffing levels will adequately support librarians’ curriculum work in support of student learning, a significant strength of CityU’s approach.

In order to stay competitive against other global online educational institutions and to meet the increasing needs of more technologically savvy students, CityU’s IT department provides its students and staff with efficient and updated systems through the central management of IT resources. Due to the department size, the management has undertaken projects to increase its efficiency and its service. These include increased central management of technology resources, increased focus on ease of use of its systems for the end user, and stronger emphasis on streaming technologies.

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. IT has begun implementing thin client architecture in order to make internal access faster, more reliable, and up-to-date with software changes. The IT department began moving toward thin client technology in 2008. The department was facing an aging PC fleet and saw an opportunity with thin client technology to provide an improved work environment with a cost savings for the appropriate user.

The thin client technology allows for lower costs in hardware and software updates. Since the software is managed centrally on a server, software updates can be made to a single server instead of individual desktop boxes. The thin client hardware costs less than a desktop box and does not need to be updated as frequently. The thin client deployment began in January 2009 with a small test group and full deployment to the Washington CityU sites is expected in early 2010.

The IT department has been working with academics and international partner institutions to increase the access of CityU’s Blackboard Learning Management System. 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 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 — more content is integrated directly into Blackboard master shells, making it difficult to use multiple systems. As popular learning management systems like Blackboard move toward the Common Cartridge open standards, the IT department foresees less of a problem occurring from incompatibilities between different systems; but for now, moving toward a single learning management system has solved the problem.

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 is working to increase 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 plans to thoroughly revamp 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 university systems by making more information available in a customized form to each individual student or faculty using the portal.
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Standard Six
Governance & Administration
The City University of Seattle is a not-for-profit corporation established under the laws of the state of Washington. As such, it has Articles of Incorporation and bylaws that vest the governance of the institution in the hands of a self-perpetuating Board of Governors. The Board of Governors has, in turn, adopted operational policies and procedures that describe and operationalize the governance structure of the university (see Exhibits).

**Governing Board**

CityU’s Board of Governors’ bylaws specify that the board must comprise at least six and no more than twenty-one members. Currently, the Board of Governors consists of sixteen regular members and three honorary members, all of whom are independent of the institution in terms of salary or income. (See Appendix O for biographies of board members and their terms of service.) 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. The board holds regular quarterly meetings, an annual meeting to confer degrees and elect board officers in the spring, and an annual strategic planning retreat in the winter. Special meetings may be convened at other times if the board is properly notified. The other officers of the university participate actively with the board, staffing the board committees as appropriate.

The board determines its own officers on an annual basis; chair, first vice chair, second vice chair, secretary, treasurer, and chairs of each of its standing committees. Board members serve for a three-year term, subject to reappointment for up to a total of three terms. The size of the board changes periodically, based on turnover and the periodic identification and recruitment of members of the public who are interested and qualified by experience and commitment to serve on the board. It is one role of the governance committee to recruit and recommend new members. Before a new board member is elected to membership, the immediate past chair of the board and a group of current board members meet with the candidate and make a recommendation about his or her suitability to the whole board. The vita of the candidate is circulated and an effort is made to have the candidate attend at least one CityU function before appointment. In recent years, board membership has been very stable, but some new members have recently been appointed in anticipation of the expiration of the terms of some of the current board members.

The board operates as a committee of the whole on action items. There is an executive committee, which is available to consult with the president between meetings, but if an action must be taken before the next regular meeting, the entire board is convened as provided for in the bylaws.

As more fully described under Standard Nine, the board operates under a series of explicit rules governing the disclosure of possible conflicts of interest and subscribes to a policy of ethical operation. The members annually review the legal expectations surrounding the maintenance of not-for-profit status, including completion of Form 990-T; and periodically meet with legal counsel, who explains the expectations for ethical compliance with the responsibilities of anyone on a board of an eleemosynary organization. Further, the board and its audit committee receive and review the annual audit report to ensure compliance with accounting standards and to ensure that the financial operations of the institution are sound and consistent with the budgets it has approved.

Because of the breadth of City University of Seattle programs and its multiple delivery locations, there are high compliance requirements for notifying NWCCU when any substantive change occurs. Such notifications are the responsibility of CityU’s provost. As part of the education and involvement process, the provost also briefs the CityU Board of Governors on the decennial accreditation process and status of the self-study at every board meeting. (See Exhibits.) When
the board considers approving a new degree or partnership, the motion authorizes CityU administration to take the proper action to notify or seek the approval of NWCCU, and prohibits any formal action until NWCCU has approved the program or new partnership or location of study.

LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

One of the principal responsibilities of the Board of Governors is the appointment and evaluation of the president. President Gorsuch was appointed in 2006 and undergoes a formal evaluation every year. In addition, the board uses a facilitated goal setting and review process, bringing in an expert board facilitator to carry out this process. President Gorsuch provides a formal set of goal expectations and the board assesses him on those goals. As a result of the president’s review in 2009, President Gorsuch committed to another three-year term as president.

CityU’s administrative structure is based on clear lines of authority and responsibility. Direct reports to the president include the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer and Vice President of Finance and Administration, the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services, the Chancellor of the International Division, and the directors of Human Resources, Alumni Relations and Development, and Institutional Effectiveness. The administration for Academic Affairs includes the Dean of the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of the School of Management, and the Associate Provost reporting directly to the Provost. The academic officers in all foreign locations also have a dual reporting relationship to the respective school deans.

Administrators’ duties are clearly defined in their job descriptions, and the expectations for performance are established as part of the organization’s annual performance review process. Over the last two years, CityU has engaged in a transition to a performance management system that links individual performance goals to the strategic and operational goals of the institution. In 2009, a new performance management software tool is being implemented to support and reinforce this approach.

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

Historically, CityU has served primarily working adult students in its domestic operations, which represent the majority of its students. They tend to take classes part-time and through online delivery systems. A substantial portion of CityU students are in graduate programs, and many are in programs delivered outside the United States. Despite prior attempts to engage them, for the most part students have not chosen to participate in formal student governance systems. To ensure that student perspectives are included in planning and assessment at all levels of the institution, a systematic Student Satisfaction Survey process is in place, the most recent of which was conducted November 2008–February 2009. Many programs have regular means of incorporating student input as well, such as the counselling program in British Columbia. As is explained in more detail in the descriptions of CityU’s international operations, a more formal student government does exist in CityU’s partner institution in Slovakia, the Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM), and in its programs with the International Business School in Bulgaria.

FACULTY AND STAFF ENGAGEMENT IN GOVERNANCE

There are multiple mechanisms for faculty and staff participation in policy development and decision-making processes at CityU. Senior officers sit weekly with the president at President’s Executive Team (PET) meetings to discuss virtually every issue of importance to the university. At PET meetings, board agenda items are identified, assigned, and reviewed. All university policies and procedures are reviewed.
and approved by the PET. The president distributes a monthly update on CityU policy development, board actions, and events to all faculty and staff. A Strategic Planning Committee, consisting of senior leadership, faculty representation, and staff directors, meets regularly to recommend and monitor institutional planning and initiatives (see Standard One for a detailed description). Further, the president holds a quarterly State of the University meeting, connected electronically to all CityU remote sites, at which senior leadership provides a review of the budget, enrollment, academic initiatives, and institutional directions of the university. All faculty and staff are invited to participate in these quarterly gatherings and to discuss institution-wide issues. Finally, every six months the institution holds a full-day retreat with representatives of all the units to discuss a critical planning topic. In recent sessions, the institution has discussed the accreditation process, approaches to assessment, institutional mission in terms of its international and community college agenda, and resource priorities.

An annual staff survey solicits employee assessments and suggestions. The compilation and analyses of findings are broadly discussed and lead to specific actions to be taken by all departments within the university.

On matters of academic policy and programs, the Office of the Provost oversees an established faculty governance process. The provost chairs the Academic Affairs Council, the membership of which consists of the associate provost, the school and division deans, the directors of Library Services and of the Office of Curriculum and Faculty Development Support Services, regional representation, and faculty representatives from each of the schools, divisions, and the Teaching Faculty. (See Exhibits.) This body is responsible for making recommendations to the provost regarding the approval of new and revised academic policies. It provides a venue for reports on major reviews of all existing degree programs on a regular basis in accordance with the program review policy. It is also the body to recommend approval of any new academic programs, including majors, minors, or emphasis areas within existing degrees, and the expansion of academic programs to new locations. This is the body that exercises the faculty academic oversight of the quality and appropriateness of the academic programs that CityU offers.

The Academic Affairs Council operates through a series of standing committees, each of which has its own clear mission, purpose, and annual charge, and reports to the AAC. The Faculty Standards and Development Committee is responsible for recommending policies and practices on faculty workload and scholarship, faculty evaluation, and faculty development. The Curriculum Quality Committee works closely with the School Curriculum Councils in ensuring the development of new courses and programs consistent with quality standards. The Academic Assessment Committee provides support for learning outcomes assessment processes to be regularized in each program. The Academic Technology Committee evaluates the platforms to be consistently used by CityU in its learning and teaching functions as well as provides recommendations on priorities for future investment in technology. There is an advisory group made up of Teaching Faculty, which is consulted on issues that impact Teaching Faculty such as job descriptions, pay scales or raises, and job duties. This committee is convened by the provost quarterly or when an issue arises that needs its review.

Through this committee structure, all of CityU’s faculty leadership are engaged in the broader institutional governance functions involving academic matters at CityU. Each of the standing committees and the Academic Affairs Council include representation from CityU academic leadership in its multiple locations, including international operations. Faculty are also engaged in decision-making processes at the school level. Teaching Faculty participate in advisory boards for specific programs, including Professional Education Advisory Boards for education programs and industry-based advisory boards in the Division of Arts and Sciences and the School of Management.
Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences Faculty Involvement

The decision-making system in the Albright School of Education (ASOE) and the Division of Arts and Sciences (DAS) is embedded in a culture of collaboration for framing problems and making decisions. The dean and directors have articulated and preserved the core values of the institution while stimulating progress toward more immediate goals.

The programs of the ASOE/DAS are implemented and monitored within the governance and staffing structure of the school. The governance committees of ASOE mirror those of the university and include a Curriculum Committee, an Assessment Committee, and a Diversity Committee. Program directors participate in or chair at least one university- and one school-level committee. Program coordinators participate in or chair at least one school-level committee in addition to program-level committees. University and school committee appointments are identified each year by the dean. In addition, the five program directors in ASOE/DAS meet weekly to oversee the work of the various committees, set strategic direction for the school, and provide annual charges to each of the committees. An additional three faculty program coordinators in Canada also serve as regional directors for their programs, reporting to the program directors in Bellevue.

The ASOE and the DAS Curriculum Councils have responsibility for the quality of the curriculum that is developed, revised, and implemented by the various programs. The chairpersons of the Curriculum Councils also serve on the Curriculum Quality Committee, one of the four standing committees of the Academic Affairs Council.

The ASOE Assessment Committee meets quarterly. Each program has its own assessment committee that oversees its work. The school has adopted its own assessment plan and each program has its individual plan. Certification programs in the ASOE also report assessment results and get input from Professional Education Advisory Boards (PEABs), which are constituted by the state government.

An active ASOE Diversity Committee provides for the implementation of goals and activities, which have been important elements of diversifying the student body for an extended period of time. It oversees the progress of each program on its own individual diversity plan. It also administers the Diversity Scholarship program to teacher candidates of diverse ethnicity in an effort to place educators in the schools of our communities who mirror the population served.

In addition, the program directors, under the leadership of the dean, review all proposals for new programs and reviews of existing programs before they are presented for further consideration at the Academic Affairs Council or the President’s Executive Team.

School of Management Faculty Involvement

The School of Management (SOM) is represented on all committees of the Academic Affairs Council. All new programs must be submitted to the Curriculum Quality Committee for its review. The School of Management complies with the policies of the Faculty Standards and Development Committee and the Academic Technology Committee. All schools must submit, annually, a report from each program on student learning outcomes assessment to the Academic Assessment Committee. The Academic Affairs Council governs all of these processes and makes recommendations for approval to the provost.

In addition to the committee structure, within the School of Management there is another committee, the School Curriculum Council (SCC) that functions as a subcommittee of the Curriculum Quality Committee (CQC) and reviews the documents for each new course or each course change before they are allowed to be released. The chair of the SCC is a permanent member of the CQC. When a program director completes a new course or a course revision, he/she submits the course documents to the SCC, which assesses them for quality, accuracy, and
completeness. Any course that does not meet standards must be revised by the person who submitted it before it can be accepted into the system. Once the SCC has approved a course, it is submitted to the university’s processes that make the course available for registration and listing in the course catalog.

All of the university and school committees are staffed with full-time faculty and program directors or coordinators. Committee members are appointed by the provost or dean at the start of the academic year. In order to facilitate faculty input to the committee structure, the university has established both discussion boards and Wikis as part of each committee database site. Also, prior to action, documents are posted for comment and review. Comments become part of the record and are considered in the final approval actions. These comments can be substantial or editorial.

In addition to the formal methods of faculty involvement in governance listed above, the SOM maintains a diverse communication net with its Teaching Faculty. These informal communication activities range from blogs to briefings and training for faculty. The feedback from SOM faculty is used in the review of courses and programs and finds its way to the Curriculum Review Committee and SOM weekly department meetings for discussion. The primary methods of documenting these processes are the minutes of the committees and the weekly SOM department meetings.

**BUDGET DEVELOPMENT**

Budget development provides another example of the engagement of all sectors of the institution in decision making. Starting almost six months into the current fiscal year — or six months before the beginning of the next annual budget year — discussions at the schools and units begin on proposals for programmatic additions or changes and the budget impacts of those shifts in or additions to priorities. These matters are vetted widely at the local level and then discussed at the academic level, if appropriate, and eventually at the President’s Executive Team meetings. Budget priorities are identified and costed, and these are circulated widely for implications and priority impacts. Budgets are reviewed first in discussion sessions with the board before the administration presents an annual budget to the board, for adoption in May, before the beginning of the next academic/fiscal year on July 1.

Of course, part of any budget development incorporates decisions about salaries, those of faculty and staff. CityU uses a market-based approach to establishing compensation ranges and a merit-based approach to compensation increases. Salary ranges are established through a comparative analysis of CityU’s job descriptions against independently obtained and relevant market data on a regular basis. A salary range reflects the competitive cost (minimum and maximum) to hire a qualified employee to do that job. An employee’s position in the range is determined by both experience and performance in that job.

The base salary of each employee is reviewed as part of his or her annual performance evaluation to determine whether a compensation increase is warranted, based on measurable goals and performance indicators. CityU also periodically adjusts individual salaries based on the need to recalibrate compensation levels based on market and internal comparisons. As CityU evaluates its financial position annually, it continues to make competitive compensation a priority.

The university undertook a study of comparator salary rates and identified the particular areas in which CityU was below its desired position in the market. Adjustments to the teaching rates in Canada were implemented in 2008. Effective July 1, 2009, a new salary schedule for Teaching Faculty in the United States (including faculty sent to teach in CityU programs in China and Mexico) was developed that increases the rates of pay in all categories of instruction. Compensation for Teaching Faculty in Europe is established based on the local market and reviewed regularly to ensure competitiveness.

On the staff side, the institution has performed a number of salary analyses to assess the position of staff compensation. On an annual basis, the Human Resources department performs salary comparisons
using marketing data that is academic-specific from CUPA-HR as well as Puget Sound–specific from Milliman. In total, six surveys are used as benchmarks for compiling staff salary ranges:

- College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) Administrative Compensation Survey
- CUPA-HR Mid-Level Administrative and Professional Salary Survey
- CUPA-HR National Faculty Salary Survey
- Milliman Northwest Management and Professional Salary Survey
- Milliman Puget Sound Regional Salary Survey
- Milliman Northwest Information Technology Salary Survey

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

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 6-01 “Equal Opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment and education policy,” and the HR Policy 6-19 “Anti-Harassment.” 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 had guidelines and procedures in place to support this commitment and made site visits last year to reemphasize those practices, and all materials pertaining to the recruitment and employment process are being updated and expanded for the use of all hiring managers in the United States and Canada.

The university contracts with EthicsPoint, an independent reporting service to enable employees to file complaints of any nature confidentially, and to expect an appropriate administrative response. All such complaints are also made available to the Board of Governors’ audit committee.

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.

The university prepares 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 2008–2009 Affirmative Action Plan defines specific assignments of responsible staff members, including Equal Employment Opportunity management by the Human Resources Director and line management responsibilities of each manager and/or supervisor. All 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. The Affirmative Action Plan is prepared each year, based on data from the previous July 1–June 30 period.

**CONCLUSION**

CityU’s Board of Governors consists of sixteen regular members and three honorary members, all of whom are independent of the institution in terms of salary or income. The role of the board is clearly delineated by
its policies, including the approval of the budget and all new degree offerings. One of the principal responsibilities of the Board of Governors is the appointment and evaluation of the president. President Gorsuch was appointed in 2006 and he recently committed to serve an additional three years at the institution.

CityU’s administrative structure is based on clear lines of authority and responsibility. Administrators’ duties are clearly defined in their job descriptions, and the expectations for performance are established as part of the organization’s annual performance review process. Over the last two years, CityU has engaged in a transition to a performance management system that links individual performance goals to the strategic and operational goals of the institution. Administrative Faculty are directly involved in governance, serving on the curriculum councils of each of the schools and making up the memberships of the four primary academic governance subcommittees of the Academic Affairs Council (AAC). CityU’s Teaching Faculty participate in governance through the Faculty Advisory Committee’s quarterly meetings with the provost. Administrative Faculty and staff take part in the university’s Strategic Planning Committee and its semiannual strategic planning events.

As a result of the characteristics of the majority of its students, CityU struggles to increase direct student engagement in governance. Efforts to add student advisory groups have seen mixed success. The university has implemented a systematic Student Satisfaction Survey process to ensure it gathers student perceptions regarding the university’s programs and services. It incorporates this input into its regular planning processes, and will continue to seek ways to engage all its constituencies in the ongoing decision making, assessment, and improvement of the university as a whole.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION
- Board and committee membership, background statements, terms of office - Appendix O
- Organization charts, including changes since last regular visit in 2005 - Appendix P

ON-SITE EXHIBITS
- City University of Seattle Articles of Incorporation
- Board of Governors’ bylaws
- Policy and Procedure Manual
- Board of Governors’ Academic Affairs Committee agendas August 2008–February 2010
- Accreditation Calendar
- Academic Affairs committee structure, charters for standing committees, and current membership
- Board of Governors’ policy manual, agendas, and minutes of last three years of meetings
- Job descriptions for administrative positions
- Employee Handbook
- Salary data for administrators and staff
- List of currently active committees — membership, names, and contact information for chairs
Standard Seven

Finance
One of City University of Seattle’s four strategic goals has been to improve and sustain its financial health. It uses several metrics to measure performance toward this goal, including:

- Percent net tuition increase
- Contribution to margin (2–4 percent of gross revenue)
- Department of Education ratio (1.5) — annual measure
- Average class size (13)
- Alumni Engagement Index score
- Financial contributions

These metrics are tracked quarterly or annually as appropriate and used in managerial decision making throughout the fiscal year, guiding potential adjustments to plans and budgets on the way to meeting year-end targets for financial health.

CityU is an institution with nearly 97 percent of its revenues derived from tuition, requiring great fiscal discipline and solid financial planning to maintain its viability. The last decade presented significant challenges, including a major organizational transformation triggered by the split with its founder in 2001. CityU has consistently improved its financial condition since 2000 after reaching a settlement agreement with the founder of the university and a related entity, Shepherd Group, on January 31, 2001. The impact of the settlement agreement was recorded in fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, and decreased the university’s unrestricted net assets by $14,258,871, leaving the university in a net unrestricted asset deficit position of $2,396,743. (See City University and Subsidiaries, June 30, 2000, Audited Financial Statements in the Exhibits for a full discussion of the settlement agreement.)

Through extensive expense controls and increased tuition revenue, the university greatly improved its financial position. As of June 30, 2009, the university’s unrestricted net assets were $11,114,113, for an increase of $13,548,856 over the past ten years. Since June 30, 2000, the university has averaged a positive change in net assets of $1,457,210 annually.

As further evidence of the improvement in the university’s financial strength, key financial information as of June 30, 2000, and 2009 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$2,452,651</td>
<td>$8,816,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable, Net</td>
<td>$1,529,427</td>
<td>$1,993,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Assets</td>
<td>$4,555,832</td>
<td>$12,197,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$6,952,575</td>
<td>$10,286,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) uses a composite score based on three ratios (Primary Reserves, Equity, and Net Income) to calculate the overall financial health of colleges and universities for purposes of determining Title IV financial aid eligibility. The university’s current composite score (DOE ratio) stands at 1.65 at June 30, 2009, compared to .65 at June 30, 2000. Additionally, the university has exceeded the minimum required DOE ratio the last four years, improving from a negative .63 in 2000 to a projected ratio of 2.11 at June 30, 2010. Figure 7.1 highlights the improved financial performance of the university over the last ten years.

The university monitors financial results monthly, including key financial statistics on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis. Key financial indicators are shared with all staff at quarterly State of the University presentations by the president. Please see the Exhibits for examples of the financial information available.

Quarterly financial reports are provided to senior management for budget tracking and analysis. Monthly departmental and program reports are made available electronically to all department managers. (See list of financial reports made available to managers in Appendix Q, and examples of these reports in the Exhibits.)

**FINANCIAL PLANNING**

CityU prepares annual operating and capital budgets. (Refer to the Exhibits for copies of the budget process...
and procedures as well as examples of completed departmental budgets.) The budget and the preparation process are driven by the mission and vision statements of the university. The Board of Governors meets for an annual strategy and planning session each January to determine overall strategies in preparation for the upcoming budget process. Goals and expectations are outlined for the process.

Under the leadership of the president and chief financial officer/Vice President for Finance and Administration (CFO) of the university, revenue budgets and enrollment projections for the upcoming year are developed collaboratively with the Finance and Admissions and Student Services Offices and Academic Affairs. Tuition rates for the following year are developed in January and presented to the Board of Governors for review, modification, and approval at the February meeting.

Based on the goals and expectations from the Board of Governors and the enrollment projections, the CFO provides operational expense guidelines to each department. Each department then prepares detailed expense budgets by location. This process includes consideration for new programs and initiatives. All budgets are then submitted to the Business Office for consolidation and review of the results. Results are reviewed with the president and the President’s Executive Team to determine if the expected goals were achieved. Depending upon the results, the budget process may be reviewed and revised expense budgets drafted if the first iteration did not achieve the operating goals for the university.

When a final draft version of the budget achieves the operating goals and is approved by the president, it is presented to the Board of Governors at its scheduled May meeting for discussion and modification, as deemed appropriate.

The approved annual budget is published in June and distributed to all departments. Results are compared to the budget each month and statements are provided to senior management and department heads within approximately six business days of the month end. The university may modify the budget during the year, depending upon actual results, and has a defined process for budget changes. Additionally, new initiatives can be considered at any time (see Exhibits).

Quarterly results are reviewed with the Board of Governors at each quarterly meeting. These reviews include a comparison of results versus the budget as well as projected results through the end of the year. Net tuition and student fees account for nearly
97 percent of total revenue. This heavy dependence on tuition revenue makes it critical to forecast correctly to best utilize available resources. Tuition revenue is forecast with participation by Admissions, the Office of the Provost, deans, and academic program directors to ensure proper input in the process. Adjustments will be made if the projected results are not achieving the operating plan for the year. Quarterly results are also provided to the university’s bank.

CityU prepares annual capital budgets that focus capital spending based on the following priorities:
- Expand access to educational programs
- Improve the learning environment
- Improve the student experience
- Streamline administrative functions

Capital budget procedures are distributed to each department (see Exhibits). Each department submits its request to the Business Office, which compiles all the requests and submits them to the president and the President’s Executive Team. The Executive Team prioritizes the requests based upon the identified institutional criteria, as well as available funds. Once a capital budget is determined, it is submitted to the Board of Governors at its regular May meeting for review, modification, and approval. The Business Office tracks expenditures against this budget and reports its findings on a quarterly basis.

The Board of Governors prefers to fund all capital out of current operations. Board approval is required to enter into any debt funding for any reason.

As part of the total budgeting process, the CFO reviews anticipated cash flow activities based upon the proposed operating and capital budgets. The university’s goal is to avoid debt for general operating purposes and to consider it only for acquisition of long-term assets, such as buildings and major equipment. Anticipated cash flow activities are also provided to the board during the operating and capital budget reviews.

The university’s goal is to maintain cash flow levels, before capital expenditures, of at least two times its annual debt service. Debt service coverage for the most recent year, ended June 30, 2009, was at 4.96. Figure 7.2 shows the last three years of debt payments.

Based on the approved annual capital and operating budget, CityU updates its five-year forecast using various trend analyses and assumptions for the future. Various high and low scenarios are considered in this process and contingency plans developed for low scenarios. (See Exhibits for a copy of the most recent five-year forecast.)

The university tracks enrollment and tuition revenue data by school and program within each school for trending analysis as well as performance against plan. (See Exhibits for examples of university trend analysis.)

**Adequacy of Financial Resources**

As stated earlier, CityU has faced some difficult financial challenges after the split from the founder and the Shepherd Group in 2001. However, through diligent expense management and the implementation of new programs, the university has significantly improved its financial results and has increased the net assets available by over $13 million since 2001.

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 7 percent or less for the 2009–2010 fiscal year, while state-supported institutions increased tuition rates up to 14 percent.

The university has historically been dependent on student tuition and fee revenue but has recently implemented activities to engage alumni support and to more actively seek grants. It recently received a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Debt Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,471,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,372,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,566,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt payments for the next five years are included in the footnotes (Note 5) in the audited financial statements.
$98,750 grant from the Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation Public Benefit Grant Program for diversity scholarships in its teacher education programs. The university will continue to seek additional funds to maintain affordable tuition rates.

Since 2001, CityU had to invest significantly in facilities, classroom equipment and furniture, computer systems and networks, and took on debt and capital lease obligations for such. Additionally, the university purchased a building in Slovakia, which was also funded through long-term debt. Since 2005, management has been focused on bringing down debt and has funded virtually all new equipment acquisitions through operations. Debt and capital lease obligations have been reduced by over $2.3 million since 2005 and will be completely paid off by 2011. Besides reducing debt levels since 2005, the university has also increased cash and cash equivalents balances by nearly $5.4 million to further strengthen its financial position and available reserves and exceed total debt outstanding.

In 2007, CityU began a program to identify excess space and sublet it where possible. The university has secured subleases through 2012 for 24,143 square feet, generating savings of approximately $530,000 annually. Further, the university leased two wireless spectrum licenses under long-term leases that generated up-front cash payments of $570,000 and monthly lease income of $13,000, which are worth approximately $3.8 million (nondiscounted basis) over the life of the leases. These aggressive expense management and asset utilization programs continue to strengthen the financial reserves of the university.

In addition to the composite score (DOE ratio) discussed earlier, CityU has tracked a Consolidated Financial Index (CFI) since 2005, which also reflects continuing improvement in the financial health of the institution. A graph of the CFI index by quarter is included as Figure 7.3.

CityU does not operate any auxiliary enterprises, although it does recognize revenue from textbook rentals to students in Europe through CityU Slovakia. The university outsources to third parties for bookstore, apparel, and memorabilia sales. It receives revenue from these arrangements based upon sales volume. In 2006, the university closed the physical bookstore operation it housed under contract with Follett after determining that it was more beneficial to transition to an entirely online bookstore with eFollett as the vendor. However, as stated earlier, the university has taken advantage of underutilized space as well as Federal...
Communications Commission licenses granted to CityU to increase other income sources and improve the overall operations of the institution.

There are no transfers or interfund borrowing among funds.

CityU prepares annual budgets based upon country of operation, instructional location, and program. Each country and location are allotted the resources necessary to meet the local educational and instructional needs. Some locations may operate at a deficit and are funded from surplus funds from other locations. Generally, operations in a deficit position are either new locations or have new programs just getting under way. New locations and programs are, as a rule, given a three- to five-year window to achieve a positive operating result. In new locations, facilities are rented as needed.

The university receives approximately 27 to 30 percent of its tuition revenue from students who are assisted from federal financial aid programs. CityU awarded $334,373 in scholarships during 2009, and recently implemented a scholarship program for community college transfers and displaced workers. If fully utilized, these scholarships could represent university tuition assistance of approximately $10 million over an expected attendance of two years for each student. The university continually monitors the amounts and types of available financial aid to students in comparison to tuition costs for each program at the university.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The administration reports on the financial adequacy and stability of the university to the Board of Governors at regularly scheduled quarterly meetings. At each quarterly meeting, the president and CFO/Vice President of Finance and Administration report on the financial status of the institution as of the most recently ended quarter. The information reported consists of the Quarterly Financial Statements comparing actual results to budget, actual cash flow year-to-date compared to the budgeted cash flow, and the year-to-date actual expenditures compared to the annual capital budget (see Exhibits). Additionally, projections of expected future operating results are provided to determine if operating adjustments are necessary to achieve the current operating budget for the year.

Additional items may also be reported to the board as required by university policy. These can include items such as investment results, enrollment statistics, partner operating results, and any material actions that may have an impact of current or future operations.

CityU’s financial functions are centralized in the Business Office for U.S. and Canadian locations and are the responsibility of the CFO/Vice President of Finance and Administration. The CFO reports directly to the president. The detailed accounting work in Slovakia and Switzerland are performed in those respective locations and the resulting trial balances are sent to the Business Office monthly for review and consolidation with the results in the United States and Canada. The university’s financial aid awards and drawdowns are performed in the Financial Aid Office and are the responsibility of the Financial Aid Director and the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services.

Revenues and expenditures from all sources, including the administration of scholarships, grants, loans, and student employment, flow through CityU’s integrated accounting system, which is currently PeopleSoft. The Financial Aid Office is responsible for managing and awarding federal- and institutional-funded aid. The Business Office works closely with the Financial Aid Office to ensure the accuracy and timeliness of the financial aid drawdowns, applications of funds, and necessary refunds to students. Each department in the university is responsible for preparing an annual budget. The budget includes the projection of all expenditures and income from whatever source and includes a budget for scholarships. The Financial Aid department also plans and projects grants in aid, loans, and student employment. CityU has two annually scheduled audits. The first is for the preparation of the university’s financial statements. The second is an A-133 audit of the university’s federal grant funds. Opinions for both of the audits have
always been unqualified. (See copies of Audit Reports in the Exhibits.)

The Board of Governors has approved clearly defined and implemented policies regarding cash management and investments. The investment policy outlines the required objectives, goals, and criteria used to invest and manage the university’s cash, endowments, and restricted funds, and provides guidelines for making investment decisions. Daily and weekly cash reports are prepared in the Business Office to review and monitor cash. Quarterly and annual cash flow reports are provided to the Board of Governors at each quarterly meeting. (See the university’s Investment Policy in the Exhibits.)

CityU implemented a fully integrated accounting and Enterprise Resource Planning system called PeopleSoft in fall 2005. This system includes a Financial Systems module (general ledger, accounts payable, accounts receivable, banking); a Student Administration module (student accounts — student records); Human Resources — Payroll, employee maintenance, etc.); and a Customer Relationship Management module that aids in student recruitment and application processing. All policies and procedures governing the financial systems are developed and maintained by the Business Office and are in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). These policies and procedures are followed and enforced university-wide.

CityU has an audit committee that consists of three elected board members. The CFO of the university serves as the audit committee’s administrative liaison. Each year, this committee selects the independent audit firm to perform the financial audit, as well as the A-133 audit, which are then put forth to the Board of Governors for approval. The university typically engages the audit firm on a two- to three-year contract. The selected audit firm presents the results of the annual audit to the audit committee for its review and approval. The report is then presented to the full board by the head of the audit committee.

Since 1984, CityU has been audited annually by the independent certified public accounting firm, KPMG. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards (and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board). The audit includes a management letter when appropriate. A summary of the latest audited financial statements is made available to the public. (See copies of the university’s audited financial statement for the past three years in the Exhibits.)

All funds for financial aid are audited annually by an independent certified public accounting firm and a management letter is issued if deemed necessary. CityU has no other specific programs that are subject to audit.

The university does not have a program to perform internal audits of the accounting system. However, policies and procedures are in place to ensure proper internal controls are adhered to. For example, university management reviews and approves all expenditures and each department head is held accountable for budget variances. These policies and procedures are described in the Business Office’s formal policies.

The annual KPMG audit includes an examination of CityU’s internal controls including comments of any weakness noted. The university immediately addresses any management letter comments that are received from the auditors. There have been no comments on material weaknesses in internal control in the past several years, and CityU has never received a qualified opinion.

City University of Seattle is neither a proprietary nor a public institution. It is a not-for-profit entity incorporated under the laws of the state of Washington.

FUNDRAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

In 1988, institutional leadership founded a corresponding City University Foundation within the meaning of section 509(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of supporting City University of Seattle, a Washington not-for-profit corporation exempt from
taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and described in sections 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code. The purposes of the foundation, as set forth in the Articles of Incorporation, are exclusively charitable, educational, scientific, and literary, within the meaning of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. While the foundation remains current, it is not being utilized as the primary fundraising medium for the university. Instead, since 2007 the Alumni Relations and Development Office under the Office of the President has led a resurgence in fundraising efforts. Guided by the conventional Donor Bill of Rights, created by the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP), and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), the Development Office is laying the groundwork for future fundraising efforts, which may be absorbed by a fully staffed City University Foundation at a later date.

As fundraising campaigns and grant pursuits conducted by the Development Office have emerged in the past two years, it has been determined that CityU should adopt a gift acceptance policy. To implement this policy, a gift acceptance committee will be established that will determine what gifts can be accepted and what conditions may be placed on donations by donors, and will include gift acknowledgment, recognition, and in-kind policies. The university’s goal is to have a gift acceptance policy developed, reviewed, and approved by the end of the 2010 academic year.

Because CityU has only reinitiated fundraising in the past two years, the prospect of creating a significant endowment within the next five years is unlikely. Should fundraising reach $1 million in any given year, consideration to endowment development will be given. In so doing, the university will need to develop policies regarding endowment parameters, investment, and yearly expenditures permitted.

In November 2009, CityU held its first major fundraising event, the Global Innovations Gala. Each member of the Board of Governors pledged to sponsor a table at the event, themed around CityU’s future and sustainability. The keynote speaker was Martha Choe, Chief Administrative Officer for Foundation Operations of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. This event began an agenda to raise awareness and support for the university, and raised over $25,000 for scholarships.

**DONOR BILL OF RIGHTS**

Philanthropy is based on voluntary action for the common good. To assure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, it is declared that all donors have these rights:

1. To be informed of the organization’s mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purpose.

2. To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization’s governing board and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgment in its stewardship responsibilities.

3. To have access to the organization’s most recent financial statements.

4. To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.

5. To receive appropriate acknowledgment and recognition.

6. To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.

7. To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.

8. To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers or employees of the organization or hired solicitors.

9. To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.

10. To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful, and forthright answers.
Alumni Relations at City University of Seattle

Embracing the core belief that a university's success lies in the achievements of its graduates, the alumni relations function at City University of Seattle seeks to “friend raise” and cultivate relationships with graduates in order to have a stronger institutional foundation. The vision of the Alumni Association, as determined by the Alumni Advisory Council in 2006, states that: “City University of Seattle alumni are a part of a vibrant, active community of lifelong learners who continue to grow from a mutually beneficial partnership.” The Alumni Association’s purpose is to champion methods of alumni helping alumni to become successful, strengthening and supporting the ultimate fulfillment of CityU’s overall mission.

CityU seeks ongoing participation by the Alumni Association in a strategic variety of beneficial programs, events, tools, and communications. The alumni relations function was not a major priority for the university for approximately five years until 2005, when an alumni director was hired to create and implement a program to serve alumni needs. Efforts to engage alumni since 2005 have resulted in increased goodwill and a stronger sense of community. The expectation is that more engaged alumni will lead to student referrals and giving to scholarship funds. The ultimate success of alumni relations efforts will be determined when one of the reasons students choose CityU of Seattle is because of the vast alumni network and benefits.

An online survey of alumni indicated a desire for services in three key areas:

1. Lifelong learning
2. Career assistance
3. Networking

The Alumni Relations and Development Office has responded to these expressed needs in the following ways:

- An alumni online community to promote networking among alumni, foster communications, and announce new academic programs and seminars
- Career growth assistance through electronic job postings, job search tools, and the CityU Counseling and Career Center
- Degree/program-specific events with guest speakers addressing a variety of topics, paired with networking sessions
- Publications such as the monthly themed e-newsletter Velocity and the annual President’s Report, covering a variety of topics including career tips and “hot jobs,” continuing education articles, alumni spotlights, and CityU news

The Alumni Relations and Development Office has succeeded in securing more than 3,800 alumni registered with the alumni online community, representing over 8 percent of total CityU alumni. Efforts to stay current with technology have resulted in additional alumni outreach through Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. The office has also implemented an Alumni Engagement Index (AEI) to measure and track alumni involvement from Velocity readership to event attendance and donations.

In the 2010 academic year, the Alumni Relations Office will play a key role in inviting alumni to participate in the launch of two initiatives: a mentoring program to provide needed assistance to diverse student scholars and an alumni referral program to build student enrollment at the university. Alumni recognition in the form of a new award, the Global Innovator Award, was implemented at the inaugural Global Innovations Gala in November 2009. Additionally, alumni discounts will be made available to those registered with the online community.

As additional resources become available, it is the intention of the Alumni Relations program to expand engagement efforts by collaborating with academic program directors both in the United States and worldwide to create events and communications, both electronic and print, at the more specific program/degree levels. Because a student’s experience at CityU is within a cohort in a specific school, the expectation is that there will be more alumni participation if the schools themselves sponsor the events, with the Alumni Relations Office providing support.
### STANDARD SEVEN - Finance Table 3
**Summary Report of Revenues and Expenditures - Public* and Private Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>41,777,423</td>
<td>42,215,644</td>
<td>42,538,547</td>
<td>45,288,728</td>
<td>47,553,164</td>
<td>49,930,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>40,481,449</td>
<td>41,998,716</td>
<td>42,349,274</td>
<td>43,959,091</td>
<td>45,691,997</td>
<td>48,045,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers - Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess (Deficit)</td>
<td>1,295,974</td>
<td>216,928</td>
<td>189,273</td>
<td>1,329,637</td>
<td>1,861,168</td>
<td>1,885,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>200,440</td>
<td>206,487</td>
<td>204,241</td>
<td>214,453</td>
<td>225,176</td>
<td>236,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers - Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Excess (Deficit)</td>
<td>200,440</td>
<td>206,487</td>
<td>204,241</td>
<td>214,453</td>
<td>225,176</td>
<td>236,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operational Excess (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>1,496,414</td>
<td>423,415</td>
<td>393,514</td>
<td>1,544,090</td>
<td>2,086,343</td>
<td>2,122,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STANDARD SEVEN - Finance Table 5
**Undergraduate Enrollment, Tuition, and Unfunded Financial Aid - Private Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Undergraduate Tuition Rate</strong></td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>12,960</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>14,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong>*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>139%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfunded Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td>310,524</td>
<td>303,600</td>
<td>334,373</td>
<td>778,100</td>
<td>780,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(000s) <strong>Index</strong>*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>251%</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time Undergraduate Student Enrollment - Fall</strong></td>
<td>766</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong>*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Undergraduate Head Count Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index</strong>*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio of Unfunded Student Financial Aid to Undergraduate Academic Year Tuition</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use data of three years prior as base in development of 100
### STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE TABLE 4  SOURCES OF FINANCIAL AID - PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A C T U A L</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Private Contributions</td>
<td>74,148</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>44,403</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100,734</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government State Aid</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid (PELL,SEOG,WS)</td>
<td>607,689</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>673,729</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>708,290</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Earnings</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Non-Foundation)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Unfunded Aid</td>
<td>310,524</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>303,600</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>334,373</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Student Loans (if applicable)</td>
<td>12,067,589</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>11,928,972</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>10,921,825</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfederal Workstudy Aid</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Financial Aid</td>
<td>13,059,950</td>
<td>12,950,704</td>
<td>12,065,222</td>
<td>13,064,721</td>
<td>13,714,207</td>
<td>14,396,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of Total Financial Aid  **Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available  ***Budget for Current Year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition and Fees</strong></td>
<td>40,392,987</td>
<td>40,497,609</td>
<td>40,577,235</td>
<td>42,606,097</td>
<td>44,736,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored</td>
<td>(607,689)</td>
<td>(673,729)</td>
<td>(708,290)</td>
<td>(743,705)</td>
<td>(780,890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-sponsored</td>
<td>(310,524)</td>
<td>(303,600)</td>
<td>(334,373)</td>
<td>(351,092)</td>
<td>(368,646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Appropriations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Grants &amp; Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Grants &amp; Contracts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>200,440</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>206,487</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>204,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realizes/Unrealized Net Gains on Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>41,977,863</td>
<td>42,422,131</td>
<td>42,742,788</td>
<td>45,503,181</td>
<td>47,778,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Revenues
# STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE TABLE 7 EXPENDITURES - PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%*</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>16,391,468</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16,667,604</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16,223,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>2,593,891</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,121,840</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,542,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>996,761</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,004,126</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>905,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6,056,411</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6,290,203</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6,883,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>12,134,393</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12,628,744</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12,451,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>2,308,525</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,286,199</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,542,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>2,068,601</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,945,919</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,329,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>239,924</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>340,280</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>212,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Foundations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>40,481,449</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>41,998,716</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>42,349,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Asset</td>
<td>3,103,153</td>
<td>2,839,034</td>
<td>(1,039,384)</td>
<td>1,329,637</td>
<td>1,861,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Assets</td>
<td>6,241,310</td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>12,183,497</td>
<td>11,144,113</td>
<td>12,473,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Net Assets</td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>12,183,497</td>
<td>11,144,113</td>
<td>12,473,750</td>
<td>14,334,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of Total Revenues
## Standard Seven - Finance Table 8

**Assets, Liabilities and Net Assets - Private Institutions Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>6,512,343</td>
<td>8,634,061</td>
<td>8,816,358</td>
<td>10,545,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>2,120,972</td>
<td>2,342,744</td>
<td>1,993,050</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>1,122,058</td>
<td>1,224,006</td>
<td>1,387,633</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,106,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Land</td>
<td>10,826,650</td>
<td>12,703,812</td>
<td>11,126,058</td>
<td>9,326,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Settlement Receivable</td>
<td>273,932</td>
<td>19,317</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges Receivable (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Deposits and other assets)</td>
<td>812,262</td>
<td>692,049</td>
<td>824,793</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>22,774,392</td>
<td>25,615,989</td>
<td>24,147,892</td>
<td>23,771,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>995,277</td>
<td>943,934</td>
<td>860,228</td>
<td>925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Liabilities</td>
<td>3,994,007</td>
<td>3,777,210</td>
<td>3,421,979</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>1,087,863</td>
<td>1,280,354</td>
<td>1,792,649</td>
<td>321,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government advances for student loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current portion of capital lease obligations</td>
<td>247,852</td>
<td>268,562</td>
<td>226,403</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current portion of other long-term liabilities</td>
<td>126,818</td>
<td>338,087</td>
<td>483,332</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (Specify)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenues</td>
<td>3,056,860</td>
<td>3,294,902</td>
<td>3,501,512</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes payable</td>
<td>2,348,563</td>
<td>1,223,538</td>
<td>486,900</td>
<td>165,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations, excluding current portion</td>
<td>496,353</td>
<td>228,616</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long-term liabilities, excluding current portion</td>
<td>1,076,336</td>
<td>2,077,289</td>
<td>2,229,691</td>
<td>1,739,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuity and Life Income Actual Liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (Specify)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits Held for Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>13,429,929</td>
<td>13,432,492</td>
<td>13,003,779</td>
<td>11,142,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>12,175,357</td>
<td>11,144,113</td>
<td>12,628,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>12,183,497</td>
<td>11,144,113</td>
<td>12,628,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>2010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Gifts</strong></td>
<td>74,148</td>
<td>44,403</td>
<td>100,734</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations Restricted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowments Exclusive of Foundation Gifts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of annual gifts to E &amp; G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most recent fiscal year  **Budget for Current Year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>328,668</td>
<td>396,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency Exchange</td>
<td>68,238</td>
<td>117,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>396,906</td>
<td>514,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>5,049,900</td>
<td>6,102,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>100,955</td>
<td>4,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency Exchange</td>
<td>951,562</td>
<td>1,812,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>6,102,417</td>
<td>7,915,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>6,892,034</td>
<td>7,248,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>352,457</td>
<td>656,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency Exchange</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>3,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>7,248,218</td>
<td>7,908,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>4,448,723</td>
<td>4,639,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>104,227</td>
<td>147,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>(50,860)</td>
<td>(79,122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency Exchange</td>
<td>86,900</td>
<td>165,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>4,639,850</td>
<td>4,952,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td>2,191,398</td>
<td>2,271,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>69,036</td>
<td>1,476,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td>(13,156)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency Exchange</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>2,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td>2,271,859</td>
<td>3,750,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
## STANDARD SEVEN - FINANCE TABLE 10  CAPITAL INVESTMENTS - ALL INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction in Progress ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>1,471,971</td>
<td>1,372,723</td>
<td>1,566,602</td>
<td>1,792,649</td>
<td>321,500</td>
<td>415,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>347,968</td>
<td>116,582</td>
<td>151,141</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation (Private Institutions Only)</td>
<td>2,068,601</td>
<td>1,945,919</td>
<td>2,329,638</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most recent fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available  **Budget for Current Year

✓ Briefly describe the nature of the project under way and/or anticipated (e.g., dormitories, classroom facilities, auditorium). Also, indicate sources of funds for the project.

Note: Additions and Deletions to Capital Assets from non-U.S. business units were calculated using the average exchange rate for the year. Currency Exchange reflects the fluctuations between beginning and ending exchange rates for the year and using the average rate for the additions and deletions.

## STANDARD SEVEN - RATIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio 1</th>
<th>2007 Data</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>2008 Data</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>2009 Data</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Asset - Fiscal Year</td>
<td>3,103,153</td>
<td>49.72%</td>
<td>2,839,034</td>
<td>30.38%</td>
<td>(1,039,384)</td>
<td>-8.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Total of Net Assets</td>
<td>6,241,310</td>
<td>237.60%</td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>445.87%</td>
<td>11,144,113</td>
<td>488.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio 2</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Fund Balances</td>
<td>9,344,463</td>
<td>237.60%</td>
<td>12,183,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Debt</td>
<td>3,932,779</td>
<td>275.29%</td>
<td>2,732,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio 3</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Investment in Plant Balance</td>
<td>10,826,650</td>
<td>275.29%</td>
<td>12,703,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Debt</td>
<td>3,932,779</td>
<td>275.29%</td>
<td>2,732,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio 4</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Expense</td>
<td>19,982,120</td>
<td>49.36%</td>
<td>20,793,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General Total Expense</td>
<td>40,481,449</td>
<td>49.36%</td>
<td>41,998,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

The analysis of CityU’s financial history tells the story of an institution that has weathered challenges and greatly strengthened its fiscal performance. The successful turnaround of the last nine years is the result of diligent expense control, solid planning, and careful fiscal management. Taking advantage of additional revenue streams, such as the FCC licenses and reducing the university’s physical footprint, has made significant contributions to its financial health.

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

- List of Financial and Management Reports - Appendix Q

ON-SITE EXHIBITS

- City University and Subsidiaries June 30, 2000 Audited Financial Statements
- Quarterly financial reports
- Operating budget procedures and completed department budgets
- New initiative funding request process
- Capital budget procedures
- Five-year financial forecast
- Trend analyses
- A-133 Audit Reports
- Investment policy
- Audited financial statements for the last three years
- IPEDS Financial Report for the last three years
- Detailed current operating budgets
- Default rate for two most recent years as reported to the U.S. Department of Education
Standard Eight

Physical Resources
City University of Seattle began as a university designed around the concept of accessibility — bringing the university to working adult students in their place of employment, their home, and their community. Accessibility became an important driver in how and where the university chose to organize and deliver programs, thus affecting the physical manifestations of the university today.

Starting as a single classroom in 1973, and growing to be present in eleven countries and twenty-eight locations by 2009, the university chose to disperse its instructional delivery to multiple teaching locations rather than concentrating itself in a single campus location. Accessibility meant being more than a main campus with a handful of satellite centers. Accessibility meant eliminating the idea of a main campus and embracing a network of various-sized teaching locations whose infrastructure would be driven by the size of the local student population being served. And in some years, it meant having administration disbursed among several locations as well.

During the 1970s, the university was concentrated in Washington State and created a network of teaching locations in metropolitan areas from Bellingham to Vancouver and in eastern Washington (Spokane, Yakima, and Richland). Each location followed a common footprint — several classrooms, a student vending area, and a small staff office for advising or site administration. This model emphasized the delivery of instruction, focusing on providing classrooms for instructional needs and minimizing noninstructional infrastructure due to the commuter nature of the student population. Rather than investing in permanent facilities, the university chose to rent in order to ensure that it retained the flexibility to expand and contract space according to student needs.

During the 1980s, following the growing demand for education aimed at the working adult, the university expanded beyond the borders of Washington to Oregon, California, and internationally to Canada, Japan, Switzerland, and Germany. It continued to use a model of university-rented teaching locations consisting of classrooms with minimized noninstructional infrastructure.

During the 1990s, the university began to invest in its core teaching locations in Washington State and elected to purchase buildings in Bellevue, Renton, and Vancouver. It also began to invest in providing more on-site services to students, including regional library instructional centers and local on-site full-time faculty. This change included eventual investment in a permanent university facility in Bratislava, Slovakia, as the administrative center for European operations in 2002.

In early 2000, the university also began to collocate its international operations with partner colleges and universities (such as those in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, and Greece), using established instructional infrastructures in order to reduce its own operating costs. This change to the model allowed the university to introduce its programs in emerging economies in eastern and central Europe by reducing costs enough to price its tuition to the local economy.

Upon reaching a settlement agreement in 2001 with the founder of the university and a related party, the Shepherd Group, the university no longer had ownership of its facilities in Washington, but still maintained adherence to its core model: creating dispersed teaching locations through either university-managed facilities or partner-provided facilities, creating access to the university in multiple locations and countries. Because of this, CityU’s approach to facilities is unique and somewhat varied depending on finding the best solution to physical resources for the student body. (See the Exhibits for a complete listing of all sites and physical descriptions of each.)

United States, China, and Canada

In these regions, the student body has historically been made up of adult learners studying on a part-time basis and generally employed full-time. Student surveys have consistently pointed out accessibility as one of the largest areas of concern for these students.
Therefore, CityU located facilities in easily accessible areas with good freeway visibility and access, and provided for ample amounts of free parking.

CityU locations in the United States are dispersed, with multiple learning sites in support of the main campus location in Bellevue, Washington. Most are located in leased facilities in relatively new buildings that meet all health and safety standards and are ADA-compliant. Teaching sites now include Tacoma/Fife, Renton, North Seattle, and Everett.

Locations in Canada are also dispersed around the main center in Vancouver, BC. Facilities are also located in leased buildings that meet all local health, safety, and disability access requirements. Currently, CityU leases space in Victoria, Calgary, and Edmonton.

Locations in China are rented from local institutions as needed. CityU operates in China through a partner, CIBT School of Business and Technology Corporation, who handles all facility arrangements. Classes are held primarily in Beijing.

**Europe**

In locations that are operated by a partner, CityU relies upon the partner to supply facilities that meet CityU standards and are in compliance with all local regulations surrounding safety and disability access. All of our partners in Europe operate colleges or universities and either own or lease their facilities. Before any partnership is approved, CityU staff visit to ensure the facilities provide a positive learning environment.

In Slovakia, CityU constructed a new facility in Bratislava that meets its instructional needs for many years to come. Additionally, facilities in Trenčín, Slovakia, were purchased for approximately $800,000 in 2000. CityU has significantly upgraded those facilities to meet the instructional requirements of the institution. One of the buildings purchased was not directly connected to the main building and was therefore subsequently sold for $200,000; those funds were invested in further improvements to the main building in Trenčín.

CityU recently began operations in the community of Wettingen, near Zurich. Instructional facilities are leased on an as-needed basis from other local educational institutions. As enrollments expand, CityU will enter into longer term leases for instructional facilities.

CityU also partners with institutions in Bulgaria (Sofia and Pravetz), Romania (Bucharest), and Greece (Athens). In those locations, CityU utilizes the partners’ physical facilities to offer instruction.

As the university works toward ownership of an urban campus location in the Seattle area, and expansion of services to a younger student population, including access to affordable housing, accessibility still remains one of the core attributes of the university and will continue to drive how university facilities support instruction.

**INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT AND FACILITIES**

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. (See University Facilities Standards Policy and University Classroom Standards Policy in the Exhibits.) These standards are reflective of a largely commuter population who access university services for limited durations and predominantly around designated classroom attendance requirements.

Instructional requirements are established by the Academic Affairs Council and reviewed on an annual basis. These standards drive both instructional budgeting as well as facility and technology requirements. 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 Albright School of Education for specialized science labs
and gymnasiums provides future teachers exposure to relevant instructional environments in the most cost-effective manner possible.

University-managed teaching locations, such as those in Renton or Bratislava, have a standard classroom configuration, a designated computer teaching lab, student walk-in computer lab, and student lounge/vending areas. The number of classrooms, labs, and student areas is based upon the size of the student population accessing the facility. Larger teaching locations have multiple labs and student meeting areas.

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

CityU regularly upgrades facilities so they maintain a high-quality image and provide students and faculty with the best learning environment possible. In virtually all locations, CityU has designed and remodeled its own facilities. CityU has invested heavily in physical resources over the last ten years to build new facilities, upgrade existing facilities, and secure new and improved facilities. The following facility investments have been completed in the last few years (rounded to 000):

**United States and Canada**

- Bellevue Building F remodel, including new carpet, paint, floor layout changes, access for all, etc. — $809,000
- Bellevue Building G remodel, including new carpet, floor designs, paint, etc. — $950,000
- Everett remodel, including new carpet, floor designs, paint, etc. — $97,000
- North Seattle remodel including new carpet, floor designs, paint, etc. — $80,000
- Vancouver, BC, remodel, including additional space, bathroom access for all, carpet, paint, etc. — $196,000
- A classroom technology standard was developed (see Exhibits) and all classrooms in the United States have been upgraded to the new standard — $189,000

**Slovakia**

**BRATISLAVA:**

- New windows installed in some classrooms to improve ventilation
- Soundproofing boards installed in all classrooms
- New student lounge added, equipped with sofas, tables, and chairs
- Faculty lounge modernized and equipped with new furniture
- Wi-Fi installed for the whole campus
- PC Lab updated with new computers
- Classroom technology upgrades, including projectors, phonics, etc.
- Added new offices for the admissions and business departments
- Upgrades to the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) system
- A new security system installed in the car park area

**TRENČÍN:**

- All windows replaced to improve heating and cooling of the building
- The main building and the dormitories recently painted on the outside
- The building entrance renovated and access greatly improved
- Classroom improvements with the addition of projectors, printers, and scanners
- Staff workstations replaced and equipped with new computers
Not all programs are offered at all sites, which can modify the instructional needs from one site to another. To ensure all sites meet the needs of the programs offered, each site is staffed with a local site coordinator who monitors the local needs and situations. The coordinators maintain documentation on the following:

- Equipment and instructional requests
- Course time logs
- Equipment inventory lists
- Classroom maintenance checklists
- Reports of broken, damaged, or missing equipment

Student Satisfaction surveys provide evidence of the level of satisfaction with facilities. In the student survey conducted in the 2007–2008 academic year, 64.8 percent of the 932 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “The facilities where I take my classes are conducive to learning, well-equipped, and safe.” In the 2008–2009 student survey, the percentage of positive responses rose to 74.9 percent (1,242 total responses).

University-partner teaching locations are contractually required to meet the same facilities standards. This may be provided through student pass-through fees, as in the case of Centralia College, where CityU students pay the same on-campus student fee as Centralia College students for access to technology labs, or as part of the contract with the foreign partner, as in the case of the International Business School (IBS) in Pravetz, Bulgaria.

The greatest ongoing challenge, both from a financial and instructional support perspective, remains instructional technology. As a significant portion of the university’s adult population migrates to online delivery, and the remaining on-site courses develop more integrated online instructional elements, the virtual classroom plays an increasing role in instructional and support facility decision making. Maintaining 24/7 access to support services, rapid reduction of classroom facility footprints due to reduction in demand for face-to-face classrooms, and investment in fast-changing technological tools and equipment place a strain on university resources, both monetary and human. The university added a 24/7 support system in 2008 to ensure students could obtain support and assistance at any time and from any location. In addition, City University of Seattle was approved in 2009 to become a member of the state of Washington’s K–20 Network.

University staff, faculty, and administration at all teaching locations are assigned a designated workstation equipped with a computer and phone, access to fax, printers, scanners, and photocopiers. Staff and full-time faculty work spaces range from cubicles to offices and are assigned based upon job function and FTE hours. Typically, positions at the director level or higher are allocated private to semiprivate offices. In addition, all staff, faculty, and administration members have access to private conference rooms. Larger facilities have designated staff/faculty lounges.

Teaching Faculty in all locations may access university fax, printer, scanner, and photocopier services. Larger teaching facilities also have designated Teaching Faculty rooms, for example, in Bellevue and Tacoma. All Teaching Faculty have access to private conference rooms to meet with students.

As many Washington and Canadian teaching locations transition from supporting fully face-to-face instruction to increasing mixed-mode formats, work space for staff and faculty can either be temporarily constrained, e.g., in Everett or Vancouver, or underutilized, e.g., in North Seattle or Tacoma, Washington. Temporary constriction of staff and faculty space has occurred as the university has proactively reconfigured for facility needs in 2011 and beyond.

As the university plans for future expansion for the Seattle-area locations to serve a more full-time student base, consisting of international and community college transfer students, its current approach to facilities will need to evolve. Transition from a solely commuter population to one that includes the attendance of full-time students during daytime hours will require the restructuring of its standards regarding noninstructional facilities. Early planning in its search for a more “campus”-like setting for Seattle-based operations.
has recognized the need for more specialized student spaces, including those designed to promote socializing, on-site food services, and studying. The addition of more faculty to support an increasing full-time student population and expanded student services staff will change the look and feel of the university. As the university searches for a new location to replace the main Bellevue facility at the end of 2012, these guiding requirements provide the direction and strategy in the search process. Given the present poor economic conditions and the abundance of space in the Seattle market, it appears the timing is good to seek out facility ownership and create a more permanent feel for the institution.

In the United States and Canada, providing facility maintenance, security, and support services to faculty, students, and staff are the primary responsibilities of the facilities department. The facilities department is managed by the facilities manager, who is based at the Bellevue location and reports to the CFO/Vice President of Finance and Administration. Since all facilities are leased, landlords are generally responsible by contract for HVAC, cleaning, and maintenance. The facilities manager coordinates any shortfalls in service to ensure all facilities are in top condition at all times. There is a regular review of building conditions by the facilities manager as well as feedback from local site coordinators. Any deficiencies noted are reported to the respective landlord and corrected.

The Slovakia sites are managed by the site director in Trenčín and the site coordinator in Bratislava, who report to the Vice President for European Operations. For premises owned or operated by CityU, a three-year improvement plan is maintained for each location. The plan identifies those areas requiring expansion, remodel, or expected equipment replacement based on the applicable life and usage.

Each partner institution is expected to meet CityU building standards and maintain its facilities in appropriate condition to serve the students, faculty, and staff in the best manner possible. The Vice President for European Operations visits partner institutions on a frequent and recurring basis to ensure all standards are being met.

CityU policy states that all owned or leased facilities meet all required federal, state, and local safety and health requirements (WISHA: Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act, ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act, OSHA: Occupational Safety and Health Administration, ASHRAE: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, etc.), are accessible, have flexible spaces that can be rearranged to meet changing needs, and are easily maintained. These same standards and expectations are applied to all partner institutions.

The Disability Support Services Coordinator notifies each site coordinator of any specific special accommodation needs for students, faculty, or staff. The Disability Support Services Coordinator must be current with all respective laws and standards. The Disability Support Services Coordinator is a representative for the students and faculty and is available to anyone who feels that the provided accommodation is inadequate.

The facilities manager administers safety programs, enforces the Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act (WISHA) regulations and manages the disposal of any environmental waste (fluorescent lamps, paint, etc.) to comply with all state and federal regulations. The facilities manager also oversees the annual safety inspections of the facilities, assuring that all fire suppression and warning systems are in compliance with current standards and laws. The department is also responsible for maintaining effective emergency response plans and a close working relationship with local fire departments.

To respond to emergencies and ensure the best possible safety for students, faculty, and staff, the university’s “Campus Safety Plan: North America” is made available to all parties. The Safety Plan is posted on the university portal and all personnel have documented their reading of the plan. (See Campus Safety Plan in the Exhibits.)
**CONCLUSION**

CityU’s physical resources are centered around its mission, vision, and values, with a core emphasis on ease of access for students and faculty. The university regularly studies the characteristics of its students, their trends, and shifts in activity. In recent years, more and more students have been moving to online access, thus reducing the need for physical facilities but increasing technological demands.

Additionally, CityU is attracting more international students who are more traditional in age and are seeking a more campus-like atmosphere. This potentially creates a demand shift in the United States, which the university is presently studying.

**Physical Resources Planning**

All facilities in the United States and Canada are maintained under leases. As these leases approach expiration dates, the university may look to consolidate locations, decrease or increase the size of the footprint, depending on the recent trends in student activity. Additionally, the main campus leases in Bellevue expire at the end of 2012, and the university is already in the process of searching for alternative facilities. An Ad Hoc Campus Committee of the Board of Governors was established in 2009 to assist in this search.

The Ad Hoc Campus Committee is made up of university staff, representing the various departments, as well as board members and outside parties with specific real estate expertise. The committee is studying one particular site in detail but has also submitted a Request for Proposal to the real estate and development community in the Seattle area. The committee is focused on a site that provides a campus feel, yet continues to meet the mission and vision for easy access. Additionally, the committee is seeking facilities with affordable student housing potential either on-site or nearby.

Recent site reviews, the changing market, and changing student needs have resulted in the downsizing of space utilized in Vancouver, Washington. The Vancouver site lease expired in October 2009. The university was able to negotiate a new lease in the same facility but for reduced space. The leased space was reduced from approximately 25,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet. This will provide a more efficient and vibrant use of space, save resources, and provide for additional investment in other locations.

The university has not embarked on any major capital campaigns or fundraisers due to the current strategy of leasing facilities. However, this is under consideration by the Ad Hoc Campus Committee, as one strong preference is to take an ownership in the main campus facility and utilize the public transit system in the Seattle area, which is quickly improving via the expansion of light rail and bus service.

Management and the Board of Governors are involved in any decision regarding sites and facilities. All leases or purchase agreements must be approved by the Board of Governors as stipulated in the board bylaws.

As the university pursues a transition from dispersed leased facilities to a more common campus and higher use of online capabilities, it will begin the development of a master plan, depending on the efforts of the Ad Hoc Campus Committee. Once a site is located, a master plan will be developed for the expansion, maintenance, and integration of the new site into the university’s overall strategy.

**REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION**

- Map and floor plan of main campus in Bellevue - Appendix R

**ON-SITE EXHIBITS**

- Complete list of all sites and physical descriptions of each
- Facility Standards policy
- Classroom Standards policy
- Campus Safety Plan
Standard Nine

Institutional Integrity
City University of Seattle recognizes its obligation to its students, faculty and staff, organizations 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.

**ETHICAL STANDARDS AND PRACTICES**

The Board of Governors has adopted and published a Code of Ethics that sets forth the principles upon which the university is to operate:

*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 Governors, 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 and local laws, and regulations. (See Appendix S.)*

CityU’s Code of Ethics guides operations in the numerous areas in which the university must operate, such as compliance with laws applicable to tax-exempt institutions, equal opportunity and nondiscrimination, civic involvement, business ethics, conflicts of interest, and protection of institutional assets. In all of these areas, and in its relationships to students, the Board of Governors has set forth the expectations that every representative of CityU will observe the highest ethical standards and principles.

All faculty participate in a New Faculty Orientation when they are hired. Also, all staff hired in the United States and Canada participate in an on-site new employee orientation following their first day of employment. Included in both orientations is a requirement to review CityU policies, including those on ethics and conflicts of interest, and to sign a statement of understanding of and compliance with the university’s Code of Ethics. In addition, as part of the new employee orientation requirement, all faculty and staff hired in the United States and Canada go through harassment prevention training hosted by New Media Learning (www.newmedialearning.com).

In its Employee Handbook, CityU outlines its approach to resolving problems, questions, or concerns related to employment (see Exhibits). In matters that may cause concern for staff, the university has contracted with EthicsPoint (www.ethicspoint.com) to be the recipient of those reports and protect the anonymity of the reporting party. As mentioned in Standard Six, EthicsPoint is a third-party reporting solution that allows employees and students to report alleged ethical violations, with the option of remaining anonymous.

Reports generated by EthicsPoint are sent to seven individuals: the president, the CFO/Vice President of Finance and Administration, the Director of Human Resources, three members of the Board of Governors’ audit committee, and the CFO/vice president’s executive assistant who serves as the EthicsPoint site administrator for CityU. If an EthicsPoint report is in regards to any of the seven individuals listed above, they are excluded from receiving the report to ensure confidentiality.

If reports fall into the “HR” or “other” categories, the Director of Human Resources takes the lead on investigating and responding to the complaint or he assigns a designee who is best equipped to investigate/respond to a specific situation. If the complaint is recorded as “financial,” the CFO/vice president takes the lead or assigns a designee to investigate/respond. The role of the audit committee members is to ensure that CityU responds in a timely and appropriate manner to all complaints received.
In addition, a section of CityU’s Code of Ethics (see Appendix S) is posted on its public website:

For alleged violations of the Code of Ethics, the University will weigh relevant facts and circumstances, including, but not limited to, the extent to which the behavior was contrary to the express language or general intent of the Code of Ethics, the egregiousness of the behavior, the employee’s history with the University, and other factors which the University deems relevant. Discipline for failure to abide by the Code of Ethics may, in the University’s discretion, range from oral correction to termination.

In the 2008–09 academic year, a total of forty-six reports were made through CityU’s EthicsPoint service. Over half were categorized as “other” (52 percent), with the next three highest categories being employee misconduct (15.2 percent), inappropriate communication (13 percent), and discrimination/harassment (10.8 percent). The resolution of reports is shown in Figure 9.1.

Figure 9.1: EthicsPoint Report Resolutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Percent of Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action taken — frivolous/unfounded</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action taken — not enough information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprimanded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubstantiated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies and Procedures**

Organizational changes and the implementation of CityU’s continuous improvement process over the last several years have prompted the reexamination of all operational policies and procedures. The university policies included in its Board Policy Handbook, its Employee Handbook, and those related to students and academic programs needed to be assembled in a way that would make it easier for faculty, staff, and administrators to access them when needed. As a result, all the board and university-level policies and procedures were updated and organized into a single electronic library, maintained by the President’s Office, and accessed via the university’s intranet. As part of this project, all the policies of the institution, including Board of Governors’ policies, business operations policies, unit policies, or student policies, have been reviewed and updated, as appropriate, over the last two years. The university updated its “Policy on Policies,” which codifies the process for establishing, reviewing, revising, and approving all university-level policies and procedures. (See the Policy and Procedure Manual in the Exhibits.) In addition, all of the policies published in CityU’s annual catalog are reviewed annually by a committee consisting of the Vice President of Student Services, the provost, the deans, the registrar, and the controller to ensure they are consistent with the practices of the institution.

Prompting some of these reviews were public policy or legal changes. For example, the revised rules regarding board conflicts of interest, paralleling the Sarbanes–Oxley legislation governing for-profit corporation boards, required the adoption of new conflict-of-interest policies. Legal counsel for the institution reviewed the requirements with the board and annual conflict-of-interest forms were developed and are required to be filled out by each member of the Board of Governors. The board reviews the IRS form 990-T each year with legal counsel present. (See 990-T for 2008 in the Exhibits.)

**Publications and Communications**

In its publications, website, and materials, CityU promotes itself in ways that are consistent with its mission, vision, and values. Its messages are congruent with the students it seeks to serve: adults who are returning to higher education to complete an undergraduate degree
or obtain a master's degree; transfer students; international students who want to study in the United States or in their home countries where CityU has partnerships; and anyone who seeks a practitioner-focused learning experience. The university's curricula are focused on fields that have workforce goals at the end — education, management, psychology, counseling, technology, and communications. All of its communications and publications are reviewed for accuracy and alignment with its stated mission, vision, values, and the standards and policies by which it governs its operations.

**Academic Freedom**

City University of Seattle is a teaching university. It focuses on bringing a high-quality, relevant lifelong education to those who have a desire to learn, in multiple delivery modes and locations around the world. It does so by having common curricula developed by groups of experts led by the program directors and program coordinators, referred to collectively as CityU’s Administrative Faculty. While most Administrative Faculty teach in their programs, their primary jobs are as administrators, the equivalent of department chairs. The majority of teaching is accomplished by CityU’s Teaching Faculty, a cadre of faculty who are contracted to teach specific courses, and who are generally professionals in the fields in which they teach. This is in alignment with CityU’s emphasis on practitioner-focused education. The use of common curricula is thus an important component of ensuring the consistently high quality of CityU’s academic programs.

CityU promotes faculty exploration in teaching and in research. The CityU Board of Governors has adopted the following policy on Academic Freedom, adapted from the 1940 resolution of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges:

**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.**

**The Board of Governors believes that 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.**

**The Board of Governors delegates responsibility for the management of City University’s academic affairs, consistent with Board policies, to the President of the University, who shall exercise such responsibility in conjunction with the Provost.**

As more fully described in Standard Four — Faculty, all faculty who teach for CityU participate in an orientation session, and CityU’s commitment to academic freedom is discussed in that program. Faculty are encouraged to bring new material, in addition to the established course curriculum, into the classroom. Indeed, because so many of the Teaching Faculty are practicing professionals, they pride themselves in injecting the most current literature and practices of their fields into the instructional milieu. And because many students have related work experiences as well, their additions lead to the liveliest engagements. These currencies are examples of the freedoms the faculty exercise as they teach for CityU.

CityU encourages and supports scholarship, particularly for the Administrative Faculty. (See Scholarship Policy in the Exhibits.) Several faculty have pursued advanced degrees with informal institutional support to accommodate their studies. Many have participated in conferences and published research papers. The institution houses an Office of Curriculum and Faculty Development Support Services, which administers a research grant program. A complete Institutional Review Board policy and procedure is in place to guide the ethical use of human subjects in research for both students and faculty. (See IRB Manual in the
Recently, with the approval by the Board of Governors of the proposal to create a doctoral program in Organizational Leadership, a focused interest in supporting research related to advancing good practice in the respective fields in which CityU offers instruction, as well as in new and improved pedagogy, will be driving forces in allocating research resources to faculty, but the freedom for faculty to pursue topics of their own choosing will still be respected. The 2009–2010 Request for Proposals administered by the Faculty Standards and Development Committee incorporate those themes as it seeks to distribute internal research support funds. (See 2009–2010 Request for Proposals in the Exhibits.) These matters have arisen in approval and accreditation processes in other countries that expect all faculty to be involved in the traditional triad of teaching, research, and service, and in all cases, CityU policies and practices have been approved as fostering the academic freedoms faculty expect.

When CityU operates its programs in other countries, it follows the principles codified in NWCCU’s Policy A-7, *Principles of Good Practice in Educational Courses and Programs Offered Outside the United States*. The ways in which the university ensures alignment with this policy, including principles related to ethical practice, are described in detail in the chapter on City University of Seattle’s international programs.

**CONCLUSION**

In sum, the policies and practices of City University of Seattle are current and appropriate to maintain institutional integrity and academic freedom. They allow common understandings of the rules that govern the institution, and a thorough review and adoption by the Board of Governors this past year solidifies their commitment to operating in a clear and open manner, with the highest expectations for honor and integrity.

**REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION**

- City University of Seattle Code of Ethics - Appendix S

**ON-SITE EXHIBITS**

- Employee Handbook
- *Policy and Procedure Manual*
- IRS Form 990-T for 2008
- Scholarship Policy
- Institutional Review Board policy and procedures
- Faculty Research Grants Request for Proposals
- Copies of print and electronic promotional materials
International Programs
Consistent with its mission to provide opportunities wherever there are unmet higher education needs, City University of Seattle has had a presence outside the United States for almost thirty years. Since the 1980s, when CityU took its academic offerings to an underserved adult learner population in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, the university has responded to regions in need of U.S. accredited programs and expanded its global presence to include three continents and eleven countries. Starting with its Strategic Plan developed in 2006, CityU has made becoming a leading, globally connected university part of its long-term goals.

Because of the importance of its international programming in its mission and vision, CityU decided to include in its self-study report an in-depth review of its programs and partnerships abroad. Much of the content comes from the international plan developed by the International Division and university leadership in the summer of 2008, updated for the 2008–2009 self-study year. This section covers CityU’s vision of becoming a “leading, globally connected university,” how it is organized to operate across borders, and the decision-making process used in assessing new opportunities for the institution to offer programs in additional countries. It then reviews and analyzes each of CityU’s international offerings organized by the regions it serves: Canada and Mexico in North America; Slovakia, Czech Republic, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania in central and eastern Europe; China; and Australia. It presents a summary of the main recommendations for improvement that will guide the university in its continuous improvement process related to its international offerings.

### CityU’s International Programs at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>*Head Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Springfield)</td>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Operational: Home campus</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>**N/A</td>
<td>Sent from home campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Beijing)</td>
<td>Beijing University of Technology and Canadian Institute of Business and Technology</td>
<td>Academic: Regional Director of Academic Affairs in Beijing Operational: Home campus</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Mix of local faculty and faculty sent from home campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2008–2009 Student Head Count **Started July 2009 — 5 students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
<th>Oversight</th>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>*Head Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (Pravetz and Sofia)</td>
<td>International Business School</td>
<td>Academic: Dean of Academic Affairs in Bulgaria, Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Mix of local faculty and international faculty sent from Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic (Prague)</td>
<td>Vysoká škola finanční a správní</td>
<td>Operational: Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia, Academic &amp; Student Advising</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mix of local faculty and international faculty sent from Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (Athens)</td>
<td>City Unity College Athens TEI Piraeus</td>
<td>Academic: Dean of Academic Affairs in Bulgaria, Director of Academic Affairs in Athens, Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Computer Systems, Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology, Master of Business Administration, Master of Science in Computer Systems, Master of Science in Project Management</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Local faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (Bucharest)</td>
<td>InterCollege Institute of Business Studies, University of Nicosia</td>
<td>Academic: Dean of Academic Affairs in Bulgaria, Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mix of local faculty and international faculty sent from Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia (Bratislava &amp; Trenčín)</td>
<td>Vysoká Škola Manažmentu</td>
<td>Academic: Dean of Academic Affairs in Slovakia, Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia</td>
<td>English as a Second Language (nondegree), Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bachelor of Science in Information Systems, Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>International faculty based in Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (Zurich, Wettingen, Lucerne)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Academic: Dean of Academic Affairs in Slovakia, Vice President of European Operations in Slovakia</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Management, Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mix of local faculty and international faculty sent from Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (Vancouver and Victoria, BC; Calgary and Edmonton, AB)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Operational: Home campus</td>
<td>Master of Counselling, Master of Education</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Local faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (Baja, California)</td>
<td>CETYS Universidad</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Operational: Home campus</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts in Management, Bachelor of Science in Business Administration</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Faculty sent from home campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2008–2009 Student Head Count*
CITY UNIVERSITY OF SEATTLE’S VISION TO BECOME A LEADING, GLOBALLY CONNECTED UNIVERSITY

All students everywhere share a common desire to pursue a career that builds on their natural talents, connects them to the “real” world, and enables them to contribute to the prosperity and health of their families, communities, and countries. For more than twenty-five years, the university has been expanding the reach of education to other countries, making a modest but critical contribution to enhancing the understanding of the world’s interconnectedness, fostering sustainability, and helping to build capacity for economic development. By expanding access to high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn, CityU not only advances its mission but also provides the foundation for its vision to become a truly international university. For many students in the United States, expanding access has been about convenience: offering courses at times, locations, and via means that fit within their lifestyles and circumstances. It has also been about eliminating barriers and creating alternative routes to make career moves. For non-native English-speaking students, access has meant offering special English language instruction prior to and throughout their academic studies. For students of other countries seeking a U.S.-style education, access has meant offering study opportunities in the United States and also offering full programs of study in their home countries at affordable prices, often with the opportunity to obtain a CityU degree and a degree from the local institution simultaneously, thereby equipping graduates with a more competitive and marketable preparation. For those students interested in a truly international education, access means completing a portion or portions of their international studies in another country. By creating international accessibility to a common global education platform, CityU fulfills both its mission and its vision.

CityU’s vision leads it to locations in the world where students do not have adequate access and where countries and companies have substantial unmet needs for high-quality professionals. Integral to CityU’s vision is an expanding network of international higher education partners who share CityU’s vision and whose own capabilities to serve students will be enhanced because of the partnership. With local advocates and champions of the vision, CityU uses its partners’ knowledge and capacity to help create access for students and fill unmet needs. By developing such a global network of partnerships, CityU offers students in all its locations enhanced access and opportunities to acquire a genuinely international education, and importantly, the same quality of education at all locations.

In summary, CityU fulfills its vision by internationalizing its curriculum and faculty, developing an international cultural ethos at all locations, increasing the number of students who study in a country or countries other than their home, and expanding its network of international locations to encompass the emerging economic regions, countries, and cities of the world. Using the cross-border virtual experience that an online platform can provide, CityU envisions in the future all of its students moving from a geographically centric perspective to being globally connected and globally mobile. By so doing, CityU students, as well as students from other universities, will gain the truly global and multicultural perspectives that are necessary to succeed in the twenty-first century.

ORGANIZING AND OPERATING A GLOBALLY CONNECTED UNIVERSITY

Organizational Structure

In January 2008, the City University of Seattle Board of Governors, upon the recommendation of President Gorsuch, agreed to pursue the vision to become a truly leading, globally connected university. To advance and support that vision, they also authorized the creation of the International Division within CityU. All international operations, with the exception of
Canada (until it achieves appropriate scale and status), are under the auspices of the International Division and supervised by its chancellor. Similarly, all agreements pertaining to the development and operation of international locations are under the purview of the division. The identification and development of new international locations and partners and recommendations related to the expansion of new programs in those locations are the responsibility of the chancellor and the International Division.

As of January 2010, the current Chancellor of the International Division left CityU to become the Rector of CETYS University in Mexico. During the transitional stage for the balance of the 2009–2010 academic year, CityU reorganized the responsibilities of the International Division among the current senior leadership of the university. With respect to its operations in Europe, the Vice President for European Operations reports on institutional and partner relations directly to the president, and to the provost on all academic policy matters including any new program developments. For ongoing issues related to individual School of Management (SOM) programs, the regional academic deans report to the Dean of the School of Management and to the Vice President for European Operations on operational issues.

The Regional Director of Academic Affairs in China is responsible for the MBA program and prospectively for other undergraduate SOM programs delivered in that country. This position reports directly to the Dean of the School of Management on academic-related matters. New programs or partnership development in Asia are supervised directly by the president. The Dean of the School of Management continues to be the primary contact on all programmatic matters for CityU’s partnerships in Australia and Mexico.

Regulatory Framework

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. When additional voluntary accreditation or approval options are available, the university investigates the benefits of participation and determines whether to seek them as well. CityU also ensures its international offerings comply with the policies of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) that govern agreements with nonregionally accredited organizations and programs offered outside the United States (NWCCU Policies A-6 and A-7). These requirements include:

**Program Control**

Courses offered for credit and complete degree programs must remain under the control of CityU and the award of credit must be consistent with that which is done on the home campus. This means that the decisions regarding who shall teach and what shall be taught must be under the control of CityU’s Academic Affairs department. Faculty may be compensated directly or by contract with a third party, but CityU must determine they are qualified and capable for the level of instruction offered before they are retained. Furthermore, the curricula must be set by the university and the primary language of instruction must be English.

**Student Policies**

CityU maintains control over student personnel matters, including recruitment and admission, evaluation of student progress, record retention, and library and information systems, among others. These services may be contracted to partners, but the decisions must be exercised in the name of CityU and be consistent with the policies applied to domestic students.

**Contractual Arrangements**

The NWCCU has clear policies about what must be stated explicitly in any contract with a foreign (non-U.S. regionally accredited institution) partner. All contracts established by CityU with a partner align with these requirements. (See Exhibits for copies of all contracts.)
Standards and Mechanisms to Ensure Academic Quality

Assuring academic quality includes the regulatory and accreditation concerns described above. It focuses on what is best for CityU students as they take courses and programs in locations around the world. The business and operational models that CityU puts in place must ultimately support high-quality learning experiences for all CityU students.

CityU adheres to the following core principles for assuring academic quality. In so doing, it considers any student admitted to a course or program earning CityU credit to be, for the duration of that student’s time in that course or program, a “CityU student.”

- All CityU students are provided with consistent levels of quality and service, regardless of location.
- All program offerings fit within CityU’s mission and scope.
- CityU retains sole and direct control of all courses carrying CityU credit.
- All CityU offerings are included in regular quality control and continuous improvement processes, including regular program review.
- CityU programs use common curriculum, common assessments of student learning, and common assessments of instruction.
- CityU faculty are evaluated on common standards.
- Academic standards and policies identified at the institutional, school, and program levels are applied consistently and equitably in all locations.
- Academic standards and 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.

In order to ensure the principles of academic quality are in place, all partnership agreements include provisions that affirm the following. These provisions align with the requirements of NWCCU policies on partnerships with organizations that are not regionally accredited, and with their standards of practice in delivering educational programs outside the United States.

- CityU assures faculty quality through the establishment of clear standards and expectations for faculty qualifications, and either hires faculty directly or approves all faculty hired by partners; all faculty teaching CityU courses are included in CityU’s regular faculty evaluation processes.
- CityU assures curricular quality by providing and monitoring the use of a standardized curriculum with uniform program and course outcomes and assessments of student learning that apply to all offerings, and by providing clear guidance on the elements of programs and courses that can be adapted to meet local needs.
- CityU assures equity in the acceptance of transfer credit by applying the same standards and processes for awarding transfer credit to all articulation agreements and individual student applications for transfer credit.
- CityU determines consistent admissions requirements in alignment with its mission, and applies requirements equitably to applicants in all locations.
- CityU determines graduation requirements in alignment with its academic standards, and assures they are applied equitably to students in all locations.
- CityU ensures students have every opportunity to complete their academic goals by reserving the right to work with individual students who need to change programs or locations due to personal circumstances.
- CityU students are governed by CityU’s policies on grading including grade grievances, scholastic honesty, and any other relevant grievance and/or appeal processes, and CityU assures they are applied equitably to all students.
- CityU reserves the ability to make changes to the program offering based on its regular quality assurance processes, including but not limited to changing program entry requirements, program
outcomes, course outcomes, delivery models, faculty qualifications, faculty training, course content, course sequences, number of credits required, major assessments of student learning, and/or graduation requirements.

- CityU’s academic representatives to the partnership are empowered to enforce the above provisions with clear lines of accountability and authority to a resident administrator of the CityU program offering.
- CityU and the partner agree to a regularly scheduled review of the partnership and program offering, no longer than two years between reviews, to ensure its actual performance is in alignment with these provisions.
- CityU protects students in the event of a partnership dissolving by providing clear teach-out processes and timelines.

**Business Models to Ensure Financial Health and Sustainability**

CityU requires, unless specifically exempted for strategic or legal reasons, all proposed new programs, partnerships, and investments to demonstrate a financial margin that contributes to the overhead and reserves of the home campus. Proposed new partnerships and programs are also expected to meet the defined staffing and operational requirements established by CityU. A standardized template for the “business case,” with detailed five-year projections, captures all related expenses and revenues and forms the basis for calculating the sustainability of the partnership.

Generally, no project will be advanced for approval unless the proposal demonstrates both a positive cash flow and a positive contribution to margin within the initial five years of operations. Positive cash flow is defined as the return of the initial capital investment in the project plus additional amounts necessary for the direct operation of the program or the management and oversight of the investment. For example, if a project requires an investment of $250,000 at the onset, and the project only generates cash of $200,000 over the first five years of operations, it has obviously not met the positive cash flow requirement.

Contribution to margin represents the positive net income contribution the program or project will produce before any cost allocations; that is, after all direct expenses have been covered. All proposals must produce a positive contribution margin over the first five years of at least the equivalent of 20 percent per annum.

If the proposal passes the investment criteria, it will move forward for presidential and board review, depending on the level of investment required and the impact to the then-current-year budget. Generally, any new proposal that can’t be funded within the existing operating and capital budgets requires the Board of Governors’ approval as it alters the approved annual budget.

**Scalable Staffing and Operational Models**

In order to efficiently and effectively operate across regions, the university is moving toward a “system administration” structure by 2013 that includes the implementation of matrix management in all operations worldwide. This structure includes four levels: the system administration/home campus, which provides overall strategic direction, policy oversight, and process standards; regional campuses/hubs, which provide operational oversight to a specific geographic region; regional centers/spokes, which focus on student support for smaller regions; and teaching sites/nodes, which are small, flexible, often time-limited locations with targeted program offerings.

**System Administration/Home Campus**

The system administration/home campus (interchangeable with the historical term of international headquarters) sets policies and procedures worldwide and establishes the academic and operational standards for each region of operation. The system
administration/home campus may delegate the implementation of set policies and procedures and compliance with operational standards to regional campuses/hubs, which serve as a proxy for the system administration/home campus. The system administration/home campus is currently located in Bellevue, Washington.

The system administration/home campus includes the following functions:
- President’s Office
- Academic Affairs
  - School and Division Leadership
  - Library Services
  - Curriculum and Faculty Development
- Support Services
- International Division Leadership
- Enrollment Services
- Registrar
- Finance
- Alumni Relations and Development
- Brand and Communications
- Information Technology
- Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
- Legal Counsel

In some cases, the system administration/home campus functions may also provide direct services and support to the members of the system itself based upon the development or regulatory nature of the function (for example, legal counsel). The system administration/home campus may also serve as the de facto regional hub for one or more regions based upon phase of development, geographical proximity, or fiscal constraints.

REGIONAL HUB

Each regional hub may have one or more subordinate functions reporting to the system administration/home campus functions in either a direct or matrix reporting relationship based upon regulatory or operational needs. Those reporting in a matrix relationship will report to a regional hub supervisor for day-to-day operational responsibilities but have a responsibility to the system administration/home campus function to uphold the system requirements for their assignment.

The regional hub is responsible for administratively and operationally supporting one or more regional center(s)/spoke(s) and/or one or more teaching site(s)/node(s) within the system for a geographical region. As the regional hub, it may provide applicable support as an extension of the system administration/home campus for the following functional areas: business office, registrar, financial aid, technology services, human resources, facilities, and academic oversight. The scope of support will be determined based upon student FTE in the regional hub oversight area, geographical distance from system administration/home campus, and the business, legal, and higher education regulatory environment to which it must comply.

REGIONAL CENTER/SPOKED

A regional center/spoke is a classroom-based location that provides student advisement and instructional support to one or more teaching site(s)/node(s) under the supervision of a regional hub. A regional center/spoke does not replicate the broad service areas located at the campus level, but rather focuses on the support of attending students. Those who are assigned to a regional center/spoke report directly to lead positions at the regional hub.

TEACHING SITE/NODE

A teaching site/node is a small service location or temporary/shared delivery location with a targeted program or programs. These locations may or may not have permanent staff, depending upon size, and report to either the system administration/home campus, a regional hub, or a regional center/spoke.

FOUR-PHASE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR NEW INTERNATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Through much of its history, CityU’s international offerings have come about in an opportunistic way,
through existing relationships or connections. In 2008 it began to define a more strategic approach to identifying new international sites and partnerships. The first intention is to identify those countries where there is a need for the kind of educational opportunities CityU can offer. Increasingly, this is turning out to be countries where local higher educational institutions are seeking to provide a more international education for their students, and countries where young people are “tracked” early on into academic or nonacademic pathways. CityU’s mission to expand access and its commitment to flexibility in delivery position it especially well to serve these needs.

CityU approaches the decision-making process for determining new international sites and partnerships in four phases. The four phases are Scoping, Prospecting and Prioritizing, Due Diligence, and Negotiation and Partner Approval. These phases help CityU to answer the questions:

- Is there a need for the kind of educational opportunities CityU offers?
- Will the local community perceive that CityU offers something of value?
- Will CityU be able to operate effectively, both in terms of higher education regulations and business and legal conditions?
- Will CityU be able to operate in a financially sound manner, creating positive financial margins that can then be reinvested in expanded service and quality?

If at any stage, the analysis shows that CityU cannot answer these questions affirmatively, the decision is made not to continue pursuing the opportunity.

The purpose of phase one, Scoping, is to identify the countries and cities that potentially provide the best opportunity for serving a substantial number of students in line with CityU’s mission and vision. It is a proactive phase, but one that can also be triggered by the emergence of a new potential opportunity that is brought to the university through existing relationships or other means. Because CityU operates almost entirely on revenues generated by tuition, a preliminary financial analysis is an important part of phase one.

The purpose of phase two, Prospecting and Prioritizing, is to narrow the field to the opportunities that have the highest potential and are most aligned with CityU’s strategic goals and direction. The goal of this phase is to identify and screen cities and prospective partners into a short list of opportunities that are worthy to advance to the due diligence of phase three. If an opportunity is brought to CityU by a current partner, it is likely to start in this phase, skipping phase one.

The purpose of phase three, Due Diligence, is to take the short list developed in phase two, increase the level of confidence in and affirm the commitment of the potential partner, and to identify ways to mitigate the risk exposure that is inherent in international operations. This phase represents substantial investment of time and, potentially, legal fees, and is undertaken when the determination has been made that it is likely a specific partnership would move to the last phase. If during due diligence, information is discovered that is unfavorable, however, a potential partner or ownership opportunity does not pass on to the final phase.

In phase four, Negotiation and Partner Approval, the details of a partnership agreement are worked out. Implementation issues take the forefront in all areas: academic, financial, and operational. If the implementation outlook remains favorable, the potential partnership or ownership opportunity moves forward. This phase culminates in a formal proposal for the new location and/or partnership that is brought through CityU’s internal approval processes and to the Board of Governors. It also includes gaining NWCCU approval and any other regulatory or accreditation approvals necessary.

**REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF CURRENT OFFERINGS**

This section reviews CityU’s current international offerings and includes an analysis of how each aligns with the university’s own standards and the relevant NWCCU policies. It is organized by region, starting
with North America, where CityU first expanded internationally into British Columbia, Canada, more than twenty-five years ago; and where it recently began its partnership in Mexico. It then goes on to cover CityU’s offerings in Europe, which represents the largest of CityU’s international operations. It concludes with a review of offerings in China and Australia.

NORTH AMERICA
CityU in Canada

BACKGROUND
CityU first began offering undergraduate business degree programs in Vancouver, BC, in 1980. It added programs in education in 1994, and a master’s degree program in counselling psychology in 1997. It expanded its programs in the province of Alberta in 1999 by offering graduate programs in counselling psychology and educational leadership.

At the time CityU entered the Canadian education market, there were few private higher education institutions, and few who served the growing immigrant population. Since then, particularly in the areas of business-related education, the market has become fairly saturated, which in part is why CityU no longer offers its undergraduate or graduate management programs in Canada. Still, few institutions provide access to the working adult, particularly to meet the demand and need for practitioner-oriented advanced training for teachers in the area of leadership. Further, the university’s program strength in counselling and in counselling psychology allows it to meet a great need for mental health professionals in the school and broader communities, including those who end up practicing in the rural communities in Alberta.

Operating in Canada also transfers benefits to the broader programs through further enriching and internationalizing the curricula for students in both Canada and the United States. The university advisory program bodies have membership from Canada as well. And community counselling clinics, staffed by CityU interns and supervised by CityU Teaching Faculty, offer much needed free-of-charge counseling services to underserved populations. All of these connections match perfectly with the mission of the
university to provide high-quality, relevant lifelong education to those with a desire to learn.

PROGRAMS
CityU offers the Master of Counselling (MOC) in British Columbia and Alberta, and the Master of Education in Leadership, and the Master of Education in Leadership and School Counselling in British Columbia.

PARTNER
CityU’s academic offerings in Canada are entirely its own operations.

STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
Unduplicated student head count and degrees awarded in the last three years are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU Canada Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Education</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Education</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Counselling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICY A-7
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). Policy A-6 does not apply as CityU offers its programs in Canada via its own operations without contracted partnerships.

Authorization - At the current time, in the province of British Columbia, City University of Seattle is authorized by the Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB), the agency authorized by the Ministry of Advanced Education to approve higher education programs by private universities in British Columbia, to offer the Master of Counselling; the Master of Education in Leadership; and the Master of Education in Leadership and School Counselling. These programs went through a full review process with the DQAB in 2007 and are annually reviewed for changes as well. In 2007, City University of Seattle withdrew from offering business degree programs in British Columbia and the students enrolled in those programs have all been taught out to completion.

City University of Seattle programs offered in British Columbia are based out of the primary office in Vancouver. In that space, CityU maintains administrative and faculty offices, offices for support staff and advisors, classrooms, counselling observation suites, and a student computer center. The facilities are used extensively in the week and on weekends considering the structure of programs that incorporate inclusive delivery modes. In addition, CityU maintains an office in Victoria, on Vancouver Island, where the counselling program coordinator, staff, and classes are housed. Many of the education classes are held in locations that are more convenient for the cohort-based students, including rental facilities with school districts in Campbell River, Burnaby, Abbotsford, Courtenay, Nanaimo, and Chilliwack.

City University offers its Master of Counselling degree program in both the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, Alberta, where it maintains both staff and faculty offices. CityU recently completed a full program review process by the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC), the authorizing agency of the Alberta Ministry of Advanced Education and
Technology, which approved its offering the Master of Counselling degree in Alberta for five years beginning in fall 2009. (Previously, CityU offered the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology, but it now offers the same degree titles in both British Columbia and Alberta.) Classroom space is rented from local universities.

**Academic Oversight** - The Canadian programs are not incorporated into the operations of the International Division, and are therefore consolidated with the U.S. program operations. Thus, the counselling and education degree programs report up through the dean of the Albright School of Education, which includes the Division of Arts and Sciences. The overall operational issues within Canada are under the provision of the provost, who coordinates with the Chancellor of the International Division on issues involving non-U.S. country operations. While the chancellor position is vacant, the provost continues to provide oversight through the Dean of the Albright School of Education and Division of Arts and Sciences.

For the counselling program, there is a regional director in each of the provinces, who, with the program director in Bellevue who coordinates the Washington Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology degree program, makes up the management team for that degree. They report directly to the dean. (There was until spring 2009, a full-time director of counselling programs to whom each of these three reported, but that position has not been replaced.) This management team oversees the program operations and ensures both the consistency needed between the programs and the adjustments needed to recognize the differing programmatic requirements due to the differing licensing laws that govern the ability of the program graduates to work in the different locations. In Washington, graduates become licensed mental health counselors; in British Columbia, they become registered counsellors; and in Alberta, they can be admitted to the College of Psychologists.

In the 2008–2009 academic year, the Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology and Master of Counselling degrees underwent a comprehensive program review following CityU’s program review policy. The review committee, composed of faculty and external experts from both the United States and Canada, produced a full report, which was accepted by the Academic Affairs Council and the provost. The report (copy available in the Exhibits) provided a thorough inspection of the program, including student perspectives, and resulted in some important improvement recommendations, which have been or are being implemented. Similarly, the review by the CAQC resulted in some important change recommendations as well, all of which will be implemented when the next cohort begins in January 2010.

The master’s programs in education offered in British Columbia are coordinated by a program leader in Vancouver, who reports to the program director for educational leadership programs in Bellevue. These programs are again treated the same way as domestic degree programs offered in the multiple sites in Washington as far as academic oversight and coordination. Between 2006 and 2008, CityU undertook an extensive examination of its Master of Education in Leadership and School Counselling degree programs overall. The review culminated in a substantial program revision — a world program model to which all the programs subscribe and offer now. This revision incorporates common learning outcomes and assessment structures to ensure they are being measured and met.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - Recruitment of students in Canada is done locally, much by word of mouth between current and former students and prospective students, but the faculty and advisors are also active in recruiting. For those interested in the School Leadership or School Counselling programs in British Columbia, information is disseminated within the multiple school districts around Vancouver and on the island. Print and media advertisements and web-based information are disseminated in both British Columbia and Alberta to attract students to the counselling program. In both provinces, there are
recruitment and advising staff to assist students in achieving admission and registration.

All CityU students are admitted based on the same admissions requirements as described in the official CityU Catalog. All student documentation (application form, registration for courses, etc.) is sent to the Registrar’s Office in Bellevue, where the information is further processed. At the end of their studies, the students receive their respective diplomas along with official transcripts directly from the home campus in Bellevue. All students are assigned CityU ID numbers and are able to access the CityU portal and online library resources.

All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. Information about resources such as access to the online databases is readily available. For example, mention of CityU information resources is found in all course syllabi.

All students come under CityU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress and academic standing. Student records are kept in accordance with CityU standards, and each student’s official record is kept at the home campus in Bellevue. Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU policies. Official student records are maintained in the Registrar’s Office in Bellevue. Official institutional transcripts are consistent for all students in all CityU programs, regardless of location.

Faculty - All faculty in Canada are employees of City University of Seattle. The oversight of instruction and performance fall under the direct responsibility of the program director and the dean of the school in Bellevue, though the day-to-day supervision is conducted by the regional program leaders in the provinces. Credentials for all faculty teaching in Canada are fully verified and validated as part of the contractual and hiring process, following established guidelines for all CityU European locations.

The initial faculty hiring process is conducted under the direct supervision of the regional program directors. Hiring processes include observing teaching demonstrations as well as review of academic and professional credentials and experience. Diplomas/transcripts are necessary, and the full application package must be completed before Teaching Faculty are officially considered hired.

In British Columbia, there are five full-time FTE faculty. Each of the site and program leaders has their doctorates and significant practitioner experience. In Alberta, both in Calgary and in Edmonton, there are 1.5 full-time FTE faculty, all of whom either have their doctoral degrees and/or are registered psychologists. Overall, there are more than seventy-five different Teaching Faculty engaged in student instruction or clinical- or school-based supervision.

Canadian permanent faculty play an active role in decision making at the university on at least two levels: one is system-wide and the second, school-specific. In terms of participation in system-wide decision making, there is a permanent Canadian representative on the Academic Affairs Council (AAC), the university’s senior academic decision-making body. Canadian faculty also serve on standing committees of the AAC on a rotating basis. Currently (2009/10), there are Canadian faculty on the Academic Assessment Standing Committee and the AAC Faculty Standards and Development Standing Committee. In 2008, the BC director of counselling programs was a founding member of the university’s Institutional Review Board and currently the board has two Canadian representatives. Canadian faculty participate actively in the university’s biannual strategic planning sessions and one of the NWCCU Accreditation Review Committee co-chairs is a member of the Canadian faculty. In terms of school-specific decision making, there are Canadian representatives on both the ASOE and DAS Curriculum Councils. The university’s curriculum review process affords ample opportunities for permanent and teaching faculty involvement. Both DAS and ASOE courses have Canada-specific content to respond to provincial and national customs and regulatory requirements. Canadian program directors
meet regularly with their U.S. counterparts and the dean to shape school-specific policies and procedures and to develop and monitor the budget. All faculty participate in quarterly school-specific meetings.

**Program Delivery** - Programs are delivered in face-to-face instructional modes in Canada, though there are different delivery formats depending on the programs. The education programs in British Columbia are cohort-based programs that generally require the completion of 52-degree credits for the master’s. Consistent with the philosophy of CityU, which is to make learning accessible to students, cohorts are taught generally close to their home school districts, surrounding the Vancouver area and in strategic locations on Vancouver Island. The program normally takes two years to complete.

The Master of Counselling program (MOC) is also a cohort-based program, with a 72-credit requirement in both British Columbia and Alberta. CityU’s academic year is divided into four ten-week quarters, and classes run throughout the year. A schedule is provided to students on the first day of class, covering the entire course sequence. Classes are held every Saturday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at sites in Edmonton and Calgary, and in the facilities of CityU in Vancouver and in Victoria, except for holiday weekends. Two courses are usually taken each quarter (one course in the morning and one in the afternoon), with students earning 6 to 8 credits per quarter. Students have a two-week break between quarters. In this format, it takes three years to complete the MOC; however, this may vary depending on how many classes a student enrolls in per quarter, the individual student’s capacity, and the time it takes to complete the practicum. A student may take longer than three years based on individual circumstances.

In Vancouver, the faculty started an alternative “intensive”-delivery cohort. This model involves the group in more online activities and brings them together in a face-to-face intensive model for four full days each quarter. A full-time program began in January 2010, and CityU received authorization from the StudentAid BC for students to be eligible to receive financial aid from the province since they will need to pay full-time tuition each quarter. (In British Columbia, students are only eligible to receive financial assistance from the province if they are attending full-time and the program is registered as full-time.)

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** - The Master in Counselling program has two major summative assessments, the comprehensive examination and the internship evaluations by the clinical supervisors at the clinic sites. The comprehensive examinations are both oral and written and are given in the spring at the end of the second year of the three-year program. Students must pass these examinations before they can move on to their clinical internship placements. These examinations provide evidence of student learning in all courses taken prior to the examination. Internship evaluations are completed by clinical supervisors at the end of each quarter of internship and they also provide a final evaluation at the completion of all internship hours. These evaluations provide evidence of student learning in the clinical setting as well as an appraisal of clinical competence.

The MOC degree also incorporates formative assessments throughout the program, including student self-evaluations through journaling, self-reflection papers, and assessments of fellow students through role play. Students participate in conferences with their faculty and with clinical supervisors to receive feedback on their performance in an ongoing process.

In the Master of Education program, a portfolio assessment is conducted. This involves an oral presentation from each student to a panel of adjudicators, using a common rubric based on the six CityU Learning Goals (thinking skills; critical inquiry; professional competence; written and verbal skills; lifelong learning; and ethical behavior) and the leadership dimensions used in the province of British Columbia. This formative assessment allows each student to reflect upon his/her learning and to establish personal goals for improvement. There is also a comprehensive
examination to test student mastery of the material from the courses in the program.

The formative assessment comes in the form of a major research project that demonstrates student competence in research methods and analytical thinking. Of course, students receive ongoing formative assessments during their courses from their instructors and during their internships from their field supervisors.

It is important to note that these assessment practices are common to the programs in all locations at which they are offered, including the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology offered in Washington and the parallel Master of Education programs in Washington. This allows for a cross-location comparison and assessment of the process across a much larger domain to ensure consistency of performance.

Marketing and Recruiting - Because of the length of time CityU has offered programs in Canada and because of the long-standing close relationships with school districts and clinics, much of the advertisements of the programs are by word of mouth. The alumni in Canada are CityU’s best referral service. Even so, in both provinces, some additional advertisement is required; this occurs in several ways. Public advertisement is done through print ads and through some radio announcements. Program announcements are distributed widely in school and clinic settings. Information sessions are held in the offices in all cities (Vancouver, Victoria, Calgary, and Edmonton) and in school districts and other community settings.

Tuition and Fees - Tuition pricing for CityU programs in Canada is conducted as part of CityU’s regular budgeting process, and follows the same procedures for setting tuition and fees for programs offered in the United States, including a scan of competing programs. In 2008–09, tuition for Canadian programs was $400 CDN per credit for the education program and $477 CDN per credit for the counseling program.

Resources - In British Columbia, CityU maintains a primary office in Vancouver, located at 310 West Pender Street. In that location, recently renovated to encompass the whole third floor, there are both faculty and administrative offices, several classrooms, including counseling observation rooms and a student computer center. MOC classes are held in the Vancouver space, though most of the M.Ed. classes are held on-site in the several school districts or close-by facilities, including such cities as Campbell River, Burnaby, Abbotsford, Courtenay, Nanaimo, and Chilliwack. In Victoria, BC, CityU maintains a suite of offices, which includes space for the faculty and administrative staff, classrooms, and an observation suite as well.

In Calgary, the CityU site includes offices and one meeting room/classroom that accommodates ten people; this classroom has a whiteboard, TV, VCR/DVD, and projection unit. CityU also rents classroom space at DeVry Institute of Technology, typically three classrooms per quarter. There is a computer lab at DeVry as well as computer access in the library. Each classroom is equipped with up-to-date technology: DVD/ VCR, projection unit (and screen), laptop connectors, overhead projectors, and whiteboards. Computer technicians are on-site each Saturday, and are available to assist the Teaching Faculty with the equipment. Security is on-site at all times. There is a common space in which the students can sit or eat lunch during the breaks. There is also ample free parking.

In Edmonton, CityU has a suite with office space for the faculty, administrative staff, and the student advisor who assists students in all Alberta locations. It has two classrooms on-site: one for up to eight people and one for up to twenty-five. Classroom equipment includes overhead projector and a TV/ VCR/CD combo unit. CityU also rents classroom space at MacEwan’s City Centre Campus in downtown Edmonton, usually two classrooms per quarter. Each classroom is equipped with audiovisual equipment, e.g., TV/VCR; data, video, and overhead projectors; and whiteboards. The college also has a computer lab available when needed. There is a food court and kiosks available to students at the MacEwan campus.
CityU in Mexico — CETYS Universidad: Baja California, Mexico

BACKGROUND
In February 2005, CityU and Centro de Enseñanza Técnica y Superior (CETYS) Universidad, located in Baja California, Mexico, formalized an agreement to offer City University of Seattle programs at CETYS’ three campuses. As the first program by CityU in Latin America, CityU’s program at CETYS has served as the backbone to other programs scheduled to start, and new possible partnerships under consideration, in Mexico and other parts of the world.

The CETYS/CityU partnership is convergent with CityU’s mission, providing educational opportunities not otherwise available for individuals in northwest Mexico, focusing on the delivery of U.S.-style and U.S.-accredited practitioner-based education. Graduates of the CETYS/CityU program benefit from a U.S. and a Mexican degree, concluding with a bilingual English/Spanish proficiency and an experience across three regions (United States, Mexico, and Europe).

PARTNER
CETYS Universidad is a multicampus institution with sites in Ensenada, Tijuana, and Mexicali, Baja California. CETYS was founded in 1961 and is fully recognized and/or approved by the local, regional, and national authorities, the Ministry of Education, and accredited by the Mexican Federation of Private Institutions. It is the only university that has recognition and special status from the Baja California Ministry of Education as an “Institution of Excellence.” In 2008 CETYS was recognized as a Candidate for Accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the regional accrediting agency that oversees California, Hawai’i, and other U.S. possessions in the Pacific. CETYS enrolls approximately six thousand students across the three campuses in three school levels: high school, bachelor, and graduate.

PROGRAMS
There are two programs offered in conjunction with CETYS in a double degree format. The original program is a double degree program in business, whereby students earn a CityU Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and a licenciatura, a bachelor’s equivalent, from CETYS in business. In addition, a second double degree program was started in summer 2009. In the new program, engineering students from CETYS are eligible for a Bachelor of Arts in Management (BAM) from CityU. After successfully completing each institution’s graduation requirements, students are awarded a BSBA or a BAM from CityU and a licenciatura or ingeniero from CETYS, respectively.

The programs are designed in a 3+1 format, meaning that CityU recognizes the equivalent to three years of undergraduate study from CETYS and CETYS recognizes the equivalent to one year of undergraduate study from CityU (45 credits). The CityU portion of the programs is conducted entirely in English. CETYS students attend two condensed summer sessions at CityU (one in the United States and one in Europe) and take the rest of the program via a mixture of face-to-face sessions and web-based structured learning. During their summer sessions, students attend classes and are also exposed to business and industry
visits. All instructors in the program are U.S.-based CityU faculty.

**STUDENTS AND ALUMNI**
Students attending the CETYS/CityU program are traditional college age, typically between 20 and 24 years old. The program is cohort-based, with the fifth cohort scheduled to start in summer of 2009–2010. The size of each cohort has fluctuated between fifteen and twenty students. As reflected below, there have been twenty-five graduates from this program with another twenty-four scheduled to conclude during the first half of 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU/CETYS Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 CityU Net Tuition Revenue: $104,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECTED GROWTH**
Other programs have been discussed between CETYS and CityU that are now under serious consideration for additional double degree options: Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology and Bachelor of Science in Marketing. Due to the current economic world crisis, the numbers for the 2010 academic year were not achieved as planned; however, there was growth relative to the previous year both in terms of the total number of students and courses taught. The decrease in value of the U.S. dollar and Mexican peso caused parents and students to be concerned. With the peso stabilizing, greater numbers of students are expected to enroll in the 2011 school year.

**ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7**
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7).

**Purpose, Mission, and Goals** - The purpose of CityU’s partnership with CETYS is educational and all program offerings are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. Since 2006, international presence has been an explicit part of CityU’s Strategic Plan, and in 2008, a thorough plan for implementing its international vision was developed, as described in the introduction to this section on international programs. Through intentional linkages and regularly scheduled meetings and visits, CityU assures that faculty, staff, and administrators understand and are appropriately involved in the programs offered with CETYS. The 3+1 program is being scheduled for review as part of CityU’s emerging process for review of international partnerships.

**Authorization and Contractual Arrangements** - CityU’s program with CETYS has been offered in Mexico with all the necessary internal approvals (see Exhibits). Since this program is being conducted and offered as an extension of CityU, and in mixed delivery mode not requiring a permanent physical presence of CityU in Mexico, it does not require any additional local approvals other than CETYS’ internal approvals.

The 2005 CETYS Agreement signed by both institutions needs to be updated to the current CityU Agreement to Implement Education Programs format. This new agreement covers NWCCU’s policies A-6 and A-7, guideline by guideline. Like CityU, CETYS Universidad is a not-for-profit entity, recognized by the Ministry of Education in Mexico. The execution of the contract between CETYS and CityU has not affected the not-for-profit status of either institution. As additional programs are added, a new contract or addendum should be implemented.

The new agreement will cover an additional double degree program, the Bachelor of Arts in Management (BAM), and the hiring of a CETYS/CityU program coordinator by CETYS Universidad. Additional
noncredit and for-credit programs will be included. Initially, the BAM program was scheduled to start in fall 2009, however, because of the special summer session, both institutions agreed to start the program in June 2009. The BAM is not currently covered in the CETYS Agreement signed in 2005 as the BAM as such did not exist then. The BAM and other potential new programs with said partner will be added to the new agreement.

Because of the plan for new programs, CETYS and CityU agreed to hire a double degree program coordinator (DDPC), hired and paid by CETYS, who reports to both CETYS and CityU. CityU agreed to reimburse CETYS 60 percent of the double degree program coordinator's salary and benefit expenses in two installments a year: in December and June, mid-fiscal year and at fiscal year-end, respectively. The hiring of the program coordinator was not mentioned in the 2005 CETYS Agreement, but is to be included in the new agreement.

**Academic Oversight** - As with any other initiative involving a CityU School of Management (SOM) program, the 3+1 program with CETYS is overseen from an academic perspective by the school’s program director, in this case the director of the BSBA, who is based in Bellevue. For the operational support of the effort, CityU initially assigned an SOM graduate assistant, who worked under the supervision of an SOM Administrative Faculty member. In recognition of the stage of development of this initiative and the need for a more solid foundation and support, CityU hired an international programs academic coordinator (IPAC) in January 2008 to manage the CETYS partnership. In line with CityU’s effort, CETYS Universidad hired a full-time administrative coordinator in October 2008 to oversee the program from CETYS’ side.

The IPAC reports to the Dean of the School of Management and serves as a liaison with Admissions and Student Services. The IPAC attends regular SOM meetings to be informed of any policy changes that might affect students in the CityU 3+1 programs with CETYS. In addition, since his hire at the beginning of 2008, the IPAC has visited CETYS on multiple occasions to meet with current and prospective students as well as CETYS faculty and academic administrators.

The double degree program coordinator (DDPC) at CETYS reports directly to CETYS’ international programs director and to CityU’s IPAC. The DDPC acts as a liaison between the CETYS international programs, schools of business and engineering, and CityU. The DDPC’s primary responsibilities are to take care of the day-to-day operations of the programs. In addition, the DDPC is the one point of contact for CityU at CETYS. The DDPC and the IPAC travel to each campus twice a year to recruit students for both programs.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU’s policies. Recruitment of students is carried out under contract by CETYS. All students through the double degree program at CETYS come under CityU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress and academic standing. Student records are kept in CityU’s home campus in Bellevue in accordance with CityU standards. In addition, for students who enroll in summer 2010–11, a CETYS/CityU Student Handbook will be distributed upon admission to the program.

Admissions criteria for the CityU 3+1 programs in Mexico are the same as in the United States. Students entering the 3+1 programs are in the process of concluding their second year of study at CETYS. In addition to the typical requirements of transfer students, CETYS students must also meet CityU’s English proficiency requirements.

CETYS is responsible for the initial screening of all application materials and for forwarding the applications to CityU’s International Admissions Office, which processes all student applications and follows the admissions criteria published in the catalog. Spanish transcripts are translated into English and evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU policies. Once a decision is made, CityU sends an acceptance letter to each student. The agreement delegates student recruitment to CETYS Universidad.
Once students are enrolled in the 3+1 programs, they are recognized as official CityU students. CityU’s Registrar’s Office keeps all official records of academic credit earned in the 3+1 programs. Courses taken in CityU’s 3+1 programs in Mexico carry the same credit as similar courses offered by CityU in the United States. Transcripts for CityU’s 3+1 students in Mexico are issued by CityU’s Registrar’s Office in the United States.

Through the international programs academic coordinator who travels to CETYS three times a year, CityU holds informational sessions with students, parents, and CETYS faculty to recruit new students and to talk to current students regarding their concerns. In addition, weekly telephone conferences are scheduled between the two institutional coordinators (IPAC and DDPC).

Students in the 3+1 programs receive the same treatment as any other student taking the BSBA or BAM in the United States. They receive a student orientation in their first quarter and have access to CityU student advisors and CityU’s online library resources, among other services. Upon successful completion of a CityU 3+1 program, graduates are provided the opportunity to be recognized as such during the CETYS Universidad graduation ceremony as well as to take part in CityU’s main commencement ceremony held in Seattle every June.

**Faculty** - CityU’s BSBA program director has the final authority over faculty hiring decisions for this program. Appointment and validations of credentials are made by CityU’s HR department and follows the established requirements for CityU in the United States. All faculty who teach in the partnership are employed and paid directly by CityU. In some cases, faculty from CityU in Slovakia or other CityU locations in Europe teach the CETYS students when they travel to a specific site. The Dean of Academic Affairs for the region recruits, hires, and oversees the selected faculty member teaching the CETYS students while they are in Europe.

All faculty assigned to teach in CityU’s program in Mexico are CityU faculty already teaching for CityU or especially recruited to teach in this program. Those faculty who are new to CityU and to this program are provided the training and orientation that all other new faculty go through. All faculty follow CityU’s syllabi and learning materials. All faculty in this program are evaluated by students in each course taught just as all CityU faculty are evaluated in all other CityU courses.

While CityU is typically open to adjustments in terms of the mix of faculty required to teach a CityU program (e.g., a mix of CityU faculty plus local faculty approved by CityU), at the request of CETYS, CityU assigns CityU instructors and/or hires new instructors not located near the southwestern United States to teach courses. This requirement by CETYS is in line with their local need to establish a clear differentiation between what they already offer locally and the branding and positioning of the CityU 3+1 program with CETYS as a U.S.-based program.

The designation and use of CityU faculty allow for greater consistency in intent and design (i.e., same syllabi and learning resources), and potentially greater convergence in results relative to similar courses offered by CityU in the United States. That said, there have been some adjustments and challenges that CityU and CETYS have faced and will need to work on in 2009–2010 and beyond.

One issue relates to CityU faculty training and expectations. The faculty at CityU are familiar with the “traditional CityU student” (i.e., working adult), while CETYS students are more traditional-college-age students (18–22 years old). CETYS and CityU are developing a document entitled “Teaching at CETYS: Best Practices” to be given to faculty when hired.

**Curriculum and Program Delivery** - CityU’s outcomes-based approach allows for the implementation of a consistent curriculum in programs offered in multiple locations. All courses are designed and approved through CityU’s School Curriculum Councils based in Bellevue, and the awarding of credit and determina-
tion of level is controlled by the faculty in the school, consistent with CityU policies.

CityU’s innovative 3+1 BSBA program was developed after careful review of relevant CETYS programs and course contents and their equivalencies to CityU courses. CETYS students pursuing the CETYS undergraduate or licenciatura degree who apply to and are accepted into the 3+1 BSBA program begin taking CityU courses between the end of their fourth semester and the beginning of their fifth semester at CETYS. During that summer and for the next two academic years, CETYS students who are in the CityU 3+1 program take a total of nine CityU courses, four courses via a combination of two summer sessions abroad (one in Bellevue, Washington, and the other in Europe) plus five courses taught via mixed or blended mode.

All nine CityU courses taught as part of the program with CETYS are mixed mode: 51 percent of instruction happens face-to-face, with the remainder offered via web-based structured learning. In the case of the two summer sessions, students begin their course via web-based instruction, continue with face-to-face sessions (the first summer in Bellevue and the second summer at one of CityU’s locations in Europe), and conclude with additional web-based instruction. With respect to the other five courses, these again begin via web-based instruction, followed by two intensive weekend workshops, concluding with additional web-based instruction.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** - The programs in partnership with CETYS are included in the schools’ student learning outcomes assessment processes; faculty collect capstone projects and submit them to the program director at the home campus. They provide evidence of student learning that is included in the review and analysis process and used to make determinations regarding program improvements. For the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, this process is in its third year.

**Marketing and Recruiting** - CityU’s international programs academic coordinator (IPAC), who is based in Bellevue, provides oversight to registration and recruitment efforts. CityU in Mexico follows the same visuals and graphic files as the Bellevue home campus and coordinates marketing materials with the Marketing department, based in Seattle. The IPAC reviews and makes final decisions about marketing and promotional materials and activities and ensures that all promotional advertising material is truthful and not misleading. This process assures that education is what is being offered, not employment. All advertisements carry CityU’s name. As CETYS knows its market share better, new promotional material, slated for fall 2009, will be cobranded by CityU and CETYS. CityU does not use field agents in Mexico.

**Tuition and Fees** - Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications and the website. For 2009–2010, tuition is $940 USD per course.

**Resources** - All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. During new student orientation, the librarian assigned to work with BSBA program students describes CityU’s library services to students in Mexico. Finally, information about library resources, such as access to the online databases, is readily available. For example, mention of CityU information resources is found in all course syllabi. In addition, students have regular access to CETYS library resources at any of CETYS’ library/information centers in Mexicali, Tijuana, and Ensenada.

**Plans for Improvement for Programs in Mexico**

1. The 2005 CETYS Agreement signed by both institutions needs to be updated to the current CityU Agreement to Implement Education Programs format. This new agreement covers NWCCU’s policies A-6 and A-7, guideline by guideline.
2. One issue relates to CityU faculty training and expectations. The faculty at CityU are familiar with the “traditional CityU student” (i.e., working adult), while CETYS students are more traditional-college-age students (18–22 years old). CETYS and CityU are developing a document entitled “Teaching at CETYS: Best Practices” to be given to faculty when hired.

3. CityU should review and update, if needed, the course articulations with CETYS to reflect any changes at CityU and/or CETYS that might have occurred in relevant CityU and CETYS programs.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF SEATTLE’S EUROPEAN HUB

CityU’s largest operations outside the United States are in central and eastern Europe with a regional hub in Bratislava and Trenčín, Slovakia. Its unique partnership with the college it founded, the Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM), is described in some detail because of its complexity and importance; this partnership represents about three-quarters of CityU’s annual enrollments in Europe. The staff at CityU’s campus in Bratislava oversees academic affairs at the university’s other locations in the region; deploys faculty based in Slovakia to teach in the other countries; and recruits, trains, and evaluates local faculty.

CityU has subsidiaries in Slovakia and Switzerland as well as partners in the Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Romania, and Greece. These operations meet educational needs that otherwise would be unmet, and provide an important means for CityU to fulfill its mission and vision. The quality of teaching and learning that occurs is very strong, and Student Satisfaction surveys indicate a fairly high degree of satisfaction in the largest European sites, Slovakia and Bulgaria.

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7

This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). Because CityU’s operations through its own entities and its partnership with VSM in Slovakia form the regional hub for most administrative functions related to the other partnerships in
Europe, it covers those elements that are in common across all the locations, as well as those specific to the VSM partnership. Elements that are specific to the other partnerships are covered in the sections specific to each partnership.

**Purpose, Mission, and Goals** - The primary purpose of all CityU’s offerings in Europe is educational, and this is specified in partnership contracts. CityU’s presence in Europe is consistent with the institution’s mission and goals, educational needs, and its Academic Model; CityU faculty maintain oversight of program content. Through intentional linkages and regularly scheduled meetings and visits between the home campus and European operations at multiple levels, including the President’s Executive Team, the provost, the associate provost, the deans, and the program directors, CityU assures that faculty, staff, and administrators understand and are appropriately involved in the programs offered in Europe.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight within Europe is through the CityU deans of Academic Affairs, one based in Slovakia, assigned to central Europe, and one based in Bulgaria, assigned to southeastern Europe. Both positions report to CityU’s Vice President for European Operations and have clear accountabilities back to the school deans located at the home campus in Bellevue. The Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe is employed by VSM, CityU’s partner school in Slovakia, and is selected by and reports to the designated official at CityU. This position also provides oversight to CityU’s presence in the Czech Republic and Switzerland. The Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe is an employee of CityU, and provides oversight to programs in Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania. Through CityU’s academic agreement with VSM, other personnel employed by VSM also provide oversight and support to its programs in Europe. This includes the associate deans, the regional curriculum coordinator (a joint appointment of VSM and CityU), the scholastic honesty chair, the associate registrar (a joint appointment of VSM and CityU, with a reporting relationship to the CityU registrar at the home campus), and other personnel as designated. These relationships provide examples of the matrix management referred to in this report; the individuals involved are supervised on a day-to-day basis locally, while having clear accountabilities back to the designated positions at the home campus in Bellevue.

Given the size and geographical dispersion of CityU’s BSBA and MBA programs in Europe, in the future the institution should designate lead academics for the BSBA and the MBA. Designation and/or hiring of a full-time person would enhance CityU’s capacity for oversight and support in Europe as well as coordination and reporting with CityU in the United States.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - All students come under CityU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress and academic standing. Student records are kept in accordance with CityU standards, and each student’s official record is kept at the home campus in Bellevue. Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU policies. Recruitment of students is often designated to the partner organization under the contract, which specifies they must follow CityU admissions and academic policies.

All CityU students are admitted based on the same admissions requirements as described in the official City University of Seattle Catalog. From time to time some exceptions can be made (e.g., for English proficiency), which are coordinated with the appropriate school dean. The control of this function in Slovakia is carried out by the head of the Admissions Office, who serves also as an associate registrar for Europe. The associate registrar follows all CityU admissions policies, and admissions practices are ultimately checked by the registrar in Bellevue. In the spirit of continuous improvement and considering the importance not only for CityU in Slovakia but also across other CityU locations in Europe, CityU is reviewing the role of the associate registrar based in Slovakia and will identify and act on gaps, if any.

All student documentation (application form,
registration for courses, etc.) is sent to the Registrar’s Office in Bellevue, where the information is further processed. At the end of their studies, the students receive their respective diplomas along with official transcripts directly from the home campus in Bellevue. All students are assigned CityU ID numbers and are able to access the CityU portal and online library resources.

In many of the university’s partnerships in Europe, student advising is delivered by the partner institution as part of the contractual agreement. In addition, the regional deans and directors of Academic Affairs carry student advising responsibilities as part of their academic roles. As noted in Standard Three, this solution has met with varying degrees of success. Ongoing discussion continues regarding aligning external personnel more effectively with CityU’s internal staff. Strengthening the role of CityU’s regionally located academic administrators is an important step already under way in this regard.

Since the students study in the programs of CityU, all credits earned are applicable toward the CityU degree. Official student records are maintained in the Registrar’s Office in Bellevue. Official institutional transcripts are consistent for all students in all CityU programs, regardless of location.

New students receive an orientation and an orientation package. Students have access to the City University portal and to the local portals, too. All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. There are local libraries at both locations in Slovakia and a small library located on the campus in Pravetz, Bulgaria. Information about resources such as access to the online databases is readily available. For example, mention of CityU information resources is found in all course syllabi.

**Faculty** - All faculty within Europe are employees of either City University of Seattle or the local partner organization. Oversight of instruction and performance fall under the direct responsibility of the local Dean of Academic Affairs. Credentials for all faculty teaching within Europe are fully verified and validated as part of the hiring process, following established guidelines for all CityU European locations.

The CityU Dean of Academic Affairs and the associate deans are involved in the faculty hiring process, which includes teaching demonstrations as well as review of academic and professional credentials and experience. Diplomas/transcripts are necessary, and the full application package must be completed before faculty are officially considered hired.

Typically, in the MBA program, once instructors are hired, they can be scheduled indefinitely. The End-of-Course Evaluations (EOCEs) are done on a regular basis. The MBA coordinator reviews the EOCEs and draws the attention of the appropriate dean to noteworthy cases.

Every effort is made to give all new faculty full and detailed orientation about CityU’s mission and purposes as they relate to the international program, as well as the institution’s academic policies and procedures. Occasionally, when faculty come on board on short notice, there is not enough time or resources to conduct such orientations; however, faculty will receive this information over the course of the term. All faculty are given a detailed Academic Guide, updated yearly, that outlines the mission and goals and all policies and procedures of the university.

CityU has developed an extensive and effective online training program for faculty based in the United States and Canada, which must be successfully completed before they can be assigned to their second course. CityU is working to adapt and implement this online training program to also serve European-based faculty. CityU is engaged in developing a comprehensive policy and set of related practices governing faculty evaluation, which will be applied consistently to faculty at all locations.

**Curriculum** - All courses offered in the programs in Europe are designed and approved through CityU’s School Curriculum Councils and the awarding of
credit and determination of level are controlled by the faculty in the school, consistent with CityU policies.

CityU’s outcomes-based approach allows for the implementation of a consistent curriculum in programs offered in multiple locations. In its European offerings, students follow program plans and use Course Guides/Syllabi that are approved by the School Curriculum Councils. They are consistent across locations, with appropriate modifications to make them regionally responsive. Books and other course resources are also generally consistent with the possibility of local adaptation.

Currently, the vast majority of curriculum is developed at the home campus and then sent to the international sites for feedback. This feedback may or may not be addressed before the curriculum is “finalized” and some international instructors still feel a need to adjust the curriculum significantly to meet the needs of their local students. Because there are often local instructors teaching in the program who have varied educational and professional experience, they can provide a local perspective on the subjects and bring in their own local examples. Texts and content being adopted in new and revised curriculum are beginning to add international perspectives now, yet much work remains to be done. Instructor Guides present activities in class and online with cross-cultural significance.

Given the shortcomings of the current feedback paradigm for curriculum development, the Dean of the School of Management is inventing more of a “codevelopment” model, where international instructors are included from the beginning of the process.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** - The programs in Europe are included in the schools’ student learning outcomes assessment processes; faculty collect capstone projects and submit them to the program director at the home campus. They provide evidence of student learning that is included in the review and analysis process and used to make determinations regarding program improvements. For the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, this process is in its third year. Transitions in the MBA curriculum meant there was a gap of time in collecting and analyzing capstone data; this was restarted in 2008–09 and will continue. MBA classes are offered in various delivery formats in the different locations in Europe, often in highly concentrated time frames to serve students who are already employed. They are, in some cases, drastically modified (or deleted, to be more realistic) for the shortened time frame (four to five weeks per class). As Europe adopts the new MBA curriculum in 2009–10, it will be easier to monitor the standard of student achievement since there will be some “standardized” mandatory assessments. There have been difficulties in implementing this process with the programs in Greece, which will be addressed in the section on that partnership.

The student learning outcomes assessment process is being regularized and consistently applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in most locations throughout Europe. All the programs offered in Greece need to be fully incorporated in regular outcomes assessment processes. CityU is actively monitoring the implementation and development of the new MBA curriculum across Europe to ensure that it reflects in delivery and outcomes what is being offered to students in the United States.

**Marketing and Recruitment** - CityU in Europe follows the standards for marketing and recruiting established by the home campus, with customization to best reach the local markets. The person responsible for correct messaging and following the brand style guide is the Director of Marketing and Development, CityU Slovakia. This position serves also as a coordinator of marketing and branding activities for other partners in Europe. Therefore, any advertising or promotional piece must be approved prior to starting the campaign. The director makes sure that the information on the advertisements is truthful, and does not bear any misleading or exaggerated information. This process assures that all advertising and literature are clear that education is what is being offered, not
employment. All advertisements carry CityU’s name. In Europe, the ads appear in cobranded design with the local partner. In all cases, the CityU style guide is strictly observed.

**PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR PROGRAMS IN EUROPEAN OPERATIONS**

1. Given the size and geographical dispersion of CityU’s BSBA and MBA programs in Europe, the institution needs and is planning to designate lead academics for the BSBA and the MBA. Designation and/or hiring of a full-time person would enhance CityU’s capacity for oversight and support in the region as well as coordination and reporting with CityU in the United States.

2. In the spirit of continuous improvement and considering the importance not only for CityU in Slovakia but also across other CityU locations in Europe, CityU will review the role of the associate registrar based in Slovakia and identify and act on gaps, if any.

3. The student learning outcomes assessment process is being regularized and consistently applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in most locations throughout Europe. All the programs offered in Greece need to be fully incorporated in regular outcomes assessment processes.

4. CityU has developed an extensive and effective online training program for all U.S.-based faculty, which must be successfully completed by faculty before they teach their first class. CityU should accelerate the adaptation and implementation of this online training program to also serve Slovakia as well as European-based faculty.

5. CityU is carefully monitoring the implementation and development of the new MBA curriculum across Europe to ensure that it reflects in delivery and outcomes what is being offered to students in the United States.

6. In support of consistency in policies and practice regarding the participation of faculty in the planning, delivery, and assessment of CityU programs across Europe, in particular at a graduate level, the scope of the regional curriculum coordinator should include such role in coordination with the local directors of Academic Affairs and/or the Dean of Academic Affairs and/or the Dean of Academic Affairs of the relevant region as appropriate.

**CITYU IN SLOVAKIA**

**Vysoká Škola Manažmentu — Bratislava and Trenčín, Slovakia**

**BACKGROUND**

CityU established its presence in Slovakia in 1991, a few years before Czechoslovakia split to form the Czech and Slovak republics. At the time, the need for more and better higher education was glaringly apparent, especially in Slovakia. With the help of the mayor of Trenčín, Mr. Jozef Ziska, CityU succeeded to offer a dynamic alternative to the existing system — a program of private higher education. CityU operated as an independent, freestanding institution until
the mid-1990s, when the University Act of Slovakia was revised. To bring CityU into compliance with the new legislation, which codified regulations pertaining to private educational institutions, the Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM) was created by law as a not-for-profit institution (the first private higher education institution in Slovakia) in December 1999. VSM is locally accredited by the Slovak Accreditation Commission and has its own governing board. Together, CityU and VSM expanded into Slovakia's capital, Bratislava.

City University Bellevue, USA spol. s.r.o. (now officially named City University of Seattle, spol. s.r.o., and referred to in the rest of this report as “CU Slovakia”) was initially formed in 1991 to conduct CityU’s operations in Slovakia. CU Slovakia, organized by statutory necessity as a for-profit corporation created by City University of Seattle under Slovak laws, operated under that structure as the first private university to offer accredited higher education degrees until 1999. Given the changing nature of the political and legislative situation in the higher education arena in Slovakia, the Slovakia management of CityU and other supporters from the academic and public sectors and the Ministry of Education of Slovakia submitted a separate bill to the national parliament of Slovakia, by which the Vysoká Škola Manažmentu was established by Act Number 286/99 in November 1999 as a locally accredited not-for-profit institution. A separate statute of parliament was required as there were no laws permitting the operation of a private entity offering higher education degrees in Slovakia. From that point onward, VSM became the main and sole vehicle for CU Slovakia to be able to continue offering CityU degree programs in that country.

The bylaws of VSM identify CU Slovakia as the founder of the college; as such, CU Slovakia has the right to appoint or recall members of the VSM board. The board holds the authority to change the bylaws, but as founder of VSM, CU Slovakia, thus City University of Seattle, must concur in any such change. The current five VSM board members hold their positions for life. CityU’s Vice President for European Operations serves as the chair of the VSM board, the executive in charge of CU Slovakia and CU Properties, and the chief operating officer of VSM. Through the leadership of and representation by CityU’s officials on the board, CityU expresses its views on strategic and operational matters related to the offering of CityU programs in Europe. It is this close relationship that the auditors have found justifies the consolidated accounting system for City University of Seattle, CU Slovakia, and VSM.

Until 2008, the board of VSM selected the rector and officers of the college. Recent law changes created an Academic Senate, made up of faculty, staff, and students, similar to that which exists for the public Slovakian universities. It is now this body that recommends the appointment of the rector to the Board of Governors of VSM, which, if accepted, submits the candidate for official appointment by the president of the Slovak Republic.

In response to the growth in student population and the corresponding needs for better and more functional physical facilities in the capital city of Bratislava, CU Properties was established in early 2000. This private corporation created under Slovakian law was established to construct school facilities in Bratislava to better serve the students and deliver quality education at a standard comparable to western Europe. CU Slovakia has a majority ownership (52%) of CU Properties, with the loan holders possessing the balance of the ownership. It is anticipated that the loans will be paid off in full no later than 2012, thus the full ownership of CU Properties will vest back into CU Slovakia. The properties in Trenčín are owned by CU Slovakia.

A number of agreements exist that delineate the roles and responsibilities each entity has in conducting and offering CityU programs in Slovakia. Both a Management Agreement (Agreement of Mutual Cooperation) and an agreement related to the offering of academic programs in Slovakia exist between City University of Seattle and VSM. In addition, CU Properties and CityU have an agreement whereby CityU subleases the facilities it owns in Bratislava.
to VSM for the operation and offering of academic programs. Agreements related to the rental of offices, classrooms, and the management of student housing in Trenčín have been executed between CU Slovakia and VSM.

PROGRAMS OFFERED IN SLOVAKIA
VSM has four offerings, the first three taught in Slovak and leading to a Slovak degree: the Bachelor in Business Administration; Bachelor in Knowledge Management; Magister in Knowledge Management; and an Intensive English program. All programs and courses that VSM offers are taught in Slovak and in English, which gives students an opportunity to decide whether they prefer to study in their native language or in English.

CityU programs offered via its partnership with VSM are the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and the MBA. VSM and CityU offer a unique opportunity for all prospective students to study in two programs at the same time. After successful completion of all requirements for both programs, these students are eligible for two degrees.

STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
Since most undergraduate students in Slovakia are of a traditional age (18–24 years old), they are recruited in a manner similar to that used by colleges and universities in the United States through high school visits, education fairs, open houses, radio and television advertising, national and regional print covers, and the web. Graduate students in the MBA program in Slovakia also tend to be younger than their counterparts in the United States. To recruit graduate students, the marketing strategies mentioned above are supplemented by working with businesses and organizations in the region, as well as through chambers of commerce, including the American Chamber of Commerce (AMCHAM). The link with AMCHAM is very helpful and productive.

In fall 2008–09, the undergraduate head count in CityU’s BSBA in Slovakia was 541; the graduate student head count was 141. Additionally, the partnership enrolls roughly 400 students in Intensive English and continuing education programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CU Slovakia Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CityU & VSM Net Tuition Revenue 2008-09: $5,188,169 USD

The first class of 44 undergraduate students who received the CityU degree graduated in 1994 — 30 in Trenčín and 14 in Bratislava. The first graduate degrees were awarded a year later. Since its founding, the institution has produced 2,652 graduates, more than 82 percent at the undergraduate level.

PROJECTED GROWTH
Growth at CU Slovakia is expected to be moderate.

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7).

Authorization and Contractual Arrangements - CityU programs in Slovakia and the rest of Europe are launched with all the necessary CityU internal approvals from, as needed, the Academic Affairs Council, the President’s Executive Team, the Chancellor of the International Division, the provost, the president, and the Board of Governors. CityU’s policy
ensures that it secures all required local approvals as pertinent before launching new programs. In the case of Slovakia, approval is from the Slovak Ministry of Education for the offering of CityU’s programs under VSM accreditation.

VSM was evaluated by the Slovak Ministry of Education in 1999 for institutional accreditation; in 2000, 2005, and 2007 for program accreditation; and in 2009 for comprehensive accreditation. Influenced by the U.S. accreditation process, VSM is adopting many of the internal assessment processes used by CityU. At the invitation of, and with support from the Slovak Ministry of Education, VSM participated in a voluntary quality improvement and evaluation process with the European University Association (2007–08). VSM was the only private institution out of twenty-three in Slovakia to participate in the study.

All contracts for CityU in Slovakia that cover the relevant areas in Policy A-6 were recently updated and renewed and are provided in the Exhibits.

Academic Oversight - Academic oversight within Slovakia is through the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe, based in Trenčín. The dean is employed by VSM, and is selected by and reports to the designated official at CityU. This position also provides oversight to CityU’s presence in the Czech Republic and Switzerland. Through its academic agreement with VSM, other personnel employed by VSM also provide oversight and support to its programs in the region. This includes the associate deans, the regional curriculum coordinator (a joint appointment of VSM and CityU), the scholastic honesty chair, the associate registrar (a joint appointment of VSM and CityU, with a reporting relationship to the CityU registrar at the home campus), and other personnel as designated. These relationships provide examples of the matrix management referred to in this report; the individuals involved are supervised on a day-to-day basis locally, while having clear accountabilities back to the designated positions at the home campus in Bellevue.

Faculty - Within Slovakia, faculty are given a full orientation and also have access to a detailed Academic Guide, updated yearly, that outlines the mission and goals and all policies and procedures of the university. Every effort is made to give all new faculty full and detailed orientation about CityU’s mission and purposes as they relate to the international program, as well as the institution’s academic policies and procedures. Occasionally, when faculty come on board on short notice, there is not enough time or resources to conduct such orientations; however, faculty will receive this information over the course of the term.

CityU’s operations in Slovakia are in solid shape when it comes to formal and regular faculty reviews. Faculty members undergo a full performance review once a year, and special attention is paid to new hires (e.g., they are observed several times in the classroom). If there are issues or complaints raised either in the End-of-Course Evaluations or in person, the Dean of Academic Affairs and the associate deans will follow up and work with the faculty until there is resolution or determination not to rehire.

In support of the overall quality of CityU’s programs in Slovakia, as well as a condition of the accreditation of VSM by the Slovak Ministry of Education, CityU and VSM need to increase the number of faculty with doctoral degrees or equivalent terminal degrees who teach for CityU and VSM.

Program Delivery - CityU began offering the new version of the MBA in fall 2009–10, which is in full alignment with the curriculum offered at the home campus. There have been information sessions for instructors, including some with the Dean of the School of Management from the home campus. Additional training was provided for the business simulation and the business plan software. There have also been efforts to inform incoming students about changes in the program. While in the past there have been some questions raised concerning the uniformity in delivery and similarity of intended outcomes of the MBA program offered in Slovakia and Europe vis-à-vis
the United States, the new version of the MBA should dissipate any concerns to that effect.

The BSBA is delivered face-to-face with some slight variation. In Bratislava, classes meet twice weekly for ten weeks; in Trenčín, classes meet four days a week for ten weeks. The online version runs for ten weeks.

With respect to the MBA, courses are delivered face-to-face over three weekends in the space of a month, covering a total of thirty hours. By exception, some courses are offered online and run the full ten weeks.

**Tuition and Fees** - CityU’s principle of affordability means that the tuition is set for each country outside the United States reflecting the local economy and buying power. CU Slovakia offers different payment schemes so that students can choose the option that best suits their financial obligation. They can choose from full-year tuition to quarter tuition, or even per course tuition. All options are publicly accessible on the local CityU.sk website. In Slovakia, non–European Union students pay twice the tuition rate. For 2008–09, undergraduate tuition rates were 365.10 EUR ($532.25 USD on 9/29/09) per course in Bratislava; 345.20 EUR ($502.98 USD on 9/29/09) per course in Trenčín, which was approximately 27 percent of U.S. tuition. Graduate tuition rates were 614.00 EUR ($895 USD on 9/29/09) per course in Bratislava and 577.50 EUR ($841.50 USD on 9/29/09) per course in Trenčín for master's programs, which was approximately 45 percent of U.S. tuition.

**Resources** - In Slovakia, CityU operates facilities in the city of Trenčín (roughly 4,500 m²), and in the city of Bratislava (roughly 3,900 m²). In both cities, facilities include classrooms, teacher offices, meeting rooms, libraries, PC labs, and in Trenčín, also a dormitory. Both buildings are equipped with audio-visual equipment to support instruction, as well as WiFi access throughout. Within Slovakia, processing of student applications and registrations is sometimes delayed, but new business practices are being implemented to ensure timely registration.

All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. Slovakia has physical libraries at both its locations in Bratislava and Trenčín, managed by VSM. Mention of CityU information resources is also found in all course syllabi. Past issues with access to the CityU portal, which is the access point to library services, appear to be resolved in most cases; the dean assesses this regularly to ensure early response to any problems.

Although students have access to the portal, CU Slovakia does not follow the same practice as in the United States wherein all contact is via CityU e-mail addresses, which in part ensures that students are aware of new developments. However, the partner institution, VSM, has recently instituted the use of its own e-mail addresses for all students, so this problem has been effectively remedied.

For the e-learning environment, VSM has developed its own e-learning platform, the Bulletin Board. CityU courses will be delivered through Blackboard (Bb), beginning in the 2010–2011 academic year.

**Plans for Improvement for Programs in Slovakia**

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, two additional needs relate specifically to the programs in Slovakia.

1. In support of the overall quality of CityU’s programs in Slovakia, as well as a condition of the accreditation of VSM by the Slovak Ministry of Education, CityU and VSM need to increase the number of faculty with doctoral degrees or equivalent terminal degrees who teach for CityU and VSM.

2. In order to fully gain the benefits of CityU’s approach to structured learning supported by its learning management platform and be in line with CityU programs offered in the United States, CU Slovakia will begin implementation of the Blackboard Learning Management System in 2010–2011.
CITYU IN CENTRAL EUROPE: THE CZECH REPUBLIC AND SWITZERLAND

CityU has two other locations in central Europe. The first of these is a partnership with a university headquartered in Prague, Czech Republic; the second, is a CityU-owned operation in Zurich, Switzerland.

Vysoká škola finanční a správní: Prague, Czech Republic

BACKGROUND
In 2002, City University of Seattle and Vysoká škola finanční a správní or Institute of Finance and Administration (VSFS) entered into a partnership to offer CityU of Seattle’s Master in Business Administration (MBA) to VSFS students. Three years later, CityU and VSFS agreed to expand the portfolio of programs and offer CityU’s Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA).

PARTNER
VSFS, which is headquartered in Prague, is a multicampus institution with a presence in Prague (two sites), Most, and Kladno. VSFS, founded in 1999 by the Bank Academy and Czech Coal Group, gained appropriate approvals and accreditation in the Czech Republic. In the course of its first five years of existence, VSFS became the largest private institution of higher education in the Czech Republic, currently enrolling more than five thousand students. Recently, VSFS was granted full university status by the Czech Ministry of Education.

PROGRAMS OFFERED IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC
CityU’s presence in the Czech Republic includes the MBA and Bachelor of Science in Business Administration via the partnership with VSFS. The MBA is offered to students as a part-time program and is delivered in a highly condensed mixed-mode...
format, in which twenty hours of in-class instruction is delivered over an intensive weekend and is supplemented by online instruction. It has two starts per year (April and October).

The Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) was launched in 2006 and is therefore relatively new in the Czech Republic. It typically has one start per year in September. The program is designed as a 3+1 option in which VSFS undergraduate students complete three years of an undergraduate degree through VSFS, and complete their final year in CityU courses to earn the CityU BSBA. Students who successfully complete all requirements for both programs earn the Czech degree from VSFS and the CityU degree.

**STUDENTS AND ALUMNI**

The size and scale of CityU’s MBA and BSBA in the Czech Republic have been small. Currently, CityU has 76 MBA and 13 BSBA graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU/VSFS Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CityU Net Tuition Revenue 2008-09: **$130,799 USD**

**PROJECTED GROWTH**

Based on conversations between CityU and VSFS regarding an increase in marketing, the parties expect an increase in numbers.

**ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7**

This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). CityU’s operations through its own entities and its partnership with VSM in Slovakia form the regional hub for most administrative functions related to the other partnerships in Europe, including finance, operations, human resources, marketing, student registration, partner contract management, and interfacing with the home campus. Therefore, many of the elements related to the partnership with VSFS were covered in the section on CityU in Slovakia. Elements that are specific to the VSFS partnership are discussed here.

**Authorization and Contractual Arrangements** - CityU’s offerings in partnership with VSFS received appropriate internal approvals and authorization from NWCCU. A contract with VSFS is in place allowing for the offering of undergraduate and graduate programs in Prague (see Exhibits). Further information is outlined in the “Memorandum of Understanding for Contiguous Undergraduate Studies” (MOU) (see Exhibits). While not contractual in nature, this document is a reference for credit transfer, responsibilities of each partner, and other academic and operational procedures.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight for the partnership with VSFS is provided by the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe, based in Trenčín, Slovakia. The associate deans, regional curriculum coordinator, scholastic honesty chair, associate registrar, and other functions housed in the VSM partnership also serve to provide oversight and support to the offerings in Prague.

The associate rector of VSFS has taken on some academic oversight responsibilities, as described in the MOU. In relation to these responsibilities, he reports to CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe. Greater coordination and clarity is being developed for the academic affairs role being covered by VSFS on behalf of CityU.
Faculty - Instructors are a mix of local hires and CityU instructors provided from Slovakia. The Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe is involved in all interviews and teaching demonstrations for locally hired instructors. As with other sites, Prague uses a number of Slovak-based instructors who are well-versed in the mission and goals of the home institution. End-of-Course Evaluations are closely monitored, and are used in a “red flag” manner — i.e., if there are repeated indications that there is a problem related to instruction, the situation is investigated by the Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe. CityU will incorporate its programs in the partnership with VSFS to the institution-wide system for Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation.

Students, Admissions, and Records - VSFS has staff designated to service and provide attention to students attending CityU programs in Prague. Based on CityU’s preferred staffing model, the partnership should expand, directly or via VSFS, in adding a student services coordinator based in the Czech Republic.

Curriculum and Delivery - The curriculum used in the programs in partnership with VSFS follows the model described in the section on Slovakia. Both the undergraduate and graduate programs use the curriculum developed and approved by the School of Management. Changes to syllabi that are intended to make the learning experience more relevant or appropriate to the student population are reviewed by the Dean of Academic Affairs or his representative.

The MBA delivered in partnership with VSFS uses a mixed-mode format, where twenty hours are taught face-to-face and ten hours are accounted for online. Although an initial scan of student capstones did not indicate a significant gap in achievement, instructor feedback has consistently described this format as problematic. The twenty hours take place over a single weekend of workshops, with six hours on Friday afternoon, eight hours on Saturday, and six hours on Sunday. The students often take these classes at the end of a long workweek. The ten online hours are not systematically monitored. For fall 2009–10, a slightly adjusted format has been implemented wherein the class starts online about a week before the workshops, so students come to the first session with some course work completed. Instructor training occurred prior to the start of the fall 2009 term.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment - The programs in Europe are included in the schools’ student learning outcomes assessment processes: faculty collect capstone projects and submit them to the program director at the home campus. The project documents provide evidence of student learning that is included in the review and analysis process and used to make determinations regarding program improvements. As the partnership with VSFS adopts the new MBA curriculum in 2009–10, it will be easier to monitor the standard of student achievement since there will be some “standardized” mandatory assessments.

Tuition and Fees - Tuition rates are established based on the local market and reviewed annually. Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications. For 2008–09, the tuition rates were 360 EUR ($524.62 USD on 9/29/09) per course for undergraduate programs and 600 EUR ($874.28 USD on 9/29/09) per course for master’s programs, which were 21 percent and 51 percent, respectively, relative to U.S. tuition.

Marketing and Recruiting - Advertising and promotional literature is generally done in cooperation with the Director of Marketing and Development in Slovakia. The director makes sure that the information on the advertisements is truthful, and does not bear any misleading or exaggerated information. More attention and a co-investment are required in marketing and recruitment in order to achieve the growth the partnership projects for the next few years.

Resources - Students and faculty have access to the physical facilities of the partner institution, which also
includes local learning resources and wireless Internet access throughout the school buildings.

**PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR PROGRAMS IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC**

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, additional needs relate specifically to the programs in the Czech Republic.

1. More attention and a co-investment are required in marketing and recruitment.
2. Greater coordination and clarity are in process for the academic affairs role being covered by VSFS on behalf of CityU.
3. CityU will incorporate its programs in the Czech Republic to the institution-wide system for Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation.

**City University of Seattle, Zurich: Zurich, Wettingen, and Lucerne, Switzerland**

**BACKGROUND**

CityU’s newest operation in central Europe is in Switzerland. CityU offered programs there in the 1980s and 1990s before it ended its presence there in 2000. The current project in Switzerland was initially discussed as a possibility in summer 2006, when CityU was approached by Cemal Erinmez (a CityU MBA alumnus from Switzerland and formerly employed by CityU to manage the teach-out of the CityU programs in 2000) to consider establishing a partnership with Fachschules (vocational and trade schools) in Switzerland. The rationale for the original concept was that graduates of Fachschules did not have undergraduate degree completion options available from local institutions, and CityU could fill this gap via its ability to offer flexible transfer options. In winter 2007, the CityU Board of Governors approved a proposal to restart CityU programs in Switzerland via a proof-of-concept approach that would entail establishing a CityU-owned entity in Zurich (“City University of Seattle, Zurich”) and articulating with the Benedict Group, a very successful Fachschule in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. Accompanying but secondary to the bachelor’s degree completion option was the intention to offer the MBA degree as well.

While the initial strategy was to partner with the Benedict Group and a select group of Fachschules, a delay in the start of the project and changes in market conditions led CityU to modify its strategy. CityU now transfers undergraduate students from many Fachschules via articulation, with partnering schools sending groups of students to CityU for degree completion — not unlike the concept of taking students with technical associates’ degrees in the United States and delivering the required General Education and upper-division courses. Because Fachschules are considered equivalent to vocational schools, CityU awards transfer credit at a ratio of 16.5 contact hours to one quarter credit, as per its policy.

In the case of the MBA, as the effort got under way, students were taken in via Benedict Hospitality Management School (BHMS), as part of a double program with Benedict’s post-graduate diploma in Hospitality Management. There were several issues...
that led to CityU deciding to offer the MBA on its own. The courses and work placement at BHMS are not exactly equivalent to CityU’s graduate level and, because of time constraints on their visas and internships, students needed to overload their MBA studies, taking four courses a quarter. Accordingly, as CityU Zurich has effectively taken ownership of the programs, it is no longer subject to the study and work-term schedules of the original partner. It has been possible to reduce the number of courses in a quarter to three, and also to take full control of English proficiency testing and English classes in order to meet requirements.

CityU will phase out its partnership agreement with the Benedict Group by the end of the 2009–2010 academic year.

**PROGRAMS OFFERED IN SWITZERLAND**

In order to accommodate the need to offer a full complement of General Education courses, CityU decided to offer its Bachelor of Arts in Management (BAM), a degree program designed to serve graduates of technical and vocational programs. Since moving to a more independent business model, the university found that the MBA is receiving a greater response from potential students than the undergraduate program. It is anticipated to be the mainstay of CityU’s presence in this first phase of development. The MBA was launched in summer 2008, and the BAM in 2009.

**LOCATIONS**

The majority of students take classes in person either in a classroom at the partnering Fachschule in Lucerne (Benedict Hospitality Management School, or BHMS) or at the CityU-Zurich campus building in Wettingen, a town adjacent to Zurich. There are a handful of students taking online classes on Blackboard via CityU of Seattle.

**STUDENTS AND ALUMNI**

There is a small group of students enrolled in CityU’s MBA and the first group of students started in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU Zurich Three-Year Snapshot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analyses Pertaining to NWCCU Policies A-6 and A-7

This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). CityU’s operations through its own entities and its partnership with VSM in Slovakia form the regional hub for most administrative functions related to the other partnerships in Europe, including finance, operations, human resources, marketing, student registration, partner contract management, and interfacing with the home campus. Therefore, many of the elements related to CityU’s Zurich operations were covered in the section on CityU in Slovakia. Elements that are specific to CityU Zurich are discussed here.

**Authorization and Contractual Arrangements**

CityU programs in Switzerland have received the necessary internal approvals, as needed (e.g., Academic Affairs Council, the President’s Executive Team, the provost, the president, and the Board of Governors), as well as from NWCCU. It has the required local permissions to operate in Zurich, Wettingen, and Lucerne. All required contracts, including the ownership
arrangements and the agreement with Benedict Group, were in place in Switzerland before operations began. The agreement with Benedict Group is updated to reflect the current strategy and will be phased out by the end of the 2009–2010 academic year. (See Exhibits.)

In light of the changing nature of CityU’s strategy in Switzerland, during the 2009–2010 academic year, the institution is reviewing said strategy, and intends to adjust it as necessary, and update a five-year plan that includes programs to be offered, potential growth, resource and staffing needs, and projected financial results. Particular attention will be paid to the emerging accrediting system in Switzerland and the specific requirements that need to be met.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight for the offerings in Switzerland is provided by the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe, based in Trenčín, Slovakia. The associate deans, regional curriculum coordinator, scholastic honesty chair, associate registrar, and other functions housed in the VSM partnership also serve to provide oversight and support to the offerings in Switzerland.

CityU’s program offerings in Switzerland are directly coordinated with CityU of Seattle. Strategic direction and decision making are made by the managing director, who is a CityU-Zurich employee as well as a minority owner, in coordination with the Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe and CityU’s Vice President for European Operations. Direct links to the home office are via the chancellor, the provost, the Dean of the School of Management and the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services. Lines of control and administration are either directly with the home campus in the United States or directly with the Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe.

Administrative staff report to the managing director, an employee of CityU of Seattle. Currently, said staff includes the following positions: academic coordinator, ESL coordinator, ESL instructor, housing manager, and HR/Accounting. Teaching staff are directly accountable to the Dean of Academic Affairs for Central Europe.

**Faculty** - Faculty are either hired locally or sent in from other European locations, the majority of whom are based in Slovakia. Generally, instructors who are sent to Switzerland have been teaching with the university for some time and adhere to the institutional mission and goals. Also, some of the instructors hired locally have ties with the former incarnation of the school in Switzerland and are aware of CityU’s Academic Model. CityU’s program is adapted to the culture of the host country mostly via hiring local instructors or by using European-based instructors.

The managing director and Dean for Academic Affairs for Central Europe, based in Trenčín, are involved in the hiring process of faculty, which includes teaching demonstrations as well as review of academic and professional credentials and experience. Diplomas/transcripts are necessary, and the full application package must be completed before faculty are officially considered hired.

End-of-Course Evaluations are closely monitored, and if there are repeated indications that there is a problem related to instruction, the situation is investigated by the Dean of Academic Affairs. Consistent standards, policies, and practices for faculty evaluation need to be implemented in all locations. Beginning in 2009–2010, CityU in Switzerland should designate either a part-time or full-time academic lead person to support faculty- and program-related matters.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - Direct control of admissions is under the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services and the registrar at CityU’s home campus in Bellevue, Washington. All student documentation (application form, registration for courses, etc.) is collected locally and sent as a package (in .pdf form) directly to the home campus. Since the students study in the programs of CityU, all credits earned are applicable toward the CityU degree. Official student records are maintained in the Registrar’s Office in Bellevue. Full records are also kept in Switzerland.
Official institutional transcripts are consistent for all students in all CityU programs in Switzerland.

Students in the international program are fully informed as to services that will or will not be provided. New students receive an orientation and an orientation package. Students have access to the CityU portal and to the local portals, too. All students are also given a CityU.edu e-mail address for communications related to their studies.

All students in Switzerland are registered according to standard CityU admissions requirements, except for one notable exception: fulfillment of the English proficiency requirement has been waived for three terms. Students may not continue in their program after this point unless they demonstrate meeting English proficiency. English improvement requires ongoing support. A big challenge for the students in Switzerland is learning English in a German-speaking society. Now that CityU has established a site in Wettingen, it no longer relies on the partnering Fachschule to raise the English proficiency to the required standards. One important improvement is that the studies have been “slowed down” — students in Wettingen are solely CityU students and are taking fewer courses per term (three instead of four) and only focus on their English (not German as well).

In response to international student needs, CityU Zurich provides apartments or flats that students can sublet. A part-time housing manager acquires appropriate space and takes care of maintenance. The current housing manager has many years of experience in this field, as well as in security systems, and previously worked for another international school in Switzerland. All housing units meet Swiss standards of health and safety; many are newly renovated, with new kitchen appliances, etc., and have wireless access. The school also takes responsibility for cleaning all rental units once a week. The housing units are in quiet residential areas in villages and small towns within thirty minutes of the campus via public transportation. Currently, the school has ten flats in various locations around the Wettingen campus; fifteen students are housed there, and approximately forty will be living in these apartments by the end of the year.

Program Delivery - The initial delivery model for the MBA presented significant challenges as described in the section above; students were required to take four courses per term, while also improving their English language skills in a primarily German-speaking environment and while continuing their studies in the partner Fachschule. CityU Zurich’s decision to move to a more independent model allowed this to be addressed, with a reduced course load and more support for English language development. CityU now has an ESL coordinator who tests and monitors student progress. In the past, all students were “lumped” together in a single class, regardless of level. Now they are being streamed according to test results. As stated above, the “ownership” of this part of their studies has led to significant improvement of the conditions for English studies.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment - Within the CityU curriculum are a number of common assessments, and both the BAM and MBA have capstone-type projects that can be monitored. The standard of student achievement is a matter for serious review and alteration. At this point, no review has taken place since the program is so new and few elements of comparison have been compiled. Scholastic honesty issues are currently a matter of concern: students come from an educational background where little or no such tradition exists. Although relevant information on the topic has been shared with students (including written documentation of the Scholastic Honesty policy), conditions for sharing this information are far from ideal. For example, in Lucerne, the SH policy is covered as part of a two-hour orientation after the students have had a full day of sessions with the partner school (frequently within a day or two of a long international flight). Steps are being taken to address this gap, with longer, more detailed orientation sessions under better conditions and with support staff now in place in Wettingen.
When the first group of students has been through a full cycle and capstones are completed, a full review will take place. CityU intends to incorporate its programs in Switzerland into the institutional effort to normalize assessment across locations in Europe.

**Tuition and Fees** - Information concerning tuition and/or fees charged, receipt and disbursement of funds, and the refund policy is clearly stated in local publications. Tuition rates are established based on the local market and reviewed annually. For 2008–09, the tuition rates were 1,000 EUR ($1,463.53 USD as of 9/29/09) per course for undergraduate programs and 1,437.00 EUR ($2,103.40 USD as of 9/29/09) per course for master’s programs, which were 62 percent and 87 percent, respectively, relative to U.S. tuition.

**Marketing and Recruiting** - As CityU has shifted its strategy, there has been an increased emphasis on international (i.e., non-Swiss) students, and due to this, field agents are beginning to be used widely. Currently, agreements have been made with agents in India, Bangladesh, Nepal, United Arab Emirates, Russia, the Baltic States, Vietnam, and Turkey. (See Exhibits for the Standard Agent Contract.) A key part of the application and visa process is to gauge and ensure English proficiency, academic qualifications, and financial stability. The agents are selected and monitored personally by the managing director and program coordinator.

**Resources** - City University of Seattle, Zurich, has the following facilities at its disposal as needed:

- At CityU’s location in the financial district in Zurich: office and classrooms that are rented on a needs basis for part-time Swiss students.
- At CityU’s leased facilities in Wettingen: for full-time international and local students, classroom and office space have been engaged and expanded on a needs basis.
- At BHMS in Lucerne: the partnering Fachschule provides classroom space, accommodation, board, and visa support as part of the agreement.

All CityU students in Switzerland have access to all CityU resources available via the CityU portal, including the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, such as e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. In the case of BHMS in Lucerne, students have access to a computer lab; and in Wettingen, the building has wireless access throughout. The model for operating in Switzerland is exceptionally “lean” and efficient with personnel and facilities only being engaged in accordance with student numbers.

**Plans for Improvement for Programs in Switzerland**

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, additional needs relate specifically to the programs in Switzerland.

1. CityU will fully incorporate its programs in Switzerland into the institutional effort to normalize assessment across locations in particular in Europe, as soon as there are students completing their program. When the first group of students has been through a full cycle and a business plan is completed, a full review will take place.

2. CityU is preparing to incorporate its regular faculty evaluation practices in Switzerland. Beginning in 2009–10, CityU in Switzerland will designate either a part-time of full-time academic lead person to support faculty- and program-related matters.

3. In light of the changing nature of CityU’s strategy in Switzerland, during the 2009–2010 academic year, the institution will review its strategy, adjust it as necessary, and update a five-year plan that includes programs to be offered, potential growth, resource and staffing needs, and projected financial results. Particular attention should be paid to the emerging accrediting system in Switzerland and the specific requirements that need to be met.

4. Helping students get integrated into the living conditions in Switzerland is one of the biggest challenges. Living apart from the campus helps them with their integration. Also, the staff
provides support, often helping students communicate in a German-speaking environment.

5. Students will be provided a fuller orientation to the Scholastic Honesty policy and the policy will be enforced.

6. Regarding English proficiency, CityU now has an ESL coordinator who tests and monitors student progress. In the past, all students were “lumped” together in a single class, regardless of level. Now they are being streamed according to test results. As stated above, the “ownership” of this part of their studies has led to significant improvement of the conditions for English studies. The plan is to stay the course until we see the results of the current cycle of students.

CITYU IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE: BULGARIA, GREECE, AND ROMANIA

CityU’s partnerships in Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania are also served by its regional hub in Slovakia. In 2006, the university determined that operations in the region had grown to such a scale that it established a second Dean of Academic Affairs position, to be located at the partner’s campus in Pravetz, Bulgaria. The Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe provides academic oversight to all of CityU’s programs in these countries, and is the main point of contact for academic and student services matters for the region with European operations in Slovakia and with the headquarters in Bellevue. The decision was made to locate the position at the Pravetz campus because of its size and the nature of the student population it serves.
— younger students often living away from home for the first time. This role therefore combines some elements of a “campus director” and student services advisor with the more typical academic leadership provided by a dean.

**International Business School: Pravetz and Sofia, Bulgaria**

**BACKGROUND**
CityU currently operates degree programs in Bulgaria through and with the International Business School (IBS), one of the first private schools of higher education in the country. Initially, CityU began offering the MBA program in Bulgaria in 1999 via the City University Distance Learning Center, a single-person LLC owned by Nickolov, Dimova, and Co. It began offering an undergraduate program by virtue of an agreement between CityU and IBS in 2001 that was then replaced by the Agreement for Cooperation in the Implementation of Educational Programs (the “Bulgaria Agreement”), which was executed on May 24, 2004. In turn, the 2004 Agreement is replaced by an amended agreement signed by CityU and IBS in December 2008.

As a result of the agreement with IBS, CityU operates at two sites in Bulgaria, one in Sofia and one in Pravetz. The Sofia location has been used to offer the MBA program under an executive format to working professionals since 1999. The Pravetz location, which is leased to IBS, was made possible through the organizational and financing efforts of Mr. Valentin Zlatev, a private Bulgarian citizen active in many private and public enterprises. The Pravetz location has classrooms, other academic-related facilities, dormitories, and athletic facilities; CityU has offered the BSBA to traditional-college-age students there on a full-time residential basis since 2002.

Consistent with CityU’s mission, students and graduates of CityU’s programs in Bulgaria are provided with and are benefiting from an opportunity to receive a U.S.-style higher education opportunity for personal and professional advancement that would otherwise not be available. CityU programs in Bulgaria, through the partnership with IBS are the only U.S. option in that country besides the American University of Bulgaria.

**PARTNER**
The International Business School was funded in 1991 as a private higher education institution. IBS is officially accredited by the National Evaluation and Accreditation Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria. IBS has its main campus in Botevgrad, from where it serves over six thousand students across Bulgaria through face-to-face and distance modes of delivery.

The facilities that IBS leases for the CityU programs are designed to meet students’ expectations. On its campus in Pravetz, students enjoy one of the most modern facilities in Bulgaria that includes residence halls, a computer center, library, and a first-class sports facility. The facilities in Sofia, Bulgaria’s capital, are in a high-tech business office setting.

**PROGRAMS OFFERED IN BULGARIA**
The MBA students in Bulgaria can choose from three emphases within the MBA. Likewise, the emphasis areas can be taken as a stand-alone program, also referred to as a graduate certificate. CityU is also approved to offer the Master of Science in Project Management, the Master of Science in Technology Management, and the Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology through its partnership in Bulgaria, and plans for recruiting students are under way.

At the undergraduate level, students can currently opt for one of two Bachelor of Science in Business Administration emphasis areas: General Management or Marketing. Students not interested in a degree can enroll in the emphasis courses and earn an undergraduate certificate.

Based on the respective approval processes followed by CityU with NWCCU in the United States and by IBS with the Bulgarian Ministry of Education, graduates of CityU’s programs in Bulgaria receive a U.S. degree from CityU and a Bulgarian degree from IBS.
STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
In 2004–05, there were 59 MBA students in Sofia and 159 BSBA students in Pravetz. By fall 2008, the number of MBA students had risen to 81, while the BSBA had 202 students. The number of alumni in Bulgaria as of fall 2008 stands at just above 300 (100 from the BSBA and 201 from the MBA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU and IBS Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees awarded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CityU Net Tuition Revenue 2008–09: $241,965 USD

PROJECTED GROWTH
Based on the agreement that was amended in December 2008, IBS and CityU will seek, beginning in 2009–10, to offer three new programs in Bulgaria: Bachelor of Arts in Applied Psychology, Master of Science in Project Management, and Master of Science in Technology Management.

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). CityU’s operations through its own entities and its partnership with VSM in Slovakia form the regional hub for most administrative functions related to the other partnerships in Europe, including finance, operations, human resources, marketing, student registration, partner contract management, and interfacing with the home campus. Therefore, many of the elements related to the partnership with VSFS were covered in the section on CityU in Slovakia. Elements that are specific to CityU’s programs in partnership with IBS are discussed here.

Authorization and Contractual Arrangements - CityU programs in Bulgaria have received the necessary internal approvals, as needed (e.g., Academic Affairs Council, the President’s Executive Team, the provost, the president, and the Board of Governors), as well as from NWCCU. CityU’s presence and offering of programs in Bulgaria have been authorized by the Ministry of Education since 2002. Programs to be offered beginning in 2009–2010 were approved in May 2009 by the Bulgarian Council of Ministers.

Since the Bulgaria Agreement was executed in 2004, there have been various issues that have affected the overall operation of CityU’s programs in that country. There were some issues of concern for CityU, including but not limited to the Bulgaria Agreement, providing exclusive rights to partner with CityU to offer its programs not only within Bulgaria but also extending to ten other countries in the region, effectively shutting out potential expansion. The financial arrangement based on net revenue share was also problematic.

Between 2004 and 2008, additional issues affected the functionality and operation of the partnership: excessive intervention on the part of IBS management that impacted the need for timely decisions; withholding payments due to CityU; refusing to recognize any indirect or overhead CityU costs; and not proceeding with the expediency required to seek Bulgarian Ministry of Education approval to offer other CityU programs in Bulgaria. In addition, costs for the rental of the Pravetz location and charges being assessed to students staying in the Pravetz dormitories continued to rise above the regional norm. Unlike several other CityU partnership agreements that call for a gross revenue share, the original agreement is a net revenue agreement and the partner remains unwilling to change.
All of the above contributed to an escalation in costs for students and for the operation of CityU programs in Bulgaria that led to a default in payment to CityU and raised serious questions as to the long-term sustainability of CityU’s presence in that country.

While some of these challenges have been addressed in the new agreement signed December 2008, there continues to be a tendency on IBS’s part to ignore certain aspects of the agreement. For example, timely payment of CityU invoices are continually delayed, and perhaps most importantly, signing authority for the managing director, which is seen as crucial for the success of the program, has not yet been implemented.

CityU is closely monitoring these issues with the International Business School on the timeliness of payments and the decision-making authority of the managing director. Should these operational issues not be successfully resolved, CityU may seek an alternative to its current partner or exit Bulgaria following NWCCU guidelines.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight for the offerings in Bulgaria is provided by the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe, based in Pravetz, Bulgaria. The associate deans, regional curriculum coordinator, scholastic honesty chair, associate registrar, and other functions housed in the VSM partnership in Slovakia also support the offerings in Bulgaria.

Except for the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs, all other local employees who support the CityU program in Bulgaria are employees of IBS. IBS staff reports to the managing director employed by IBS to manage its operations with CityU. The Dean of Academic Affairs and the managing director work together to guide the academic, student service, and administrative matters pertaining to CityU’s programs.

CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs is officially assigned .75 time to the programs in Bulgaria, with the other .25 assigned to CityU’s offerings in Greece and Romania; currently, his time and energy are spread thin. In addition, consistent standards, policies, and practices for BSBA and MBA faculty evaluation need to be implemented in Bulgaria. To address this issue, the 2009–2010 budget includes an additional academic position to share the faculty evaluation and development role in Bulgaria. The implementation of this position is contingent on the start of the new graduate programs in Bulgaria, the MS in Project Management, and the MS in Technology Management.

**Faculty** - The CityU Dean of Academic Affairs oversees the hiring process of all faculty in Bulgaria. Every effort is made to give all new faculty full and detailed orientation about CityU’s mission and purposes as they relate to the international program, as well as the institution’s academic policies and procedures. Occasionally, when faculty come on board on short notice, there is not enough time or resources to conduct such orientations; however, faculty will receive this information over the course of the term. All faculty are given a detailed Academic Guide, updated yearly, that outlines the mission and goals and all policies and procedures of the university.

CityU in Bulgaria has no full-time faculty serving its undergraduate or graduate programs, primarily because the student numbers are too small. However, if the projected growth in these programs is realized, full-time faculty will be assigned to its programs there.

The CityU Dean of Academic Affairs monitors faculty performance through classroom observations and monitoring the End-of-Course Evaluations. However, a formal faculty evaluation and review process has not been in place. CityU has developed an extensive and effective online training program for all U.S.-based faculty, which must be successfully completed by faculty before they teach their first class. CityU will adapt and implement this online training program to also serve Bulgarian as well as European-based faculty. In relation to continuing faculty, CityU Bulgaria will implement in 2009–2010 the emerging CityU Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process. Training occurred on the process in September 2009.
Program Delivery - BSBA programs are offered under CityU’s typical ten-week format; MBA classes have followed a five-week format. While this is perhaps better than the four-week format of other CityU sites in Europe, there have been some concerns expressed by both faculty and students, indicating that the time frame is not sufficient to properly cover work required for each class. CityU in Bulgaria will adopt the ten-week format for all master’s programs starting October 2009. Whether this should also be the policy for the other European sites in an effort to establish more consistency with regard to program quality and student achievement is being discussed.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment - As the partnership with IBS adopts the new MBA curriculum in 2009–10, it will be easier to monitor the standard of student achievement since there will be some “standardized” mandatory assessments. While CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs ensures the collection of capstone projects of all students to provide evidence of student learning and progress, CityU should continue to build a more direct and systematic link between capstone projects and student progress.

Tuition and Fees - Information concerning tuition and/or fees charged, receipt and disbursement of funds, and refund policy is clearly stated in local publications. CityU’s principle of affordability means that the tuition is set for each country outside the United States reflecting the local economy and buying power. The tuition is the same for all students from EU countries. For students from outside the European Union, tuition is approximately two-thirds more. Payment options are readily accessible on the local CityU.bg website. For 2008–09, the tuition rates were the equivalent of $412 USD per course for the BSBA and $740 USD per course for the MBA, which were approximately 25 percent and 45 percent, respectively, relative to U.S. tuition.

Marketing and Recruiting - Recruitment of students is carried out under contract by IBS employees who are assigned to support the CityU program. CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe provides oversight to registration and recruitment efforts.

Resources - The facilities used to deliver the educational programs in Bulgaria are exceptional and well equipped. In Pravetz, the primary building hosts modern classrooms with online access and multimedia equipment installed. This facility also houses the administrative offices for staff to support the program. A separate building adjacent to this primary facility hosts a PC lab and library. Approximately 400 meters from these main educational buildings are two modern dormitory facilities. In Sofia, where the MBA program is located, the program is delivered in a modern business-park-office environment. This rented space includes one classroom, equipped with wireless online access and multimedia equipment, as well as two offices for staff. In January 2010 the program will move to a new leased location of comparable quality. Additionally, all registered students in Bulgaria have access to the CityU online library resources and databases.

PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR PROGRAMS IN BULGARIA

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, additional needs relate specifically to the programs in Bulgaria.

1. CityU is closely monitoring these issues with the International Business School on the timeliness of payments and the decision-making authority of the managing director. Should these operational issues not be successfully resolved, CityU may seek an alternative to its current partner or exit Bulgaria following NWCCU guidelines.

2. CityU of Seattle has developed an extensive and effective online training program for all U.S.-based faculty, which must be successfully completed by faculty before they teach their first class. CityU will adapt and implement this online training program to also serve Bulgarian as well as European-based faculty.
3. In relation to continuing faculty, CityU Bulgaria is implementing the emerging CityU Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process.

4. CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs’ time and energy are spread thin. To address this issue, the 2009–2010 budget includes an additional academic position, potentially assigned to graduate programs, which can share the faculty evaluation and development role in Bulgaria. If the new graduate programs are launched, this position should be implemented as soon as feasible.

City Unity College Athens and the Technological Education Institute of Piraeus: Athens, Greece

BACKGROUND

CityU of Seattle has operated degree programs in Greece since 2001 in partnership with City Unity College (CUCA). The agreement between CityU and the local partner (then known as CityU Athens), titled the Agreement for Cooperation in the Implementation of Educational Programs (the “Greek Agreement”), was executed on November 10, 2004, and replaced prior agreements that began in 2001. The 2004 Greek Agreement was amended and replaced by the agreement signed December 23, 2008, by CityU and CUCA. Through CUCA and with their operational support, CityU has also had an agreement in place with the Technological Educational Institute of Piraeus (TEIP) since May 2005 for the offering of specific graduate programs.

Based on the respective approval processes followed by CityU with NWCCU in the United States, graduates of CityU’s programs in Greece receive a U.S. degree from CityU. Consistent with CityU’s mission, students and graduates of CityU’s programs in Greece are provided with and are benefiting from an opportunity to receive a higher education opportunity for personal and professional advancement that would otherwise not be available. CityU’s partnership with CUCA represents one of only a handful of U.S. institutions offering full degree programs in Greece, which has been typically dominated by the presence of institutions from the United Kingdom.

In 2005, City University of Seattle formed an educational partnership with the Technological Education Institute of Piraeus (TEIP). The CU-TEIP program offers a Master of Science in Project Management. The program is open to students holding a Greek higher education institution’s degree and/or a recognized non-Greek equivalent. The partnership between CityU and TEIP, supported by CUCA, is one of an even more select group of collaborations formally recognized by the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs.

PARTNERS

Initially known as City College/Omega Metropolitan and then CityU Athens, CUCA is a private-for-profit educational institution chartered by the government of the Republic of Greece on December 22, 2008. Like other private postsecondary organizations in Greece, CUCA operates as an education and training institution that cannot issue its own degrees but rather partners with foreign institutions (i.e., CityU and Liverpool John Moores University of the United Kingdom) to offer undergraduate and graduate degrees.

TEIP is a public technological university recognized and supported by the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. The approval by the ministry of the partnership between TEIP and CityU provides the graduate degree granted by CityU the same recognition as any graduate degree granted by any Greek public university, which is essential for certain government-related jobs.

PROGRAMS OFFERED IN GREECE

As a result of the 2008 agreement, CityU offers the following programs via its partnership with CUCA in Athens: BSBA, BS in Computer Systems (BSCS, which is transitioning to the BS in Information Systems), BA in Applied Psychology (BAAP), MBA, and the MS in Computer Systems (MSCS). The MS in Project Management (MSPM) is offered in partnership with TEIP at the TEIP site. While the bachelor’s
programs are offered on a full-time and part-time basis, master’s programs are offered under an executive format for working professionals. The MA in Counseling Psychology (MACP) is planned for the 2009–2010 academic year.

STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
Whereas in 2004–05 there were 36 master’s students and 151 bachelor’s students, in fall 2008 the number of master’s students had risen to 111 and bachelor’s students to 210. The number of alumni in Greece as of fall 2008 stands at 489.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU and CUCA/TEIP Three-Year Snapshot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Applied Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Counseling Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Computer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Applied Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Counseling Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Computer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Net Tuition Revenue 2008-09: $351,474 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7). CityU’s operations through its own entities and its partnership with VSM in Slovakia form the regional hub for most administrative functions related to the other partnerships in Europe, including finance, operations, human resources, marketing, student registration, partner contract management, and interfacing with the home campus. Therefore, many of the elements related to the partnership with VSFS were covered in the section on CityU in Slovakia. Elements that are specific to CityU’s programs in partnership with CUCA and TEIP are discussed here.

Authorization and Contractual Arrangements - CityU programs offered in Greece are launched with all the necessary CityU internal approvals from, as needed, the Academic Affairs Council, the President’s Executive Team, the provost, the president, and the Board of Governors. CityU’s policy ensures that it secures all required local approvals as pertinent before launching new programs. In the case of Greece, private education and training organizations do not require nor receive approval from the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, and CityU’s programs in partnership with CUCA operate accordingly. However, the CityU MSPM program offered with the Technological Education Institute of Piraeus (a public polytechnic) has received approval from the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs.

A new agreement with CUCA was signed in December 2008 (see Exhibits). Although the presence of CityU programs in Greece can be considered successful as reflected by the number of students served and the financial performance, the same cannot be said about CUCA. Indeed, by fall 2008, CUCA had payments in arrears for roughly $450,000 euros. Moving forward, CityU has decided to modify the revenue share agreement with CUCA as well as negotiate payment of the amount due over the next three to five years. This will allow CUCA to cover its basic expenses.
and have at least marginal resources for further development and growth.

Recent developments in Greek higher education potentially allowing the formal recognition of local private institutions have led CUCA to seek approval from the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs of that country. In support of that process, CUCA and CityU amended the current agreement in December 2008 as alluded to above. CityU is now monitoring the amended agreement to ensure that the long-term sustainability of the institution’s programs is secured.

In July 2009, CityU updated its agreement with TEIP to continue offering the MS in Project Management. This program received all internal CityU approvals and is included in its institutional accreditation with NWCCU; it is also authorized locally via TEIP’s recognition by the Greek Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight for the offerings in both partnerships in Greece is provided by the CityU Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe, based in Pravetz, Bulgaria. There have been challenges in applying the infrastructure in place in the VSM partnership in Slovakia to the partnership with CUCA. While CityU has a regional curriculum coordinator for Europe who is involved on various committees in the United States and coordinates for all sites in Europe, it does not at this point include Greece. In addition, the size of the operations stretched the limited time allotted to oversight by the regional dean, who is technically assigned .75 FTE to CityU’s programs in Bulgaria and also oversees offerings in Romania. To strengthen capacity for oversight and coordination, as part of its renegotiation of the contract with CUCA in late 2008, CityU established a new position in 2009, a Director of Academic Affairs for Greece who is hired and paid by CUCA but selected and supervised by CityU’s dean in the region.

Except for the dean, all other employees who work to support the CityU program in Greece are employees of the local partners. This includes the recently hired Director of Academic Affairs for Greece. In the case of CUCA, they in turn report to the managing director. CityU’s dean and the managing director work in a harmonious manner to operate the academic, student service, and administrative matters pertaining to CityU’s programs. In the case of the TEIP partnership, CityU’s dean works directly with the program director assigned by TEIP, who is a well-established and highly respected professor in that organization.

To ensure full compliance with standards, the capacity for academic oversight on the ground in Greece is being addressed by hiring the new Director of Academic Affairs for Greece.

**Faculty** - Though CityU’s local partners hire faculty to teach CityU courses following established guidelines for all CityU locations in Europe, actual oversight of qualifications, instruction, and performance falls under the responsibility of CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs for Southeastern Europe. The dean monitors the hiring process of all faculty, which includes an interview, a teaching demonstration as well as review of academic/professional credentials and experience. Diplomas/transcripts are necessary, and the full application package must be completed before faculty are officially considered hired. In the partnership with TEIP, CityU also sends faculty from its home campus in Washington to teach up to five of the fifteen courses in the program. These faculty are jointly selected and monitored by CityU’s program director, housed in the School of Management, and the regional dean.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - All CityU students in Greece are admitted based on the same admissions requirements as described in the official City University of Seattle Catalog. Admissions criteria are standard across all of the European programs and are similar to those used for international students admitted to the U.S. campus. From time to time some exceptions can be made, which are always coordinated with the Dean of the School of Management. In the past, admissions have been problematic in programs
in Greece, where students were allowed to take courses without first demonstrating that they met CityU’s English proficiency requirements. This has been substantially remedied through application of the special admission policy, but will be monitored for full compliance with CityU policies.

CityU will also seek to increase its student support services in Greece.

Program Delivery - In general, bachelor’s and master’s degree programs are offered under CityU’s typical ten-week format. However, in the case of bachelor’s classes offered with CUCA, the transition from partial-distance delivery to full in-class delivery resulted in only thirty documented hours of class time for a five-quarter-credit course, which should have fifty hours of class time. As this issue surfaced, CityU’s dean in the region, its Vice President for European Operations, and its academic leadership at the home campus in Bellevue worked with the partner to ensure all required contact hours would be delivered. As of fall 2009, the delivery of undergraduate courses complies with the institution’s policy, and this will be closely monitored.

Because there are often local instructors teaching in the program who have varied educational and professional experience, they often provide a local perspective on the subjects and bring in their own local examples. Texts and content being adopted in new and revised curriculum are adding international perspectives now. Instructor Guides for each course present U.S. as well as international activities and discussion questions to provide insight and guidance for international faculty to present activities in class and online with cross-cultural significance.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment - The programs in Europe are included in the schools’ student learning outcomes assessment processes; faculty collect capstone projects and submit them to the program director at the home campus. They provide evidence of student learning that is included in the review and analysis process and used to make determinations regarding program improvements.

The number of programs offered in the partnership with CUCA in Greece and the reluctance to participate as actively as other locations with the support offered by CityU’s staff in Slovakia led to gaps in student learning outcomes assessment data being collected. The implementation of the Director of Academic Affairs position in Athens is expected to improve this situation. As the partnership with CUCA adopts the new MBA curriculum in 2009–10, it will be easier to monitor the standard of student achievement since there will be some “standardized” mandatory assessments. Student work produced in the MS in Project Management program with TEIP was included in its most recent complete program review, which resulted in several improvements to the curriculum. These are reflected in the most current agreement with TEIP.

CityU will continue to build a more direct and systematic link between capstone projects and student progress. Similarly, the student learning outcomes assessment process will be regularized and applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in Greece, as in most locations throughout Europe.

Marketing and Recruiting - CityU in Greece follows the same visuals and graphic files as the Bellevue home campus and coordinates marketing materials with the Director of Marketing and Development based in Slovakia. In consultation as appropriate, the managing director in Greece makes decisions about these activities and ensures that all promotional advertising material is truthful and not misleading. All advertisements carry CityU’s name. In Europe, the ads appear in co-branded design with the local partner (school). In all cases, the CityU style guide is strictly observed.

Tuition and Fees - Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications for each site. CityU’s principle of affordability means that the tuition is set for each country outside the United States reflecting the local economy
and buying power. The tuition is the same for all students from EU countries. For students from outside the European Union, tuition is approximately two-thirds more. For 2008–09, the tuition rates were the equivalent of $518 USD per course for undergraduate programs, $666 USD per course for the MBA, and $789 USD per course for the MS in Project Management, which were approximately 32 percent, 41 percent, and 48 percent, respectively, of U.S. tuition.

**Resources** - CUCA has functional facilities near the main square in Athens, which include classrooms with online access, a computer lab available to students, an emerging library, and offices for academic, student, and operational staff. Recent renovations to the building have occurred, and a second classroom building is scheduled to open in the 2009–2010 academic year. CUCA is developing dormitories as well.

**Plans for Improvement for Programs in Greece**

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, additional needs relate specifically to the programs in Greece.

1. To further ensure academic oversight is in place in Greece and that CityU admissions policies are adhered to consistently, the newly hired Director of Academic Affairs will be properly trained, supported, and evaluated.

2. The student learning outcomes assessment process will be regularized and consistently applied to all programs in Greece, and the results used to document the achievement of students.

3. CityU will monitor the amended agreement to ensure that the long-term sustainability of the institution’s programs is secured.

4. CityU will adapt and implement its online faculty orientation program, as well as its Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process.

---

**InterCollege Institute of Business Studies, University of Nicosia: Bucharest, Romania**

**Background**

CityU has been offering the MBA program in Romania since 2002. Until December 2007, CityU’s partner in Romania was the Romania Banking Institute. At that point in time, the partnership was shifted to InterCollege Institute of Business Studies (IIBS/UN), part of the University of Nicosia. As with other partnerships that CityU has developed in central and southeastern Europe, CityU programs provide support for capacity building in Romania.

**Partner**

InterCollege Institute of Business Studies is a private, vocational, and higher educational institution acknowledged and registered with the Romanian government, and a subsidiary of the University of Nicosia (UN), which has been duly accredited by the Ministry of Education of Cyprus. By virtue of said accreditation and given that Cyprus is part of the European Union, IIBS/UN can offer the bachelor’s degree in any EU country and receive the same recognition as the local degree. IIBS/UN has a solid
standing in higher education in Cyprus, where it has the main campus in Nicosia and branch campuses in Larnaca and Limassol. In addition, IIBS/UN has a renowned standing and position in training and certification programs in accounting and finance, particularly in Romania.

**PROGRAMS OFFERED IN ROMANIA**
CityU has only offered the MBA in Romania thus far. The MBA is offered to working professionals in an executive-style format. The program is supported by local faculty approved by CityU and CityU faculty who are based in Slovakia. In the interest of expanding the portfolio of offerings, IIBS/UN and CityU have come to an understanding and will be launching the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) in the 2009–2010 academic year.

**STUDENTS AND ALUMNI**
Although the number of students served is relatively small, CityU’s MBA is well positioned in what amounts to a niche market. There have typically been two new MBA cohorts per year. CityU’s presence in Romania has thus far produced 147 MBA graduates.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>CityU and IIBS Three-Year Snapshot</th>
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standpoint, as IIBS/UN covers virtually all of CityU’s direct expenses for the MBA, it is not clear that the prevailing revenue share for the MBA program will lead to a financially viable offering of the BSBA program. Accordingly, IIBS/UN have agreed to launch the BSBA with the understanding that the financial model that would be used at least for the first year would be under a net revenue share format. At a special meeting held December 10, 2008, the Board of Governors authorized CityU to formalize an amendment to the agreement between IIBS/UN and CityU that includes the following:

- The programs to be offered by IIBS/UN and CityU will be the CityU MBA and the CityU BSBA.
- The CityU BSBA will be offered starting in 2009–2010.
- Students who successfully complete the CityU BSBA will also receive an undergraduate degree from IIBS/UN.
- IIBS/UN and CityU will review and articulate their respective curriculum and the corresponding timetable to facilitate the offering of the double degrees.
- The offering of the CityU BSBA will operate under a net revenue share (see Exhibits) subject to
  1. include coverage of direct costs from both parties and then split the net revenue 50/50;
  2. carry out a quarterly review of the BSBA project;
  3. provide oversight of budget and costs on a quarterly basis.

In addition to the improvements listed above, the following will also require attention from CityU on a go-forward basis: clarify and formalize CityU’s academic and student service/operations oversight, whether this is through the hiring of staff directly by CityU or via the hiring by IIBS/UN but reporting to CityU. CityU should monitor the amended agreement to ensure that the long-term sustainability of the institution’s programs is secured.

**Academic Oversight** - Oversight is through a combination of CityU’s Dean of Academic Affairs (DAA) for Southeastern Europe, who is located in Bulgaria, and support from CityU Slovakia and the home campus in Bellevue. Except for CityU’s DAA for Southeastern Europe, who is based in Bulgaria and carries out periodic visits to Romania, all other employees who work to support the CityU program in Romania are employees of our local partner, who in turn report to the managing director. CityU’s DAA for Southeastern Europe and the managing director work in a harmonious manner to operate the academic, student service, and administrative matters pertaining to CityU’s programs.

**Faculty** - Faculty hiring and supervision processes in Romania are the same as in Bulgaria and are supervised by the DAA for Southeastern Europe based in Bulgaria.

**Program Delivery** - CityU’s MBA in Romania has been offered successfully in an executive-style format. When the institution begins offering the BSBA, the delivery format will be offered under CityU’s typical ten-week format.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** - In Romania, as in other CityU locations in Europe, learning outcomes assessment has not been as systematic as needed. The student learning outcomes assessment process needs to be regularized and applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in Romania, as in most locations throughout Europe.

**Marketing and Recruiting** - Recruitment of students is designated to CityU’s partner organization under the contract, which specifies they must follow CityU admissions and academic policies. CityU in Romania follows the same visuals and graphic files as the Bellevue home campus and coordinates marketing materials with the Director of Marketing and Development, based in Slovakia. In consultation as appropriate, the managing director in Romania makes
decisions about these activities and ensures that all promotional advertising material is truthful and not misleading. The process described above assures that education is what is being offered, not employment. All advertisements carry CityU's name. In Europe, the ads appear in cobranded design with IIBS/UN. In all cases, the CityU style guide is strictly observed.

Tuition and Fees - Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications for each site. CityU’s principle of affordability means that the tuition is set for each country outside the United States reflecting the local economy and buying power. For 2008–09, the tuition rate for the MBA was roughly 300 EUR ($438 USD on 9/29/09) per course, which is 23 percent relative to U.S. tuition.

Resources - CityU in Romania has modern and functional facilities, which include classrooms with online access, a computer lab available to students, a large conference room, and offices for academic, student services, and operational staff.

PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR PROGRAMS IN ROMANIA

In addition to the plans for improvement in all European programs, additional needs relate specifically to the programs in Romania.

1. The student learning outcomes assessment process will be regularized and consistently applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in Romania, as in most locations throughout Europe.

2. CityU will monitor the amended agreement to ensure that the long-term sustainability of the institution's programs is secured.

3. CityU will adapt and implement its online faculty orientation program, as well as its Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

CityU in China: Beijing University of Technology, Canadian Institute for Business and Technology

BACKGROUND

CityU’s presence in China began in 1996 with the launching of the CityU MBA program in partnership with the Beijing University of Technology (BJUT) and the Canadian Institute for Business and Technology (CIBT). The partnership received an initial approval from the Beijing Municipal Education Commission and then in December 1998 by the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council, the highest authority in the Chinese government concerning degree and certificate affairs. With this approval, both the Degree Committee and the Ministry of Education authorize CityU to offer its MBA program jointly with Beijing University of Technology and to issue MBA degrees to students in China. The Chinese government at all levels recognizes this degree.

From an effort that focused solely on the preparation of Chinese middle managers of multinationals and Chinese-owned enterprises, the program now also includes through the sponsorship of the Boeing Corporation, the enhancement of middle and emerging managers of China’s aviation industry. Today, the MBA program boasts over fourteen hundred graduates.

CityU’s China MBA program was selected as the “most influential joint MBA in 2004” by World Manager Weekly. The university is proud of how far the program has come since its initial foundation thirteen years ago, and plans to continue its presence in China and its contribution to China’s economic development and managerial modernization.

Looking ahead, CityU is engaged in expanding its relationships with other universities in China by implementing innovative transfer and articulation models for undergraduate programs. In one model under discussion, undergraduate students would engage in CityU courses delivered at their home university in China in their third year and come to CityU in Bellevue to complete their fourth year. This
allows further building of English proficiency as well as providing opportunities for students to earn a U.S. bachelor’s degree.

**PARTNER**

CIBT is a subsidiary of the Capital Alliance Group, Inc., a Canadian company incorporated in Vancouver, British Columbia. CIBT is authorized by the Ministry of Education, the People’s Republic of China, to offer English, technical business, information technology, and computer courses in Beijing. CIBT operates in Beijing, China, through a partnership with the Beijing University of Technology. BJUT is a university under the supervision of the Beijing Municipal Commission of Education, offering programs in engineering, science, and management. BJUT is part of the “211” group of universities selected by the Ministry of Education for special development and funding.

In 2008, CityU entered into an agreement with the University of International Business and Economics (UIBE), which when approved will become its primary partner for the future delivery of educational programs in China. That partnership is under review by the Ministry of Education, and until approved, CityU continues to teach-out its MBA students in partnership with CIBT.

**PROGRAM OFFERED IN CHINA**

The MBA degree program offered by CityU in China has consisted of fifteen courses; the new MBA curriculum, which consists of sixteen courses, will be implemented when CityU starts new cohorts in the 2009–2010 academic year, pending Ministry of Education approval. CityU delivers eleven courses in an executive-style format using CityU faculty primarily from the United States and Canada, who are supported by local tutors, while Beijing University of Technology delivers four courses taught by local instructors. CityU’s trademark has been the offering of a quality management education experience to working professionals in China that is U.S.-style, based on practitioner-faculty, flexible in its delivery format to accommodate place-bound professionals, and that combines U.S. and international talent with local talent. There are two market segments that CityU offers the MBA program to: (a) middle and emerging managers of multinational companies operating in China as well as Chinese conglomerates (often referred to as the Regular MBA) and (b) middle and emerging managers from the Chinese airline industry (also referred to as the Boeing MBA, as this program is sponsored entirely by Boeing).
STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
From an initial group of 30 MBA students in 1996, CityU on average serves over 300 MBA students yearly. Close to 90 percent of students are from wholly foreign-owned or joint-venture enterprises; slightly over half of the MBA students are male; almost 90 percent of students are between 25 and 40 years old; roughly one-third of the graduates are at the CEO, president, general manager, vice general manager or equivalent levels and over half are in middle management positions; and the MBA program boasts an aggregate of over 1,400 graduates. On December 10, 2005, CityU and CIBT inaugurated the CityU China Alumni Association with more than 300 graduates in attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CityU and CIBT/BJUT Three-Year Snapshot</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing MBA</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Net Tuition Revenue 2008-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBT partnership</td>
<td>$733,072 USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing partnership</td>
<td>$245,218 USD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS PERTAINING TO NWCCU POLICIES A-6 AND A-7
This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7).

Purpose, Mission, and Goals - The primary purpose of CityU’s offerings in China is educational, which is specified in the contract with our partner in that country and also follows the same mission and goals as the home campus. The CityU MBA program in China has provided opportunities for Chinese professionals to acquire up-to-date managerial skills that will allow them to be more competitive in an increasingly global setting. A recent survey of CityU MBA graduates in China indicated that the most-cited benefits of the degree are career progression, salary enhancement, and an entrepreneurial spirit that has led many to create their own businesses (see Exhibits).

Authorization and Contractual Arrangements - Agreements in China cover all relevant areas as indicated by NWCCU (see Exhibits). As stated above, the CityU MBA program has been offered in China with all the necessary internal approvals. The CityU MBA program has secured all relevant external approvals as well. The Beijing Municipal Commission of Education granted its approval in 1997. In December 1998, the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council approved the joint venture to offer the American MBA degree in China. Since then, the CityU MBA program has consistently secured the reaffirmation of the approval to offer the MBA in China. Overall, the program is aligned with the “Regulations of the People’s Republic of China on Chinese-Foreign Cooperation in Running Schools,” established by the Ministry of Education in China.

The CityU MBA program in China is part of CityU’s institutional consolidated accounting system. The program is planned for and has a separate budget on an annual basis, which is reflected as an individual account that rolls up to the institution’s consolidated accounting.

Expenses in China are administered with the partner, CIBT, which is fully liable for maintaining records and financial reporting and accounting in accordance with local standards. Furthermore, CIBT makes all accounting records available for audit to ensure proper accounting.

The management team reviews performance carefully and incorporates local representation as possible to ensure nimble responsiveness to local market factors. The China management team, the management
team in the United States, and CIBT/BJUT work in as coordinated a manner as possible to ensure that all operations fully comply with local rules and regulations as well as U.S. standards and accreditation.

In light of CityU’s preference to have institutional relationships that are bilateral and not tripartite, as it has been with CIBT and BJUT, CityU has announced to both CIBT and BJUT that the MBA cohort that started in fall 2008 will be the last cohort to be served under this cooperation. In the meantime, CityU is seeking to reposition its partnership via the University of International Business and Economics (UIBE) approval to offer the MBA with UIBE henceforth. In that context, the institution is concurrently working on the following:

- Approval from the Chinese Ministry of Education to transfer the MBA being offered with CIBT and BJUT to UIBE.
- Ensure that current students taking the MBA under the CIBT/BJUT partnership are serviced appropriately and can conclude their program.
- Establish a systematic and direct communication with current students and alumni in the MBA program initially via the publication and distribution of a monthly e-newsletter.
- In the context of an institutional analysis of admissions policies and standards, review current admissions practices in the China MBA program and make the necessary adjustments.
- Charge the Regional Director of Academic Affairs China (RDAA) with the development of a plan of action and timetable to begin pre-operational activities with UIBE so that the start of the MBA program with UIBE gets off the ground as smoothly as possible.
- When the program starts with UIBE, offer the new MBA version.

CityU will continue to pursue approval from the Ministry of Education (MOE) for the transfer of its program from BJUT to UIBE. CityU will also continue to work on all the key activities associated with the appropriate servicing of students taking the CityU MBA program in the partnership with CIBT and BJUT as well as lay the appropriate groundwork to prepare for the transfer of the program to UIBE. In particular in relation to UIBE, CityU will clearly articulate the services that it will delegate to UIBE, and the scope of responsibilities that will entail. To assist in this transition, an orientation and training of relevant UIBE staff will be conducted once MOE approval is secured.

The CityU MBA program in China has been evaluated on a periodic basis since its inception in 1996. This includes evaluation by the Beijing Municipal Commission of Education, CityU, NWCCU, and more recently, the Shanghai Education Evaluation Institute. The CityU MBA program in China is part of the emerging CityU partnership review process, which calls for a major review roughly every five years.

**Academic Oversight** - Academic oversight is provided by CityU’s Regional Director of Academic Affairs for China (RDAA), who is located in Beijing and supported by the Bellevue campus. This includes oversight of faculty qualifications, instruction, and performance. Administrative and operational oversight is provided by the director of the China program, who is a Chinese native and splits her time between China and the United States.

CityU’s China program is controlled by CityU. All faculty and staff involved in the China MBA program have clear job descriptions to ensure that administrators, full-time faculty, and staff are appropriately fulfilling the roles necessary for academic quality and institutional viability, including academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance. These roles and responsibilities are incorporated in the annual performance review process for full-time faculty and staff.

**Students, Admissions, and Records** - Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU policies. All students come under CityU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress and academic standing. Student records are kept in accordance with
CityU standards, and each student’s official record is kept at the home campus. A signed CityU application and program plan issued by the Registrar’s Office serves as the enrollment agreement. The students are well informed before their enrollment and they can find all academic policies in the official City University of Seattle Catalog, which is also available on CityU.edu for download.

Admissions criteria for the CityU MBA program in China are the same as in the United States: all students must have a bachelor’s degree or higher. In addition, as a general practice in China, students are asked to have over two years’ work experience and a solid work background. A high level of English proficiency is necessary for attending lectures, completing tasks, and writing reports, etc. A Special Admissions Policy is included for students who do not meet all formal educational requirements, but who may have significant experience and be highly qualified to enter the program.

Applicants are required to attend an English Entrance Examination developed by Beijing University of Technology and CityU (students with scores of 567 within that same year can be excused from this examination). Since 2001, CityU has used the ACCUPLACER examination in China. CityU’s local partner (CIBT) is responsible for the initial screening of all application materials and for forwarding the applications to CityU. CityU’s registrar evaluates transcripts, diplomas, and application forms. Once a decision is made, CityU sends an acceptance letter to each student.

Once students are enrolled in the China program, they are recognized as official CityU students. Students who wish to do so can transfer to continue their studies at CityU’s U.S. campus. CityU’s Registrar’s Office keeps all official records of academic credit earned in the China program. Courses taken in CityU’s MBA program in China carry the same credit as similar courses offered by CityU in the United States. Transcripts for CityU MBA students in China are issued by CityU’s Registrar’s Office in the United States.

At the beginning of each quarter, CityU jointly provides new student orientation with the local partner. The purpose of the first orientation is to help students better understand the CityU/BJUT joint MBA program, City University of Seattle, and Beijing University of Technology. The second portion of the orientation session includes a section devoted to academic matters. This segment provides students with an overview of the entire MBA program, and helps students learn CityU’s academic standards and requirements, including method of grading, course design and curriculum, research methods and the APA format. Students will also learn about the assignments that will be expected, such as writing case analyses, position papers, and presentations in class, as well as working with fellow students in teams, and the final examination. The RDAA orients each cohort of students, introducing them to the program, and the expectations for them as students. Students also receive a Student Handbook that explains all aspects of the program as well as how they can best be successful in the program.

CityU’s regulations and policies are clearly stated in the CityU Catalog, the China Student Handbook, and the Faculty Handbook (see Exhibits). In order to continually improve these policies and assure teaching quality, CityU meets regularly with CIBT staff, with U.S. and Chinese instructors, and student representatives to gather their suggestions and recommendations for the program. For the past twelve years, due to the contributions of our partner, instructors, and students, CityU’s China program has achieved great success.

Students in China are given the same level of services as those in the United States. Students are advised by CIBT advisors under the auspices of CityU rules and regulations. CityU’s China Program Director and the RDAA both spend a great deal of time interacting with students, to help them be successful in the program and graduate.

Students mainly come from offices of foreign enterprises in China and foreign-invested enterprises, some of whom are designated by companies and some are
at their own expense; some are from domestic enterprises, including senior managers of private enterprises. Several foreign-invested enterprises in Beijing, such as IBM, Hewlett-Packard, Northern Telecom, Ameco, and other companies, regularly send a number of their selected staff for study. The following list illustrates the distribution of students per different categories.

- Organization that they belong to: wholly foreign-owned or joint-venture enterprises (90%); private enterprises (4%); government agencies (2%); state-owned enterprises and others (4%)
- Sex ratio of students: male (53%); female (47%)
- Age of students: below 25 (2%); 25–30 (41%); 31–40 (53%); over 40 (4%)
- Proportion of students in leadership positions: chairman of the board and chief representative (9%); president, CEO, general manager, and vice general manager (23%); department managers and supervisors (56%); executives and other (12%)

Because the great majority of the MBA students work full-time and have families, they are not interested in daily student activities or clubs. However, the Alumni Association does engage students in networking and professional activities.

Faculty - CityU, through the careful scheduling of its RDAA, generally has instructors scheduled one year in advance of their teaching dates. This allows faculty sufficient time to prepare and plan for their teaching in China. In the rare cases when an instructor cannot travel to China to teach due to an unexpected event or emergency, the RDAA maintains a group of faculty who are expert in the discipline and able to teach with short advance notice. Thus, all courses are taught by motivated, prepared, and expert instructors.

Instructors in the MBA program are provided with detailed syllabi to guide their teaching of the course. Instructors are also encouraged to develop their own outline of the concepts they will cover when teaching in China, and the RDAA works with them to plan the best class possible given the topic and time constraints. The RDAA works with each faculty member one-on-one to help them develop a syllabus outline for best outcomes in the program.

The MBA program is taught by a combination of Chinese and U.S. professors and practicing managers in various fields, all of whom are reviewed and vetted by CityU’s faculty approval process. This diversity of preparation and experience is a hallmark of the program, providing rich opportunities for learning both among students and instructors. When in the United States, it has been the practice of the RDAA to meet with the faculty who teach in China and organize training sessions to keep them abreast of current events in the China MBA programs.

Instructors in the MBA program in China are of four types. First, there are MBA instructors from CityU in Bellevue who make special trips to Beijing to give lessons and are responsible for eleven courses. According to CityU regulations, MBA instructors have more than the basic qualifications of educational background, teaching experience and currency, and as such also require rich professional experience with the topics they teach. They present Chinese students with the advanced knowledge and management skills of American business professionals, and they can help students by teaching them the skills and methods to solve problems encountered in their study.

The core faculty of CityU China comprises nineteen professors. Their combined years of teaching experience are well balanced: approximately one-third has more than twenty years’ teaching experience; another third has more than ten years’ experience; and the last third has less than ten years’ teaching experience. Nevertheless, they are all experienced in teaching Chinese professionals, and they are all familiar with working in harmony with the Chinese tutors and BJUT professors.

Sixty-eight percent of the City University of Seattle faculty for China have PhD or JD degrees; 32 percent have a master’s degree. They are all seasoned professionals and active in the business world in the subject matter they teach. This aspect is particularly
appreciated by the students who can learn the best and latest business practices from people who actually apply such practices. The Shanghai Educational Evaluation Institute expert report, conducted as part of the Ministry of Education required program review in 2008, highlighted this point, complimenting the competence of the faculty.

Sixty-three percent of the City University of Seattle faculty for China hold positions such as CEO, president, vice president, or CIO. Eleven percent are tenured professors at the other traditional U.S. universities, 11 percent are full-time directors at CityU, and the remaining 15 percent hold technical and project leader positions.

The CityU faculty for China are truly international. Overall, the cadre of professors includes eight nationalities. They speak nine languages and have a track record of living and working in North and South America, Asia, Europe, and South Africa.

Second, faculty from the Beijing University of Technology are responsible for teaching four courses in the program and for serving as “tutors” in the other eleven courses of the MBA program. These instructors are mostly Chinese from the Beijing University of Technology, University of Economics and Business, University of Technology, and Renmin University.

Third, senior managers are also invited from Chinese and foreign enterprises. The managers who teach have the qualifications of faculty including management experience and lecturing experience.

Fourth, some faculty are Chinese nationals who have returned after living overseas. They have education and work experience in foreign countries, and therefore, can work with foreign teachers easily. They can smoothly communicate with foreign instructors and have accurate understanding of problems; at the same time, they know the needs of students and can help students understand courses.

The evaluation of instructors is carried out in the following three ways: (1) students fill out the CityU EOCEs to evaluate the instructors sent by City University to Beijing, (2) the RDAA carries out a classroom observation of each instructor, and (3) the RDAA tracks faculty performance over time.

Students engaged in CityU’s MBA program are expected to achieve the same level of outcomes as CityU students in the United States.

The job description for Teaching Faculty ensures their appropriate engagement in effective teaching and includes four major responsibilities: teaching excellence, continued development as an instructor, currency in content knowledge, and student support. Instructors who teach in the program understand that they are to teach in accord with the aims of the program and the tenets of the culture. Training and orientation for these faculty stress the need for cultural competence in teaching and interaction with students. They understand the need to keep privately held political and religious beliefs separate from the role as an instructor, whether they teach in the United States or in China. Each instructor is provided with best practices in teaching for the China program as well as a code of professional conduct.

To build on the detailed attention paid to faculty for CityU’s program in China, the institution should implement in 2009–2010 the emerging CityU Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process.

Curriculum and Program Delivery - All courses are designed and approved through CityU’s School Curriculum Councils and the awarding of credit and determination of level are controlled by the faculty in the school, consistent with CityU policies.

City University of Seattle’s innovative Master of Business Administration program was developed after surveying employers in the United States, Europe, and China to determine what they look for when hiring and promoting an MBA to a management position. The focus of the program is to help students become recognized as leaders at every level of an organization. Throughout this program, students are able to apply their newly learned knowledge and skills in these areas to solve real-world business problems. In keeping with the mission of CityU to provide access to all those with the desire to learn, the MBA in China is designed
to allow busy managers to complete the program in fifteen months without giving up their jobs.

Books and learning resources in the program are approved by full-time faculty experts in the discipline. However, in observance of the fact that students in other regions may have unique needs, CityU is moving toward a more flexible curriculum development process, which allows each region to choose their texts and resources within broad parameters. The intention is that CityU’s RDAA in China, Mariella Remund, and select faculty who teach for the MBA in China can analyze, compare, and choose materials that best meet the learning needs of the students.

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** - Consistent with the status of other CityU international locations, the student learning outcomes assessment process needs to be regularized and applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in China.

**Marketing and Recruiting** - Recruitment of students is designated to CityU’s partner organization under the contract, which specifies they must follow CityU admissions and academic policies. CityU in China follows the same visuals and graphic files for marketing purposes as the Bellevue home campus. This assures that education is what is being offered, not employment.

All advertisements carry CityU’s name. In China, the ads appear in cobranded design with CIBT/BJUT. In all cases, the CityU style guide is strictly observed. During the twelve years of running this program, CityU and CIBT have operated with an understanding that all information released to the public must be honest, accurate, and updated. CIBT’s marketing department is responsible for marketing the MBA program through advertising and publicity in appropriate channels and forms in China. The marketing department coordinates with relevant CityU staff to ensure that all information — such as program design, admission requirements, recruitment and tuition — is accurate, consistent, and up-to-date. Below is a list of the channels that are used for the advertisement and promotion of the China program.

- **Channels:** website (www.cmba.edu.cn); recruiting leaflets; MBA brochure; MBA catalog; exhibition stands and display boards
- **Internet:** Sina.com (sina.com.cn), SOHU.com (sohu.com), MBA Home (mbahome.com)
- **Advertising format:** news, advertorials, advertisements, education exhibitions and expos

For many years, CityU and CIBT have made joint efforts to promote the MBA program by attending education fairs, offering public promotional seminars each year, and launching marketing campaigns. As a positive result, this program has grown to be one of the largest joint MBA programs in China.

**Tuition and Fees** - Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications for each site. CityU’s principle of affordability means that the tuition is set for each country outside the United States reflecting the local economy and buying power. For 2008–09, the tuition rates in China were $753 per course for the regular MBA and $930 per course for the Boeing MBA, which were approximately 46 percent and 57 percent, respectively, relative to U.S. tuition.

**Resources** - All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. Information about library resources, such as access to the online databases, is readily available. For example, mention of CityU information resources is found in all course syllabi.

CityU offers the MBA program at the CIBT campus, located at 120 Shuanglong Nanli, Chaoyang District, which is adjacent to and on the southeast
end of Beijing University of Technology. This quiet and independent campus is equipped with advanced teaching facilities with computers, projectors, and a three-story building for special use, providing necessary auxiliary facilities. In addition, some classes are also offered at Chaowai Men Building in the central business district of Beijing to provide service for students who work in that area.

CIBT’s administrative department is responsible for the maintenance and updating of local teaching facilities in Beijing. CIBT assigns qualified persons to monitor and maintain AV equipment — computers, projectors, screens, and whiteboards — before and after classes to ensure their good functioning for use in teaching. This includes updating computer virus protection software and dusting the projectors regularly. The administrative department not only maintains the computers, but also cooperates with CityU’s MBA department to promptly meet other IT requirements of teachers and students, so as to create a good teaching and learning environment.

Students of the program can use the online library resources of CityU and access information, without any cost. The online library resources of CityU have the advantages of convenient search, plentiful stock, especially the books and publications on business management, and wide coverage, which allows students to access and download information from newspapers on business management of the United States and the whole world, and information from major business magazines. The library’s business information provides great help for students to complete schoolwork and write papers.

In addition to CityU’s online library resources, an English-language business library of CIBT School of Business is open to students who can borrow or refer to books usually every afternoon or for the whole weekend. The MBA program requires students to read many books and articles on business, and the library partly fills this need. At present, there are nearly two thousand original English business books, which have been donated by the Canadian side of CIBT School of Business, the Commerce Department of the Canadian Embassy in China, and CityU. Most of the books are new, published since the later 1990s. In addition, agreements have been reached between the CIBT School of Business/Beijing agencies and North American publishers, such as McGraw-Hill and Simon-Schuster, to donate library business publications, including Chinese versions and English photocopies published with the consent of laws.

In the case of students taking the MBA program sponsored by Boeing who are in cohorts outside Beijing, classes are held at specialized and functional facilities at Shanghai Normal University for cohorts serviced in Shanghai and at the GuangDong University of Foreign Studies for those in Guangzhou.

The CityU MBA program in China operates on a financially sustainable basis and not only covers its direct costs but also contributes to CityU’s central activities in the United States.

PLANS FOR IMPROVEMENT FOR PROGRAMS IN CHINA

1. Consistent with the status of other CityU international locations, the student learning outcomes assessment process needs to be regularized and applied to all programs, and the results used to document the achievement of students in programs offered in concentrated time frames, such as the MBA in China.

2. CityU will continue to pursue the approval from the Ministry of Education (MOE) to ensure that the long-term sustainability of the institution’s program in China is secured.

3. CityU will continue to work on all the key activities associated with the appropriate servicing of students taking the CityU MBA program in the partnership with CIBT and BJUT as well as lay the appropriate groundwork to prepare for the transfer of the program to UIBE.

4. Building on the detailed attention paid to faculty for CityU’s program in China, the institution should implement the emerging CityU Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process, when the MBA is approved by the MOE and transferred to UIBE.
CityU in Australia: University of Southern Queensland

BACKGROUND
City University of Seattle and the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) have signed an agreement to offer students a double degree program: the CityU of Seattle Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) and the USQ Bachelor of Accounting and Sustainable Business (BASB). The first cohort of students enrolled in CityU courses in summer 2009.

PARTNER
The University of Southern Queensland is a public educational institution established under the Queensland State government’s University of Southern Queensland Act of 1998. USQ is a multicampus institution with sites in Toowomba, Wide Bay, and Springfield/Brisbane. USQ has over twenty thousand students at its three sites, with several thousand students being offered a USQ degree in their country (including a partnership in Singapore that services over one thousand students). Its principal place of business is in Toowomba.

PROGRAM OFFERED IN AUSTRALIA
The double degree program involves CityU recognizing and transferring 135 USQ credits plus nine CityU courses offered at the USQ Springfield/Brisbane site and USQ recognizing the CityU courses that would contribute to a USQ four-year undergraduate degree program, the Bachelor of Accounting and Sustainable Business (BASB). The nine CityU courses are referred to as “jointly badged,” meaning that they are recognized by both universities. On successful completion of the CityU degree requirements, students are awarded a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from CityU.

STUDENTS AND ALUMNI
Students in the BSBA program in Australia are traditional-age students (18–24 years old). In addition, international students from Southeast Asia, or
Asia in general, are expected to enroll in the program to obtain a U.S. degree. The first group is expected to graduate in June 2013.

### CityU and USQ Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer quarter unduplicated head count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CityU Net Tuition Revenue 2008-09</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Growth**

At this time, USQ and CityU only plan to offer the BSBA. In addition, USQ can be developed into a study abroad location for CityU students.

**Analysis Pertaining to NWCCU Policies A-6 and A-7**

This section addresses alignment with the standards specified in NWCCU’s policies on contractual relationships with organizations not regionally accredited (Policy A-6) and principles of good practice in educational courses and programs offered outside the United States (Policy A-7).

**Purpose, Mission, and Goals** - The purpose of CityU’s effort in Australia is educational and all program offerings are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. CityU’s presence in Australia is consistent with the institution’s mission and goals, educational needs, and CityU faculty oversight of program content under the general principles of Policy A-6.

**Authorization and Contractual Arrangements** - The USQ-CityU agreement covers all relevant areas as indicated by NWCCU. Like CityU, USQ is a not-for-profit entity. USQ was established under the Queensland State government’s University of Southern Queensland Act of 1998. The execution of the contract between USQ and CityU has not affected the not-for-profit status of both institutions (see contract in the Exhibits).

The CityU program with USQ in Australia received all the necessary internal approvals. Since this program is being conducted and offered as an extension of CityU in a face-to-face mode, CityU faculty teaching in Australia obtain all necessary Australian visas prior to traveling to USQ. USQ obtained all internal and external authorization to offer cobadged courses in Australia.

**Academic Oversight** - CityU’s program in Australia is controlled by CityU. As mentioned before, the CityU portion of the 3+1 program is directly overseen by and convergent with CityU’s School of Management. As with any other initiative involving a CityU School of Management (SOM) program, the 3+1 program with USQ is overseen from an academic perspective by the school’s program director, in this case, the director of the BSBA, who is based in Bellevue. As the program gets off the ground, the program director will shift the operational logistics to the international programs academic coordinator, also based in Bellevue.

The international programs academic coordinator (IPAC) reports to the Dean of the School of Management and serves as a liaison with Admissions and Student Services. The IPAC attends SOM senior faculty staff meetings to be informed of any policy changes that might affect students in the CityU 3+1 program with USQ. Because of the newness of the USQ program, the number of students does not yet warrant a CityU staff member located in Australia. Initially, the sole faculty member teaching in Australia will serve as program coordinator while in Australia. At the time that CityU increases the faculty it sends over, two or more at the same time, one of the faculty will be assigned as program coordinator until the numbers warrant a part- or full-time program coordinator based in Australia.

While the BSBA program director and the IPAC have been jointly collaborating in the start-up phase in 2009–2010, the day-to-day operations and oversight will be shifted to the IPAC.
Students, Admissions, and Records - Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU’s policies. All students in the double degree program at USQ come under CityU’s policies regarding satisfactory academic progress and academic standing. The director of CityU’s BSBA program has full access and ensures the collection of capstone projects of all BSBA students to provide evidence of student learning and progress.

Student records are kept in CityU’s home campus in Bellevue in accordance with CityU standards. Admissions criteria for the CityU 3+1 program in Australia are the same as in the United States. Students entering the 3+1 program are in the process of concluding their first year of study at USQ. In addition to the typical requirements of transfer students, USQ students must also meet CityU’s English proficiency requirements.

USQ students interested in enrolling at CityU must apply online using CityU’s online application. These applications are automatically forwarded to the Vice President of Admissions and Student Services, who ensures students are properly matriculated. Transcripts are evaluated by the Registrar’s Office according to CityU policies. Once a decision is made, CityU sends an acceptance letter to each student. The agreement delegates student recruitment to USQ.

Once students are enrolled in CityU, they are recognized as official CityU students. CityU’s Registrar’s Office keeps all official records of academic credit earned in the 3+1 program. Courses taken in CityU’s 3+1 program in Australia carry the same credit as similar courses offered by CityU in the United States. Transcripts for CityU’s 3+1 students in Australia are issued by CityU’s Registrar’s Office in the United States.

As mentioned above, students taking part in the CityU 3+1 program are students who are already matriculated at USQ and pursuing a Bachelor of Accounting and Sustainable Business undergraduate degree. By joining the 3+1 program with CityU, these students enhance their professional portfolio with global and competitive skills that make them more marketable in particular for multinational corporations doing business in Australia.

Students in the 3+1 program receive the same treatment as any other student taking the BSBA in the United States. They have access to CityU student advisors and CityU’s online library resources, among other services. Upon successful completion of the CityU 3+1 program, future graduates will be provided the opportunity to be recognized as such during CityU’s main commencement ceremony held in Seattle every June.

Faculty - CityU’s BSBA program director has the final authority over faculty hiring decisions for this program. Appointment and validations of credentials are made by CityU’s HR department and follow the established requirements for CityU in the United States. All faculty that teach in Australia are employed and paid directly by CityU. The designation and use of CityU faculty allow greater consistency in intent and design (i.e., same syllabi and learning resources) and potentially greater convergence in results relative to similar courses offered by CityU in the United States. All faculty assigned to teach in CityU’s program in Australia are CityU faculty already teaching for CityU or especially recruited to teach in this program. Those faculty who are new to CityU and to this program are provided the training and orientation that all other new faculty go through. All faculty follow CityU’s syllabi and learning materials. All faculty in this program are evaluated by students in each course taught just like all CityU faculty are evaluated in all other CityU courses.

Curriculum and Program Delivery - All courses are designed and approved through CityU’s School Curriculum Councils based in Bellevue, and the awarding of credit and determination of level are controlled by the faculty in the school, consistent with CityU policies. CityU’s innovative 3+1 BSBA program was created intentionally with a double degree in mind. As USQ created the Bachelor of Accounting and Sustainable Business (BASB), CityU contributed nine
courses to be cobadged with USQ courses. Students in the BASB have the option, and if they meet CityU admissions requirements, to register with CityU to obtain the BSBA. All nine CityU courses are taught in Australia face-to-face. CityU sends a faculty member to teach two courses at a time. The courses are taught in a semester-long format, sixteen weeks to match USQ’s courses.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment - As students complete the program and engage in the capstone course, their work will be included in the regular analysis of student performance conducted by the program faculty.

Marketing and Recruiting - Recruitment of students is carried out under contract by USQ. USQ has access to the same visuals and graphic files for marketing purposes as used by the Bellevue home campus. CityU’s IPAC will review marketing and promotional materials and activities organized by USQ and ensure that all promotional advertising material is truthful and not misleading. This process assures that education is what is being offered, not employment. All advertisements in Australia carry CityU’s name as part of the cobranded initiative.

Tuition and Fees - Information concerning tuition, fees, and refund policies is clearly stated in local publications and the website. For 2009–10, tuition is $1,120 USD per course, or approximately 64 percent of U.S. tuition.

Resources - All students enrolled in CityU courses have access to the full suite of resources offered online through CityU’s library, including e-books, full-text and other databases, course resource guides, and tutorials. Finally, information about library resources, such as access to the online databases, is readily available. For example, mention of CityU information resources is found in all course syllabi.

Students in the 3+1 program have access to the relevant information resources required via CityU’s online library resources. In addition, students have regular access to USQ library resources at any of USQ’s library/information centers in Toowomba, Wide Bay, and Springfield/Brisbane.

CONCLUSION

In more than twenty-five years of offering higher education outside the United States, CityU has experienced both successes and failures. As most universities offering programs abroad have discovered, this type of endeavor is fraught with challenges. The coordination and communication between the home campus and the overseas locations require constant diligence; the demands on the time of academic leaders in all parts of the organization continually increase; the balance between control and oversight, on the one hand, and local relevance and responsiveness, on the other, requires continual attention and adjustment. Administrators at the home campus worry that international programs barely cover their costs; leaders at the international sites worry that their revenues won’t be available for them to invest in their own operations. Over the last two years, as CityU has become more explicit in its intention to be a globally connected university, administrators, faculty, and staff have invested tremendous amounts of time and energy in efforts to improve the learning experience for students in every location. There is still a long way to go; several key lessons learned so far will guide further improvements.

1. There must be a demand and interest from the local community to ensure that the expenditure of the university’s limited and critical resources is worth the investment.
2. The endeavor must be self-supporting after an appropriate start-up period.
3. Partners do make the difference. The quality of the partner is critical to the long-term success of the operation. A well-meaning partner with limited financial resources can be as risky as a well-financed partner who does not share the same goals.
4. The entire institution must understand and support
the activities abroad; international activities cannot be considered separate from what happens domestically.

5. “Best practices” work in both directions. There is significant benefit and value in learning what works in each individual country and using these lessons to enrich and enhance CityU’s programs in the United States and abroad.

6. City University of Seattle is ultimately accountable for everything, no matter what is contracted to partner institutions. The university alone is responsible for setting the standards, ensuring accountability, and assuring a quality education is delivered to students.

These hard-learned lessons are embedded in CityU’s focus on academic quality as well as financial sustainability. The organization has brought increasing specificity to the academic and financial standards each new expansion proposal needs to meet. These standards are taken into consideration at specific points in the decisional process and are embedded into partnership agreements. Agreements include a commitment to regular review and evaluation to make sure all parties remain committed and aligned in purpose.

ON-SITE EXHIBITS

- Current contracts with each partner organization
- Board of Governors’ minutes approving partnerships
- Report from the Campus Alberta Quality Council on the counseling program
- CETYS/CityU Student Handbook
- Academic Guide for faculty in Europe
- Report from European University Association on VSM
- International student recruiting agent contract
- Survey of graduates of MBA program in China
- China Student Handbook
- China Faculty Handbook
- SEEI Expert Report, January 2008
Summary
Each self-study process is driven by a core question: consistent with accreditation standards and policies, how well is the institution fulfilling its mission? Self-study teams find, analyze, and synthesize evidence that answers this central question. Previous chapters describe City University of Seattle’s answers regarding its mission, goals, and effectiveness; its academic programs; its students and faculty; its finances and facilities; and its overall integrity. The chapter on CityU’s international programs analyzes in depth their role in fulfilling the university’s mission. As a result of the self-study process, CityU can confidently say it is stronger and better at fulfilling its mission and is making more continuous progress than it was ten years ago. It has made particularly significant progress in ensuring its students are achieving important university-, program-, and course-level learning outcomes. It also has strengthened and knows more about the quality of instruction being delivered and the academic and professional characteristics of its Teaching Faculty. Its international operations have consciously and systematically become more integrated with CityU standards and procedures and are serving more students. CityU has improved its financial health over the past decade. The record shows CityU is committed to and is benefiting from its continuous improvement process.

As intended, the self-study process revealed areas needing more attention and continued improvement. For example, CityU identified a need to finalize, document, and communicate numerous policies and procedures that guide its operations. Similarly, greater accountability for the equity of service given to students and for the consistency of learning outcomes across all programs and locations needs to be instituted. The self-study also revealed that decision making and institutional performance could be enhanced by expanding access to and using more evidence of performance, and including more faculty and staff in the decisional processes. The following summarizes CityU’s mission fulfillment by synthesizing the evidence by each of its four strategic goals and the related accreditation standards, and concludes with a look ahead at CityU’s next stage of mission fulfillment.

GOAL ONE: PROMOTE EXCELLENCE IN LEARNING AND TEACHING

CityU is first and foremost a teaching university. Its mission is to expand access to education. Historically, it has served working adults as transfer students and graduate students. The demographics of this student population provide the context for its Academic Model and help define what is taught, where, by whom, and how. At CityU, the primary emphasis is on students and student learning. Hence, CityU devotes significant energy and resources to gathering and analyzing direct and indirect evidence of student learning, which also serves as the primary means for evaluating the effectiveness of its academic programs. This has resulted in a robust student learning outcomes assessment process. The quality of evidence being gathered in each program continues to increase, and the use of that evidence to make program improvements is becoming more systematic. As a teaching institution, CityU invests in providing an effective, seasoned, engaged, and qualified cadre of faculty to bring its promise to students of relevant, high-quality educational opportunities for lifelong learning. CityU is resolute in continuing to strengthen its abilities to recruit, select, and support outstanding faculty, and to continuously enrich its academic programs and contribute to the scholarship of its professions and to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The evidence related to this goal is primarily drawn from CityU’s analysis of its alignment with Standard Two — Educational Program and Its Effectiveness, Standard Four — Faculty, and Standard Five — Library and Information Resources. Insofar as it also draws on CityU’s ability to invest in the quality of its faculty and programs, it includes elements of Standard Seven — Finance. Its primacy in CityU’s Strategic Plan and its decision-making systems also relate it to Standard One — Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness and Standard Six — Governance and Administration.
Evidence of Student Learning

The analysis of the most recent year of program learning outcomes assessment reports reveals the strengths and challenges inherent in CityU’s approach. CityU has developed a dynamic and centralized curricula and curriculum development process that align CityU’s Learning Goals with program and course outcomes and provide a basis for assessing both institutional and programmatic assessments. Faculty spend a significant amount of time designing authentic assessments that provide evidence of student learning on program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals. The emphasis on authentic assessment means that summative assessments are generally highly relevant to the professional settings in which students will work. Students invest time and energy in completing the assessments because of this relevance. However, this approach also adds complexity to the process of evaluating assessments and distilling results into information that lends itself to program and institutional improvements. It makes comparisons across programs challenging and finding national data sets difficult.

The analysis of this evidence and applications to program improvements are in various stages of maturity in the various academic programs; what is remarkable at this stage of CityU’s evolution is the way this approach is embraced and supported by most of its faculty. It is rare now to speak to a faculty member who does not embrace, at least conceptually, the need for robust student learning outcomes assessment as a regular part of administering or teaching in academic programs. The current debates are about the best methods and ways of applying results to program improvements, indicating significant progress in the acceptance and use of learning outcomes measurements by faculty.

The linking of program learning outcomes to the CityU Learning Goals reinforces the emphasis on authentic assessment. Rather than “layering over” another set of learning outcomes and another set of assessment tools, which would risk disconnecting the CityU Learning Goals from the curricula and instruction, this approach requires faculty to emphasize the connections between them. Core skills such as critical thinking and information literacy are not afterthoughts in curriculum design; they are intrinsic to the curricula in each program. It is necessary to establish clear, concise, and valid connections between the program learning outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals. In many of the program assessment reports, faculty found this to be quite a challenge. The experience of the past year shows that the best way to infuse the CityU Learning Goals into program-level outcomes is to drill down to the course level, ensure a connection between the course outcomes and the CityU Learning Goals, and then carry that connection forward to the program level.

Where there is good quantitative data, in programs with summative assessments that are well aligned to program outcomes, analysis shows student achievement of the CityU Learning Goals is generally strong. If there are areas of weakness, they seem to be in the areas of ethical practice and diverse and global perspectives. As programs identify these areas, the faculty work to determine the best interventions, resulting in plans to update curricula, better prepare instructors, and/or better align assessment tools.

CityU still faces challenges in this arena. Pushing toward more quantitative measures while still embracing qualitative assessments and making the analyses more robust lend opportunities for more continuous improvement. Another challenge is to add assessments at points of entry and at intervals throughout the program in order to determine the actual value added by students’ experience in the program. Faculty need to ensure that course outcomes and the evidence of learning produced by students truly reflect program outcomes and CityU Learning Goals that have been embedded in the curriculum and Course Guides. The ability to ensure consistency across instructional locations could be strengthened. CityU has made significant progress and remains committed to refining its learning outcomes assessment strategies, using the direct evidence of student learning to improve programs, and ultimately ensuring that student learning is...
consistent with the university’s mission to change lives for good by providing high-quality and relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.

**Evidence of Quality Instruction**

CityU is engaged in a multi-year Faculty Initiative focused on the quality of instruction. Quarterly, it tracks metrics related to the quality of instruction (student learning outcomes, faculty supervision, scores on End-of-Course Evaluations, and participation in New Faculty Orientation) and adjusts its actions accordingly to improve the results. The university has processes in place for hiring competent faculty and determining the competitiveness of salaries to attract and retain its Teaching Faculty. Teaching Faculty are exceptionally well qualified to integrate practical components of the education with the academic rigor of the course. New faculty are provided a comprehensive New Faculty Orientation that familiarizes them with CityU policies and procedures. CityU’s online teaching and learning platform has the course curricula embedded within it and helps faculty adequately prepare for their first course. The Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of responsibilities as the standard requires.

As the university examined what it knew of its faculty, it became clear that CityU lacked an institutional database to fully describe its faculty and to document that it places practitioner expertise highly in its priorities for instructors. That led to the development of the faculty profile project, wherein CityU created an online tool for current and newly appointed faculty to provide their educational and vocational profiles for the institution to compile and analyze. One hundred and sixty faculty members (in the United States and Canada) hold a doctoral degree as their terminal degree and 813 hold a master’s degree. Because of its emphasis on teaching by experienced practitioners, CityU considers professional experience an important aspect of faculty qualifications. An analysis of 641 active faculty records compiled for the 2008–2009 academic year showed that on average, each faculty member held 4.6 professional positions related to the subjects they teach, at an average length of 5.7 years per position. The average number of years of professional experience was just over twenty-six, with nearly all faculty members having more than ten years of professional experience related to their subject areas. This indicates a substantial level of professional experience in the faculty cadre, reinforcing the strength of CityU’s practitioner model. The average length of service teaching at CityU was over five years. CityU can now say with confidence that its faculty are experienced practitioners, with extraordinary commitment to CityU, their professions, and to teaching.

New Teaching Faculty quality and assessment processes have been implemented and are in place. All new faculty go through the New Faculty Orientation, are informally assessed on a regular basis, and, similar to a tenure review process used by many universities, are subject to a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation process at least once every four years. This process includes student input via End-of-Course Evaluations, observation by experienced faculty, and a review of currency that is critical to CityU’s claim of using skilled practitioners in its teaching ranks. The elements of the evaluation itself are supported by research on best practices in engaged learning. A key part of this process was to designate, for the first time, primary supervisors for each member of the Teaching Faculty. This change in and of itself represents a major milestone for CityU and has facilitated other improvements in its ability to ensure the quality of instruction. The introduction of faculty titles that recognize performance will further reflect the outcome of this faculty initiative and the institutional importance of excellence in teaching and learning.

CityU’s programs offered abroad are subjected to rigorous quality evaluations in the countries in which they operate. In recent years, the provincial higher education authorities in British Columbia and Alberta, Canada, have reviewed CityU’s programs and operations and granted full terms of
consent. These reviews included scrutiny from faculty at similar programs at local institutions as well as cross-disciplinary boards. CityU’s partner institution in Slovakia, Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (VSM) successfully achieved its complex (comprehensive) accreditation from the Slovak Ministry of Education in 2009. At the invitation of, and with support from the Slovak Ministry of Education, VSM participated in a voluntary quality improvement and evaluation process with the European University Association in 2007–08. VSM was the only private institution out of twenty-three in Slovakia to participate in the European Union process.

Perhaps the ultimate measure of an institution’s success in teaching and learning is the success of its graduates. CityU consistently boasts a high placement rate of its graduates with teaching and principal certifications. Recent results of a survey of graduates from its MBA program in China revealed a majority of respondents received promotions and/or income gains associated with the earning of their degrees. CityU’s 2008 Alumni Survey revealed high satisfaction with their CityU education and three out of every four alumni who responded to the survey indicated that their CityU education did indeed contribute to their professional advancement.

To foster continued development of its instructional faculty, CityU has strengthened its commitment to faculty development and training. The Exhibits available for review on-site include reports prepared by the Hanover Research Council, CityU’s contracted research firm, on topics related to both teaching and operations, many of which have led to specific improvements in what and how CityU faculty teach.

In the years ahead, CityU will be further strengthening its commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning and to its contributions to the professions it prepares students to enter.

**GOAL TWO: EXPAND ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, RELEVANT PROGRAMS**

CityU’s commitment to expanding access to lifelong learning requires removing unnecessary barriers to entry, including what is taught, where, by whom, and at what cost, as well as understanding and appropriately addressing various levels of academic preparation and language proficiency. It means finding the right balance between access and structure to provide sufficient academic support through the appropriate combinations of course work, prerequisite requirements, and tutoring services. Expanding access means offering programs in multiple locations and delivery modes, and this drives CityU’s use of common curricula to ensure consistency of quality and student experience. The common curricula also allow CityU to ensure high levels of relevance via the use of industry and professional advisory boards that provide input into program design.

In many ways, this goal is primarily related to Standard One and Standard Three — Students; it’s also heavily dependent on evidence collected in alignment with Standard Two and Standard Five. It is an important component of maintaining financial health by generating new sources of tuition, and therefore also aligns with Standard Seven. Because CityU expands access via multiple locations, it brings in the analysis conducted as a part of Standard Eight — Physical Resources, and its assessment of its international programs.

**Evidence of Expanding Access**

CityU has implemented a streamlined program-development process that emphasizes learning outcomes while allowing the university to launch new programs in a highly responsive way. Over the last two years, CityU has approved several new degrees and new locations for existing degrees, some of which have been successful and others of which have not been successful. Since 2008, CityU has added full degree
programs in early childhood education, management, marketing, information systems, information security, and technology management. It added emphases in sustainable business to its business programs, increased the number of majors in its information systems program, and significantly increased the availability of single and dual endorsements in its teacher preparation programs. It also added programs to existing locations in Slovakia, Greece, and Bulgaria; opened a new location in Switzerland; and launched its partnership in Queensland, Australia.

Several of the new programs or programs added to existing locations, despite significant efforts here and abroad, did not start at all, started later than planned, or started with lower than projected enrollment. As a result, CityU engaged in an assessment of its feasibility and program launch processes. This led to the use of cross-departmental teams in the market analysis, program design, and program launch phases. The university will continue to strengthen its market analysis capacities.

Using student credit hours as a measure of expanding access, the 2008–2009 academic year showed a flattening of previous declines, and the first half of the 2009–2010 year shows an increase over the previous year. As the higher education marketplace becomes increasingly competitive, CityU will continue to face steep challenges in its ability to increase the number of students it serves. In order to face these challenges, the university is considering new program offerings, new demographics of student populations, new locations, and new delivery modes that will allow it to fulfill its mission effectively.

**GOAL THREE: BECOME A LEADING, GLOBALLY CONNECTED UNIVERSITY**

Consistent with its mission to provide opportunities wherever there are unmet higher education needs, CityU has had a presence outside the United States for almost thirty years. Since the 1980s, when CityU took its academic offerings to an underserved adult learner population in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, the university has responded to regions in need of U.S. accredited programs and expanded its global presence to include three continents and eleven countries. Starting with its Strategic Plan developed in 2006, CityU has made becoming a leading, globally connected university part of its long-term goals.

The evidence related to CityU’s international programs spans all the accreditation standards. The university’s ability to provide high-quality programs, faculty, and services are part of Standards Two, Three, Four, and Five. The scale of its international operations requires analysis in light of Standards Seven and Eight.
Evidence of Global Connections

In more than twenty-five years of offering higher education outside the United States, CityU has experienced both successes and failures. As most universities offering programs abroad have discovered, this type of endeavor has its challenges. Over the last two years, as CityU has become more explicit in its intention to be a globally connected university, administrators, faculty, and staff have invested tremendous amounts of time and energy in efforts to improve the learning experience for students at every location.

In 2008, CityU further defined a more strategic approach to identifying new international sites and partnerships. CityU approaches the decision-making process for determining new international sites and partnerships in four phases. The four phases are Scoping, Prospecting and Prioritizing, Due Diligence, and Negotiation and Partner Approval. This increasingly intentional approach is being implemented as CityU considers expanding its international offerings in Singapore.

CityU is sustaining its focus on academic quality as well as financial sustainability. The university has brought increasing specificity to the academic and financial standards each new expansion proposal needs to meet. These standards are taken into consideration at specific points in the decisional process and are embedded into partnership agreements. Agreements include a commitment to regular review and evaluation to make sure all parties remain committed and aligned in purpose.

The relationships between European operations and the home campus are much stronger. The deans in Europe work more closely with the deans in the United States than ever before. Communication flows more directly. Challenges are addressed more collaboratively as peer administrators work more directly with each other. Institutional policies, such as the need for the New Faculty Orientation, are starting to be seen as benefits and supports to the European operations, rather than directives. There is a stronger sense that CityU is one university.

There are still challenges in operating in eleven different international locations. One is to significantly increase international and domestic faculty collaboration in curriculum design and instruction. Another is to increase the resources for starting new initiatives and to ensure meaningful oversight of each program and location as it develops. CityU will be reexamining the teaching structures in some locations and encouraging the use of more mixed-mode delivery options to improve the learning experience. The process of launching new programs also needs improvement, and policy implementation needs to be made more uniform. But overall, this is one area where the self-study process has helped CityU achieve more alignment, collaboration, and mutual appreciation.

CityU’s dedication to being a global university goes beyond offering programs in multiple countries. It has made the adoption of global and diverse perspectives one of its core learning goals for all students, and is working to ensure that all students have the opportunity to engage in global learning through international content in the curriculum. It is also planning to increase the mobility of its students and faculty across its locations, enriching the teaching and learning experience for all involved.

GOAL FOUR: IMPROVE AND SUSTAIN FINANCIAL HEALTH

At the core of CityU’s financial health is the commitment to continuous improvement referred to at CityU as the Plan, Act, Assess, and Revise (PAAR) process. This has translated into formal plans for all academic and administrative units that drive the university’s budgeting process. All goals have been operationally defined into measurable metrics and annual targets are set and populate a dashboard for monitoring and assessing institutional performance against these targets. This year, CityU is implementing a new online performance management system called Success Factors, which thoughtfully integrates and aligns all unit plans with those of the institution.
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 7 percent for the 2009–2010 fiscal year, while state-supported institutions increased tuition rates by as much as 14 percent. As an institution funded almost entirely by tuition revenues, investing in resources to improve planning and effectiveness is also a challenge. CityU faced some difficult financial challenges after the split from the founder and the Shepherd Group in 2001. However, through diligent expense management and the implementation of new programs, the university has significantly improved its financial results and has increased the net assets available by over $13 million since 2001.

This goal is most closely aligned with Standard Seven; its focus on expanding capacity for evidence-driven decision making that supports effective execution also draws upon analysis related to Standard One.

**Evidence of Financial Health and Sustainability**

CityU is making progress in linking its planning and budgeting cycles to ensure it provides appropriate resources for its priority initiatives and regular operations. The Finance Office has significantly improved the timeliness of budget reports, allowing budget managers to adjust expenses to meet year-end targets. Efforts to expand grant support have increased with a new contract with Hanover Research Council for grant writing. CityU secured a major grant of nearly $100,000 to support diversity and student mentoring in fall 2009. Perhaps most significantly, the university has diligently and successfully developed a strategy to build a financial reserve to provide for the long-term sustainability of the university.

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE) uses a composite score based on three ratios (Primary Reserves, Equity, and Net Income) to calculate the overall financial health of colleges and universities for purposes of determining Title IV financial aid eligibility. CityU’s composite score (DOE ratio) stood at 1.65 at June 30, 2009, compared to .65 at June 30, 2000. Additionally, the university exceeded the minimum required DOE ratio the last four years, improving from a negative .63 in 2000 to a projected ratio of 2.11 at June 30, 2010.

Sustaining the organization requires solid decision making and data-informed management. Leaders in all parts of the organization increasingly use data to inform their practices. Departments are establishing metrics that are meaningful to their operations. The End-of-Course-Evaluation data available online has been used to develop faculty development resources on best practices, to assess which (if any) qualifications upon hire are related to good instruction, and to identify areas of weakness common to low-rated classes. Financial data has improved considerably, both in timeliness and quality. The president regularly uses dashboards to measure success or failure against prior performance and future expectations. The Board of Governors expect to receive this factual and data-driven information as part of the decision-making conversation. The main challenge is to continue to provide good data in easy-to-access-and-use ways that will assist leaders and managers in improving their operations. CityU has learned it cannot successfully answer questions, make decisions, or prove compliance with standards without accurate data.

The analysis of CityU’s financial history tells the story of an institution that has weathered challenges and greatly strengthened its fiscal performance. The successful turnaround of the last nine years is the result of diligent expense control, solid planning, and careful fiscal management. Taking advantage of additional revenue streams and reducing the university’s physical footprint have made significant contributions to its financial health. CityU needs to continue to shepherd its resources carefully as it moves into the next stage of its Strategic Plan and reaches out to serve additional students and communities around the world.
A LOOK AHEAD

CityU today is one of the largest private, not-for-profit, postsecondary educational institutions in the Pacific Northwest. It occupies an important 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. CityU’s deliberative expansion will continue its tradition of providing access to underserved students, wherever they are located. Its commitment to providing rigorous and relevant education designed and delivered by professional practitioners will continue as it pursues its mission through the next decade.

CityU continues to follow its three-stage Strategic Plan, described in more detail in the chapter on Standard One. The first stage, Strengthen the Foundation, focuses on ensuring CityU is positioned to achieve its long-term goals. Improving the organization’s core operations, streamlining processes and procedures, establishing good leadership, and focusing the university on the quality of teaching and learning are top priorities in this first stage. In the second stage, Build Capacities to Grow, CityU is engaged in further prioritization of its initiatives, strengthening its partner relationships, and improving its ability to develop and launch new program offerings. It is emphasizing the use of data through metrics and measures to guide decision making and build a genuine performance management system. The last stage, Invest in the Vision, positions CityU to develop and grow by building a strong competitive foundation from which to serve its core population of adult students and to expand its outreach to serve new demographics of students, including adults who completed little or no college credit; younger domestic students who are unable to enter the public institutions; and international students seeking a full four-year experience. To serve these students, CityU is creating a “value proposition,” one that allows it to deliver a high-quality education at a cost to the student that is between the subsidized public institutions and the for-profit private institutions that must create value for their shareholders, a cost that is within the reach of financial aid.

However, attracting and serving these new demographic populations will drive changes in CityU’s programs and services, as well as the character of its physical presence. There is significant potential synergy in reaching out to younger domestic students and continuous improvement processes, investing in student preparation and retention, investing in the facilities and activities necessary to attract new demographics of students, and generating and maximizing the use of reinvestment funds. CityU’s efforts to grow in order to achieve scale while simultaneously reducing expenses through various cost-sharing or cooperative ventures are clearly on the horizon.

CityU’s core population of adult students is attracting intense competition from the for-profit universities. More and more traditional and for-profit institutions are marketing themselves to appeal to this population with similar combinations of practical education and convenient delivery. CityU needs to ensure it delivers its model effectively by investing in the quality of instruction and the quality of the curriculum while retaining its personal and practitioner approach. CityU also believes that its commitment to true internationalization provides it with a distinctive and competitive place in U.S. higher education. Its international presence and integration of international content and experiences into the curriculum place it in the company of very few U.S. colleges and universities.

To expand its ability to fulfill its mission, CityU must diversify to serve new populations. The strongest candidates for consideration are students who need a full four-year undergraduate program. They include adults who completed little or no college credit; younger domestic students who are unable to enter the public institutions; and international students seeking to study in the United States as freshmen, transfers, or graduate students. To serve these students, CityU is creating a “value proposition,” one that allows it to deliver a high-quality education at a cost to the student that is between the subsidized public institutions and the for-profit private institutions that must create value for their shareholders, a cost that is within the reach of financial aid.
international undergraduates, who typically seek similar aspects of the college experience (a campus feel, social activities and support, academic support, connection to the community in which they live, work, and study). Developing a more cohesive approach to lower-division undergraduate study, including general education and service learning, positions CityU to serve these populations and to reach out to another segment of its core returning student population, those who completed little or no college credit, became employed in trades or other areas, and now seek to begin an associate’s or bachelor’s degree to support their professional aspirations.

In response to its changing student population, its growing international presence, and its strategic priorities, CityU is undergoing an examination of its General Education credit distribution requirements. An important consideration is creating stronger links between General Education courses and the upper-division courses. CityU is reviewing the content and outcomes that make up the suite of General Education courses to determine if such topics can be covered in a way that makes them more directly relevant to the upper-division courses in the student’s major. In addition, CityU is exploring the best way to design and deliver a baccalaureate degree in a three-year time frame, to build on its global connections, expand its undergraduate offerings, and better align with similar degrees in Europe. This may mean combining General Education requirements into “modules” that require the same level of work, offer the same number of credits, and allow the students to complete them in intensive learning experiences.

As CityU continues to strengthen its international presence and examines new opportunities to grow, it will also create more systematic ways to ensure its Academic Model and standards are implemented consistently across all its locations. In addition, it will explore the advantages and disadvantages of expanding its partnership model to include various options related to collaborating with others for nonessential dimensions of its operations at home and abroad.

In 2010, CityU will publish its “Storyline,” a carefully crafted document developed over the previous summer that provides a platform for CityU to tell the story of the past, reconcile the present, and align for the future. The “Storyline” was developed as an internal document intended to provide the history of the university in the context of how it defines its future; it taps into the maverick spirit that is such an important part of CityU’s founding. The document provides the foundation for gaining internal alignment in messaging among the various constituents (staff, faculty, students, and alumni) and the basis for forming external messaging. The “Storyline” provides a framework for building faith in CityU’s mission and vision, while ensuring adaptability in rapidly changing times.

CityU is confident in its capacity to meet the significant challenges that lie ahead: keeping the interests and education of students central in all decision making, ensuring curricula are relevant, engaging faculty across multiple domestic and international locations, supporting students from different backgrounds with different levels of preparation, and providing high-quality instruction in all sites and delivery modes. These are just a few of the ongoing challenges uncovered and addressed through the self-study process. Remaining dedicated to expanding access to lifelong learning in an increasingly competitive higher education landscape will require the university to evaluate its options carefully, plan diligently, and execute effectively.

The nature of the university is likely to evolve as it clearly defines its “value proposition” for students and reaches out to serve new populations of students. Its facilities, faculty, staff, and services will all be affected by change. CityU must persist in being a good steward of its resources, placing fiscal responsibility at the core of its operations. Its global reach will provide exciting new opportunities to engage in higher learning and new challenges to its ability to provide consistently high-quality learning experiences to students around the world. CityU will embrace these challenges in the spirit of its mission, with a renewed dedication to delivering the promise of high-quality, relevant lifelong education to anyone with the desire to learn.
Glossary

AAC — Academic Affairs Council
ACBSP — Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs
Administrative Faculty — Faculty engaged in full-time or full-time equivalent positions, serving as program directors and program coordinators
ASOE — Albright School of Education
Assisted MBA — Provides language assistance to non-native English-speaking students in the MBA program
ATC — Academic Technology Committee
BJUT — Beijing Institute of Technology (China)
Blackboard Learning Management System (Bb) — The technology platform CityU uses to support instruction and deliver online courses
BOSC — Blackboard Operations and Standards Committee
CETYS — Centro de Estudios Tecnicos y Superiores (Mexico)
CFI — Consolidated Financial Index
CIIBT — Canadian Institute for Business and Technology
CityU Learning Goals — The six essential learning outcomes for graduates of all CityU degree programs
CQC — Curriculum Quality Committee
CRC — Curriculum Resource Center
CUCA — City Unity College Athens (Greece)
DAS — Division of Arts and Sciences
Dashboards — Visual displays of performance metrics
DOE Ratio — Composite score used by the U.S. Department of Education to determine Title IV financial aid eligibility
EOCE — End-of-Course Evaluation
Fachschules — Vocational and trade schools in Switzerland
FERPA — Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
FSDC — Faculty Standards and Development Committee
FTE — Full-Time Equivalent
IAC — Industry Advisory Committee
IACBE — International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education
IBS — International Business School (Bulgaria)
IBS — InterCollege Institute of Business Studies, University of Nicosia (Romania)
IPAC — international programs academic coordinator
ISO — International Student Office
IT — Information Technology
KPMG — CityU’s independent certified public accountant firm
NFO — New Faculty Orientation
OIE — Office of Institutional Effectiveness
OSPI — Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
PAAR — Plan, Act, Assess, Revise — the continuous improvement process used at CityU
PEAB — Professional Education Advisory Board
PeopleSoft — CityU’s Human Resources/Payroll, Student Administration, Financial, and Enterprise Portal system
PESB — Professional Educator Standards Board
PET — President’s Executive Team
PLA — Prior Learning Assessment
PPA — Performance Pedagogy Assessment
SCC — School Curriculum Council
SIFE — Students in Free Enterprise
SOM — School of Management
SOPs — Standard Operating Procedures
SPC — Strategic Planning Committee
Success Factors — Web-based performance management software
TCP — Teacher Certification Program
Teaching Faculty — Faculty engaged on a contracted, per-course basis
TEIP — Technological Institute of Piraeus (Greece)
UIBE — University of International Business and Economics (China)
USQ — University of Southern Queensland (Australia)
VSFS — Vysoká škola finanční a správní or Institute of Finance and Administration (Czech Republic)
VSM — Vysoká Škola Manažmentu (Slovakia)