



REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

University of the Pacific

March 4-7, 2019

Jeff Armstrong, President, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Chair);
Brian Harlan, Associate Provost, California Institute of the Arts (Assistant Chair);
Susan Collins, Vice President for Finance and Admin., Saint Mary's College of California (Team Member);
Monique Snowden, Provost and Senior Vice President, Fielding Graduate University (Team Member);
Maureen Maloney, Vice President, WSCUC (Staff Liaison)

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant
- B. Description of Team's Review Process
- C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

(s) (A) (c) (e) (d) (w) (BDC/MCID) (S) (A) (c) (I) (w) (o) (T) (c) (S) (BDC) (a) (S) (BDC) (N) (I) (D) (e) (S) (e) (I)

In 2016 the university notified WSCUC about a policy violation regarding the use of off-campus courses within one of its schools. University of the Pacific submitted a corrective action plan, and the institutional report included a summative update to that plan. During the visit the team not only recognized the university's open and honest communication with WSCUC with respect to this issue, but also the speed and seriousness with which the issue was resolved.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team reviewed the institutional report during its Offsite Review in August 2018. Satisfied with the quality of the report and the responses to questions during the video conference, the team moved to proceed to the Accreditation Visit with nine lines of inquiry in the areas of planning and decision making, policy oversight, assessment, and financial sustainability. Additional information was requested to support these lines of inquiry beyond the institutional report and the numerous appendices associated; these additional materials included financial statements, athletics policy updates, recent survey data of all campus constituents, and example documentation on a full cycle of program review. All materials, as well as last-minute requests onsite, were provided expeditiously.

Between the Offsite Review and the Accreditation Visit one

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

The team expressed its appreciation to the university for the clarity and superbly organized institutional report. The report was straight forward and sincere, demonstrating a commitment to WSCUC Standards through well-articulated responses to all Criteria for R

philosophy that will result in faculty salary adjustments in the next fiscal year, and further investment into an already well-functioning Center for Teaching and Learning.

A significant portion of the institutional report described the university's laudable progress in the areas of assessment and program review. The university provided much evidence of its capacity and expertise in the conducting of direct outcomes-

learning against established standards of achievement. Learning outcomes assessment at the general education level is done consistently and is reviewed through formal faculty committees. Similarly, the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators suggests that the vast majority of programs measure achievement using a broad range of direct and indirect assessment tools. While assessment appears to be ongoing, the university has continued work ahead to centralize reporting and to routinize the use of assessment results to improve student learning. This is especially notable in the graduate programs;

turn around the financial operations of the Law School in response to the new enrollment realities. During the visit it was also cited that a lack of timely, easily accessible financial reporting has led to a perceived lack of financial accountability (CFR 3.4). The university has nevertheless been able to maintain its rating with Moody's, confirmed in March 2019.

Pacific's self-review indicated that organizational structures and decision-making processes need attention, and stated that there is work to be done to achieve consistency in operational controls and accountability. A structure of shared governance exists and is documented in the Faculty Handbook, and the administration is working within that structure toward improvements. A shared governance matrix has been established, for example, that clearly charts decision-making authority for the board, president, provost, cabinet, deans, faculty, and governance committees. The matrix outlines who provides input, makes recommendations, makes decisions, or approves, both academic and business-oriented issues. Yet despite the clarity of this document, during the visit a number of faculty reported that it was never fully ratified by the faculty, and thus never officially implemented.

Indeed, there is general agreement that shared government is not functioning properly at Pacific. This fracture in shared governance has led to a lack of trust

being used for broader positive impact in terms of establishing institutional priorities and improving financial operations. The team sees opportunity for the university to continue expanding the impact of institutional research on institutional learning across and within all three campuses (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

Pacific has made recent changes to its program offering portfolio and student services, with the goal of efficiently and effectively meeting the educational and support needs of students on its three campuses. While these changes appear to be justifiable and beneficial, during the visit the team encountered noteworthy faculty and staff concerns with respect to shared governance processes, decision-making transparency, and timely communications. On balance, the team also recognized the need for quick administrative action toward ensuring the institution's responsiveness to the changing higher educational environment, particularly in terms of enrollment-related competitiveness. Moving forward, in terms of demonstrated commitment to institutional learning, the team encourages more proactive and meaningful engagement of faculty and staff in matters that will yield significant institutional changes (CFRs 4.5, 4.6).

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that Pacific has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 4.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

The university invested considerable effort into understanding the student experience as a means to articulate the meaning, quality, and integrity of Pacific degrees. This work was conducted largely by a university-wide committee composed of faculty from multiple disciplines and staff from a breadth of administrative functions (e.g., student life, institutional research, marketing, technology, planning). Through both qualitative and quantitative research investigating undergraduate and graduate programs over approximately two years, the team identified four characteristics of the Pacific experience that most—and in some programs all—students typically encounter. These characteristics, referred to as the Hallmarks of a University of the Pacific education, include close mentoring through a deep engagement with faculty and staff, applied learning opportunities or requirements, service to surrounding communities, and activities and services to prepare students for success in their life after graduation.

The hallmarks were repeated in several meetings during the visit by administration, faculty, staff, and students, and were evident in the review of academic programs and student services. The Strategic Framework for Institutional Change planning documents also captured the hallmarks, although

over 56,000 hours of service each year, serving more than 40,000 residents and clients within the communities surrounding its three campuses. Clinics and centers in Stockton, Sacramento, and San Francisco offer legal, dental, pharmaceutical, and educational services, to name a few. The level of impact on the community in terms of residents served appears to be matched by the educational impact on Pacific students, who in discussions during the visit expressed their appreciation for these opportunities as both learning opportunities and as career-preparation opportunities.

The academic plan also directly addresses preparing students for future success, rather than simply providing traditional career counseling resources. This begins in the first year for undergraduates through a first-

Education Data System Outcomes survey to provide more reliable means of assessing the success of new freshmen and transfer students at both full and part-time status. Student success data suggests a need for additional academic support for some undergraduate populations. While the recent average of 6-year graduation rates for first time, full time undergraduates is over 67%, with Latinx students at over 70%, African American students

Component 6:

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

The university utilizes the Composite Financial Index to benchmark its financial health. Its strengths are in the areas of return on net assets, reserves and debt capacity. The fourth area, net operating revenues, has been a challenge. Pacific

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

None

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

The team commends the university for:

1. Identifying and articulating four hallmarks of the Pacific experience for both undergraduate and graduate students, which includes experiential learning both inside and 3.3 (u)-0.7 (a)-5.9 (s)64.3 (i)-3.23(d)-0.7

5. Foster equity and inclusion across all three campuses through implementation of the Diversity Plan developed by the Diversity Leadership Team (CFRs 1.4, 3.1)

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 3. Student Complaints Review
 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Off-Campus Locations Review, as appropriate

Federal Requirements. A careful review of the Pacific catalog, policy documents, course schedules, syllabi, and program review documents shows that the institution provided sufficient evidence to confirm that the Pacific complies with federal standards for assigning academic credit, fair marketing and recruitment practices, responding to student complaints, and transfer of credit.

Credit Hour and Program Length

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? YES NO Where is the policy located? https://www.pacific.edu/about-pacific/administrationoffices/office-of-the-provost/shared-governance/standing-committees/academic-

	Comments: The university's website provides information on jobs for graduates and the employment of graduates.
--	--

Student complaints review

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? https://www.pacific.edu/campus-life/safety-and-conduct/student-conduct/student-resources/student-complaint-procedure-notice.html https://www.mcgeorge.edu/forms/student-complaint-process
	Comments:

Process(es)/ procedure

Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?
 YES NO
If so, please describe briefly:

Formal and informal processes exist to route complaints by category to the appropriate university official/committee. 3 (i)-1 (ci)-0. 23 (e)9i2.005 Tc -0.005 Tw 9.96 -0 TJETQq1 w0.5 (ii)-0.9 9.96 -0 TJE

