Chicago State University

HLC ID 1077

NOTICE   Visit Date: 1/23/2017

Mr. Cecil Lucy
President

Anthea Sweeney	**Michael Westerfield**	**Gary Burkholder**
HLC Liaison	*Review Team Chair*	*Federal Compliance Reviewer*
Kathy Johnson	**Randall Patterson**	**William Ray**
Team Member	*Team Member*	*Team Member*
Sheilynda Stewart		
Team Member		

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

1/23/2017
Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

Founded in 1867, Chicago State University (CSU) will celebrate its 150 year history next year. The University began as a Normal School, training teachers to serve Illinois and beyond. CSU continues to train leaders for the Chicago Public Schools and districts across the urban population it serves. The student demographics represent a strongly diverse population where 69% are African American, 9% Hispanic, 5% Caucasian, 3% Asian/Asian American, and 14% other. In addition, the University serves the South Chicago area where students (54%) are living below the poverty line.

Since the last visit, the state of Illinois has not passed a budget for the last two years, affecting the funding of public institutions in Illinois. This lack of fiscal attention at the state level has created a financial stress for many Illinois institutions of higher education in general and CSU in particular. CSU historically received support that represented 30% of its total annual revenue.

Due to this decrease in funding, the CSU Board of Trustees declared financial exigency in February 2016. This allowed the University to restructure its workforce as one way to reduce expenditures to reflect the lack of state funding. The efforts of the University led the Board of Trustees to end financial exigency in December 2016.

One additional factor that has affected CSU and has affected University efforts to move forward has the been the negative press that has followed the University since declaring financial exigency, with the press indicating CSU

would not open in the fall of 2016. This has forced the University to try to deal with the issues it faces in the public domain, complicating recruiting efforts and marketing efforts for the University. In January 2017, the Governor of Illinois led a public press conference where he pledged his efforts to secure the future of CSU and appointed an Advisory Board to work with the Board of Trustees in planning and fundraising efforts. The Advisory Board has seven members representing significant expertise in higher education, finance, planning, and advancement.

Interactions with Constituencies

- President
- Provost and Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Acting Vice President for Administration and Finance
- Board of Trustees (Chair, two new members, staff liaison, University Counsel
- Open Drop In Meeting (105)
- Open Forum Criterion One and Two (83)
- Open Forum Criterion Three and Four (87)
- Open Forum Criterion Five (79)
- Area of Focus: Enrollment Management (53)
- Area of Focus: Budget/Planning 28
- Alumni, students, faculty, staff, administration, and community members attending Open Forums

Additional Documents

- Additional figures on Fall 2016 enrollment for full-time and part-time for freshmen and new transfer students
- Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) to determine how non-tenured faculty are evaluated
- List of computer spaces on campus
- West Chesterfield Community Association memo regarding support for Chicago State University (CSU)

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.A The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

- Open Forum discussions and meetings with key stakeholders such as the Board of Trustees provide evidence that the mission statement and its core values and vision are broadly understood within the institution. The University Budget Committee (UBC) assures that all budget requests are tied to the mission of the institution. Budget requests must be tied to Planning Management Effectiveness (PME) which ties requests to the Strategic Plan. Growing out of the mission, all planning is tied to budgeting and any new initiative undertaken by the University.
- Campus students are able to clearly articulate the mission of Chicago State University (CSU). Students spoke of numerous opportunities for growth, academic success, and student support and linked those opportunities to the mission of CSU. Students are particularly proud of the service to the surrounding community in South Chicago and are committed to social justice and service to the community surrounding CSU.

1.A.1 The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.

- In 2011, a broad based committee of University faculty, staff, students, and administration collaboratively developed the current mission and vision statements. Interviews reflect the inclusive nature of the process and led to a statement that is broadly understood and supported across the campus. Focused on providing a diverse student body access to higher education, meeting educational goals, and transforming the community beyond the campus, the mission

permeates the decision making process on the campus. Examples of such commitment were evidenced in shared examples of CSU placing the needs of students first. Examples of this commitment include faculty and staff who come to campus on weekends to ensure technology support for students with no internet access at home, the library staff providing continued services through the serious financial stress with reduced staff and reduced budgets, and departments sharing resources with one another so that science equipment could be purchased even during the budget crisis. This team spirit and commitment to mission has created a resilient and dedicated community.

1.A.2 The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

- A review of course syllabi and departmental sites provided evidence that the academic programs have created departmental missions that clearly grow out of the stated University Mission and Vision. Students and faculty provided numerous examples of how social justice, community service, and diversity were clearly woven throughout the academic programs. The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) is focused on academic success for students. This student focus provided tutoring and resources for student success. Other programs that clearly live out the mission of the University are the CSU Counseling Department, the library's Information Mall, and a large number of clubs to provide support from LGBT issues to resources provided by the African American Male Resource Center (AAMRC).
- The CSU Mission and supporting statements clearly focus on serving a diverse population of students. A review of the enrollment profile clearly presents evidence of a diverse student population. With an average age of 31.9 years old. CSU serves a large commuting population. With 54% of CSU students living below the poverty line, the University must provide extensive support to the students enrolling in the institution. Students verify that the University does a good job of providing for their needs and helping them to achieve success.

1.A.3 The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

- The institution has been intentional in its planning and budgeting to support the mission of the University. Because of the inability of the legislature to pass a budget funding higher education in Illinois, CSU found itself having to reduce its budget by $30 million. The adherence to a process of planning and setting priorities to fund those items that served students has led to a lean but efficient institution. Faculty shared evidence of how one academic department shared discretionary resources with another department to help fund student research. Faculty sought grants to support ongoing projects. Staff provided volunteer hours to serve students in IT and the library, to mention a few. All departments must submit an annual Planning, Measurement, and Effectiveness Plan (PME) that clearly links the activities to the missional and budget priorities set by the institution.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.B.1 The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.

- Interviews, a review of the website, a review of department materials, signage on the campus clearly indicate CSU is mission driven and serious about continuing to meet its mission even in difficult times. From students to board members the same articulation of the purposes and vision of the institution was shared in Open Forums, Areas of Focus, and other group interactions. The mission and supporting documents are clearly understood and supported on the campus.

1.B.2 The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

- A review of a number of documents from academic departments, strategic plans, and budget and planning processes verify that the mission is current and focused on what the institution sees as its purpose and role. The Faculty Handbook clearly articulates the role of research and teaching. The Student Handbooks clearly outline the University's role in public service. Public service is a part of all programs from undergraduate through the School of Pharmacy and other graduate programs.
- Recent financial stress on the University has allowed to Board and the University to recommit to the mission and purposes of CSU. This is seen in the planning and budgeting process that prioritized student learning and student support as fundamental to the mission of CSU. The dedication to the community surrounding CSU is admirable. Support services range from serving high school students through tutoring and life skills to providing economic development for the surrounding area. Students and CSU employees clearly articulate this aspect of the

mission of CSU.

1.B.3 The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

- The mission and supporting documents clearly identify and promote the diverse constituencies served through CSU. A review of curriculum in both general education and departmental programs verify how students and faculty can work and live in a diverse society. In addition, students and staff are committed to serving the South Chicago community. The diverse clubs (81) serve the community through support activities, social justice programs, and informational services. The African Male Resource Center (AAMRC) was often mentioned by students as a powerful organization that has changed lives by stressing the important role African males play in the community.
- The pharmacy program was recently ranked the ninth most diverse pharmacy program in the nation. The College of Health Sciences graduates over 50% of the African American nurses and occupational therapists who earn degrees in Illinois. These programs are but two that reflect the institution's understanding of its constituents and the needs of the community it serves.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.C.1 The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.

- Chicago State University recognizes the important commitment to training students for a role in a multicultural society. The University encourages student clubs and institutional programming that covers a wide variety of topics intended to expose students and the community to a multicultural worldview. Examples of programs reviewed during the visit covered such topics as Black History, Latino History, LGBTQ awareness, and other programs related to Abilities Awareness and current topics focused on issues related to sexual assault and crime. Students reported that these programs are well attended and appreciated.
- The University is justly proud of its African American Male Resource Center. This center provides a number of programs and activities that reached over 13,000 people. Some examples of the initiatives verified through the review of programs and student discussions include the annual Kwanza Celebration, the Brother 2 Brother series, and W.U.R.D. (Words Uplifting and Restoring Dignity) is Balm, an interesting event that includes the spoken word and focuses on a positive approach to building dignity and respect. CSU is active throughout the campus and the community, providing numerous activities and programs that address its role in a multicultural society.

1.C.2 The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

- The commitment of the University to diversity is intentional and reflective of the planning that has been done to serve its constituencies. A review of the planning documents, the budget process, and committee minutes provide evidence of this intentionality. CSU has supported or participated in a number of activities that promote diversity. Too numerous to list, the team heard through Open Forums about participation in Pride Parade, Irish Day Parade, Abilities Awareness Adaptive Basketball Game and Adaptive Bike Challenge, an Anti-Bullying event, a voter registration drive, and a designation of a unisex bathroom in the student union building to name a few.
- CSU also promotes students attending professional conferences that expose them to diverse cultures and diverse thought. Examples of conferences attended include the United States Leadership Institute, the American Student Government Association, African American

Psychology Conference, and the Hispanic Association of College and Universities Conference. Students value these opportunities and bring back ideas and initiatives to the campus. In addition, CSU is very inclusive of students on University committees. A review of minutes and discussion with students serving on these committees verify they are active participants. Committees include the Presidential Search Committee, the Board of Trustees, the University Budget Committee, the Finance Committee, to name a few. This has allowed students to be a part of the solution to the issues facing CSU and has provided additional voices to help students understand that the negative press and other pressures facing CSU are not insurmountable. This has provided an exceptional amount of student support for the University.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1.D.1 Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.

- Chicago State University understands its role in serving the public. Located in South Chicago, the University is surrounded by economic struggle, issues created by a lack of resources both financial and support services, and a lack of simple services needed to support a vibrant community (such as grocery stores, health services, and other vital services). CSU is transparent in its dedication to serving its public obligation as evidenced in its website that contains program information, cost of attendance, demographics, and other important information about services offered to the campus and to the community.
- CSU is a public institution committed to an open and transparent approach to solving the issues it faces. While some of the narrative through the media has been out of the control of the University, the University has been open through its website, planning documents, state reporting agencies, and public forums in addressing how it plans to move forward and serve its constituents.
- Several days before the team visit, the Governor of Illinois stated publically his support for the University and appointed a special Advisory Board to work with the Board of Trustees to plan for the future and to find financial and physical resources to support CSU. In a meeting with the Board of Trustees, the team verified the role of the Advisory Board, made up of key educational and civic leaders in Chicago, to assure that the Board of Trustees remains the board with fiduciary and oversight responsibility. The Board of Trustees and a recent appointee of the Governor to the Board of Trustees affirmed that the Board of Trustees is looking forward to working with the Advisory Board to assure success for Chicago State University.

1.D.2 The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

- A review of the Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) website, the Board of Trustee minutes and website, the planning and budgeting materials verifies that student learning, student development, and community service are the primary purposes and focus of CSU. The Board of Trustees minutes contain many examples of the Board supporting the student focus of the mission of CSU, even during the time of financial stress. The team commends the University for its continued focus on its mission through reallocation of resources and making difficult decisions regarding reductions that allowed the University and the Board of Trustees to maintain its mission and its focus on the students.
- As a public institution, CSU reports data to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, abides by state statutes such as the Chicago State University Law, and operates all Board of Trustee meetings according to the Illinois Open Meeting Act. In addition, as a unionized campus, CSU maintains union contracts outlining the rights and responsibilities of University employees. A review of these documents and hearing verification from individuals in Open Forums supports the idea that educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes.

1.D.3 The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

- CSU uses a variety of methods to engage with its external constituencies, as well as its internal constituencies. A review of the Vision Statement provided several goals for engaging constituents. The University is committed to serving the unique needs of its surrounding community and aspires to bring innovation in teaching and research to promote ethical leadership, entrepreneurship, and social and environmental justice. CSU achieves input from constituents from a number of groups such as CSU students, faculty and staff, CSU alumni, trustees, donors, community organizers and business leaders, neighborhood organizations, not for profit organizations, and regional K-12 schools, to name a few. Representatives from all these groups attended various Forums and verified that their voices are heard and that CSU is an important and critical part of serving its external constituencies.
- CSU uses surveys to continually scan the external and internal environment. The team reviewed several examples of the surveys used. These included the School of Pharmacy survey that is used to inform preceptor training and to inform the need for curricular revision to meet the changing needs of professional pharmacists. The team reviewed surveys of employers of CSU graduates to determine satisfaction with the graduates as well as informing the need for curricular revision. Faculty provided numerous examples of how this information has led to changes in internship, curriculum, and training. The University also has Advisory Boards for programs such as Pharmacy, Education, Business. These community members of these boards provide valuable insight into what is needed in professional programs and in assuring the graduates are prepared for the world of work. One example of how CSU has responded to direct needs of the community is seen in its establishment of the Community Policing Initiative to address a community identified need for safer neighborhoods.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

Chicago State University has had to deal with a number of serious issues related to the inability of the State of Illinois Legislature to pass a budget funding its public institutions. This led to a very public display of the struggles through the media. The "bad press" led to rumors of the closure of the institution and enrollment suffered as a result. Many institutions would have been overwhelmed with the situation, but Chicago State University did what an institution should do in such circumstances and focused on its mission and purposes as CSU.

The institution affirmed its mission was one focused on students, student learning and student development. In addition, it affirmed its commitment to meeting the needs of its local community. With this foundation, the University leadership had to make very difficult decisions to overcome the loss in state funding and to address the immediate needs of the University. This has not been easy, but CSU benefits from a strong commitment to the mission on the campus. The team found a strong sense of hope and a futuristic vision from students, faculty, staff, administration, board members, and community representatives. The team believes this strong mission commitment will carry CSU forward. While CSU continues to make decisions that are necessary to provide a more stable University, CSU is stronger because of the clear sense of mission among those who work and serve CSU.

The team believes that Criterion One is met.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

- Chicago State University (CSU) appears to have necessary policies and procedures in place to operate with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions. The integrity statement provided to faculty and staff serves to encourage high standards of honesty, fairness, and ethical behavior. The Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Governing Policy and Regulations all serve as key policies and procedures that govern the activities and integrity of the Board of Trustees (BOT), faculty, and staff. These documents are accessible on the CSU BOT Policies and Procedures website and are available to the public.

- The Finance, Facilities, Operations, and Audit Committees are charged with providing advice and counsel to the BOT on accountability matters related to finance, physical facilities, and operations. In addition, the committees are responsible for reviewing internal control, accounting, and reporting practices to ensure proper accountability of University practices and to alert the BOT of problems in a timely manner as stated in Article VI Section 3 of the Bylaws. For example, internal control procedures mandate disclosure of purchases over $25,000 as documented in the Resolution of the Illinois Procurement Policy Board to provide transparency and ethical procurement practices. In addition, annual audits completed by an independent certified accounting firm annually ensures compliance with state, federal, University, and Department of Education requirements.

- Key documents for sub-areas under Academic Affairs such as the Personnel Calendar and Timetable, Faculty Handbook, Curriculum Handbook, Institutional Assessment Plan, UPI

Contract and Memoranda of Understanding, and policies and procedure documents written by the Office of Grants and Sponsored Research serve to guide their operations with academic integrity. For example, the Faculty Handbook contains a statement on faculty and University administration expectations regarding ethical behavior, collegiality, and professionalism. Also, the Curriculum Handbook provides guidelines about the curriculum process related to courses and degree programs. Lastly, the Financial Conflict of Interest policy on the Office of Grants and Sponsored Research website demonstrates commitment to academic and scholarly integrity as well as ethical research requiring disclosure of any financial interest by CSU employees or investigators in compliance with federal and state statutes.

- CSU is committed to facilitating processes for fair and ethical behavior for faculty, staff, administrators and student workers as evidenced in the CSU Human Resources Policy Manual. The Office of Human Resources conducts annual compliance workshops for new employees to promote awareness of their ethical and legal responsibilities. Key policies on the CSU Human Resources website such as Drug and Alcohol, Sexual Harassment, Computer Use Policy, and Anti-Fraud provide a framework for professional conduct and integrity standards in the workplace. In addition, the grievance policy outlines formal processes that faculty and staff may follow to initiate an investigation and resolution of concerns.

- The Enrollment Management (EM) division, headed by the Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management under the direction of the President, has oversight of operations and activities related to strategic planning and evaluation of enrollment, recruitment, and retention services. The EM strategic plan list strategies to increase enrollment of first-time, full-time freshmen and transfer students, scholarship and recruiting efforts, and manage enrollment capacity as evidenced in the Enrollment Management Strategic Plan. This strategic plan also seeks to increase recruiting efforts, including involvement of alumni and current students. These EM goals are aligned with the University's overall goal to increase enrollment, retention, and graduation rates as evidenced in the CSU strategic plan. In addition, the updated enrollment-planning model is shared University-wide and assists the EM team with outreach efforts.

- The Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation (ERG) committee serve to coordinate strategic efforts to monitor and assess processes and activities related to the University's Strategic Goal #4 on enrollment, retention, and graduation. Four sub-committees under the ERG university-wide committee serve as hubs to collect and communicate about ERG activities: 1) Marketing, Communications and Events, 2) Admission Criteria and Recruitment Strategies, 3) Student Centered Services and Retention Initiatives, and 4) Data and Metric Mining. These efforts should lead to success in addressing enrollment, retention, and graduation rates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Chicago State University (CSU) clearly presents information about programs, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation to students and the public as evidenced on the CSU website. The CSU annual Fact Book is a resource for accurate key facts and statistical information shared with the community and public as evidenced on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research website. The Office of Integrated Marketing and Communications and the Information Technology departments are responsible for the accurate presentation of information on the CSU website. For example, the Communications team collaborate with the deans, department chairs, vice presidents, directors, and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research staff to review draft content pages for accuracy before information is presented on college and departmental web pages.   The content on the CSU website is reviewed annually to ensure policies, reports, facts, and figures are communicated to the CSU community and public with accuracy.

Communication Modalities

Chicago State University (CSU) use various communication modalities such as the campus internet-based radio station, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and town hall meetings to reach out to diverse listeners in the community and the world as evidenced on the CSU home page and Facebook page. For example, the CSU staff of Student Affairs collaborate with students and the community utilizing social media such as Facebook and Twitter, as well as town hall meetings, to address policy issues in an informal and accessible environment. In addition, the Communications team utilize social media to communicate information about events, accomplishments, and weather-related news.

Programs

Documents such as the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs and admissions materials are presented clearly to the CSU community and prospective students about programs, policies, and application requirements. The Undergraduate and Graduate handbooks provide guidance to students on academic and disciplinary policies and may be accessed on the CSU handbooks web page.

Faculty and Staff

The campus directory provides contact information about faculty and staff by department such as title, telephone number and location and is accessible to the public on the CSU home website page. In addition, faculty and staff information is available to the public within academic departments and administrative units. Lastly, CSU Cougar news articles about accomplishments of faculty, staff, and students are transparent and accessible to the public from the CSU home website page as well.

Costs to Students and Controls

CSU presents information on tuition and fees clearly for undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and pharmacy students as evidenced on the Office of the Bursar website. For example, policies on tuition and fee waivers for graduate and undergraduate students are documented in the Tuition and Fee Waiver handbook. In addition, current and prospective students may access information about the cost of attendance, financial aid process, scholarships, and loans on the Office of Student Financial Aid website. The price calculator is a web-based tool accessible to students and the public to estimate the cost of attendance and grant aid in a given academic year and is accessible to the public on the Consumer Information website. Financial internal controls that regulate ethical and responsible behavior in regard to accounting and administrative transactions are documented in the Administration and Finance Policies and Procedures manual.

Accreditation Relationships

CSU presents accreditation information about the university and program level accreditation relationships on the CSU accreditation web page and is accessible to the public. For example, college accreditation relationships include the program name, accrediting agency, and date of last visit. Documents such as steering committee members, agendas, and minutes are accessible internally through the Cougar Connect portal.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.C.1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

- Since January 1, 1996, the creation of the Chicago State University (CSU) Board of Trustees (BOT) provides broad authority to offer programs and conduct research as cited in the Bylaws and governing policies. These Bylaws outline policies and procedures and are accessible to the public on the Board of Trustees website. The governing board is autonomous and has charged the University with operating within the policies and regulations established by the BOT as evidenced in Article II of the governing policies. Adaptation of the mission and University-wide strategic goals by the BOT on June 27, 2011 demonstrates strides to promote priorities such as innovations in teaching, research and service to assure integrity and enhance the University.

2.C.2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

- The BOT shows commitment to relevant interests of the University's internal and external constituencies during decision-making deliberations.   This is demonstrated by the creation of an organized standing committee structure by the University to provide advice and counsel on Board-level policy concerns. Such powers and duties are articulated within Article I of the Governing Policies granting committees of the Board as fact-finding, advisory bodies to guide the deliberation process. The academic/student affairs, finance and audit, facilities, legislation, and human resources committees were designed to meet with constituencies and provide oversight of defined goals and duties. Information about BOT minutes and agendas are easily accessible and available to the public on the University website. In addition, the Executive Committee counsels about University operations on behalf of BOT. The BOT committee

assignments show participation of faculty, staff, and students in the organized standing committee structure as evidenced on the University website.

2.C.3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

- Members of the BOT and officers of the University strive to conduct their business affairs independent from donors, elected officials or other external parties to avoid possible conflicts of interest with their duties and obligations to preserve institutional integrity. Safeguards are in place to discourage conflict of interests of administrative employees and the BOT as articulated in the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, requiring annual disclosure of economic interests, and Article VIII of the BOT Bylaws. In addition, state legislation, regulations, and the Illinois Procurement Code seek to avoid conflict of interest issues by regulating political activities, nepotism, and purchases of goods and services.

2.C.4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

- The BOT is autonomous and delegates the governance and responsibilities of the University to the President as evidenced in Article VII of the BOT Bylaws. In addition, the President is responsible and held accountable for effective administration of the institution. Appointment procedures are in place for faculty, administrators, and civil positions to comply with the delegation of authority policy by the BOT. The BOT Governing Policy supports the delegation of day-to-day management of the University to the administration.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

- Chicago State University (CSU) is committed to academic freedom in the pursuit of teaching and learning without censorship and is grounded by the CSU Code of Excellence, as evidenced in the Faculty Handbook, to achieve these goals. Support for academic freedom from the Board of Trustees is evidenced through the incorporation of AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the Statement on Professional Ethics (2009 version) in the Board of Trustees Governing Policies, Section 5, "Academic Freedom and Responsibility". While faculty are free from censorship in the classroom, the policy advises that faculty members have mastery over their subjects, refrain from materials not related to their subject matter, and show respect for others and their opinions.

- The most recent CSU Faculty handbook includes a statement on academic freedom and responsibility as essential for the search of truth and freedom in learning for students. The 2016-2017 Faculty Handbook is accessible to the public on the CSU academic resources website.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

2.E.1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students

- Chicago State University (CSU) demonstrates responsible research integrity and scholarly practice for the acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge by faculty, staff and students. The published Code of Excellence and policies and procedures on research integrity guides the practice of high ethical standards in pursuit of academic integrity, cultural diversity, and personal and academic excellence.
- Research integrity and oversight is assured through collaborative efforts of the CSU research compliance committees, the Office of Grants and Research Administration (OGRA) and the Office of the Provost to address integrity and scholarly practices by faculty, staff, and students. The Research Integrity officer is appointed by the President to enforce research integrity and address research misconduct activities in accordance with federal guidelines. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversee the research process submissions and approvals to ensure research activities follow an approved protocol as evidenced in the IRB Policies and Procedures. The composition of the IRB members is selected by the President according to levels of expertise and experience as applicable by the Code of Federal Regulations on the protection of human subjects (45 CFR 46 §107). In addition, mandatory human subjects training for CSU personnel conducting research is provided by the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) Consortium. Specific information about CITI training can be found on the IRB website and is accessible to the public. Furthermore, all research investigators are required to complete financial conflict of interest training and personnel researching funded projects must submit a financial conflict of interest (FCOI) disclosure form as documented on the IRB website. Lastly, the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) provide oversight over animal rights and safe usage of biological materials, respectively, in accordance with federal guidelines as documented on the OGRA website.

2.E.2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

- Chicago State University demonstrates commitment to educating students on the ethical use of information sources.   For example, a library instruction session is embedded into the English core curriculum courses to assist students with learning how to cite sources. Library guides are available to assist students with research, copyright laws, and citation instruction on the website. The electronic plagiarism tool, Turnitin, is used by faculty to introduce students to the appropriate citation of sources. This tool is used to address plagiarism and the ethical use of information as evidenced by the Turnitin usage policy accessible on the College of Education website. Discussions with faculty at an open forum revealed that Turnitin is a tool used to teach students how to cite sources and reduce incidents of plagiarism. In addition, the Learning Assistance Center employ writing assistants to instruct students on how to properly cite sources.

2.E.3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

- The Code of Excellence and Student Code of Conduct are policies adopted by Chicago State University to enforce academic honesty and integrity. The Code of Excellence include succinct statements about the practice of personal and academic integrity as well as academic excellence. Both of these documents are accessible to the public on the Office of Judicial Affairs website. Faculty are urged to include academic integrity policies in their syllabi and to review this policy with their students. The judicial process for safeguarding students' rights and ensuring due process is described in the Student Code of Conduct for both academic and nonacademic matters as evidenced on the Office of Judicial Affairs website. In addition, the Research Integrity Officer, provides oversight over research integrity to address research misconduct issues in accordance with the United States Department of Health and Human Services requirements.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

Chicago State University (CSU) operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions and establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior. The Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Governing Policy and Regulations as well as the university integrity statement, all serve as key policies and procedures that govern the activities and integrity of the Board of Trustees (BOT), faculty, and staff. Committees are responsible for reviewing internal control, accounting, and reporting practices to ensure proper accountability of University practices.

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships. The CSU annual Fact Book is a resource for accurate key facts and statistical information shared with the community and public. Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs, and admissions materials are presented clearly to the CSU community and prospective students about programs, policies, and application requirements. Communication modalities such as the campus internet-based radio station, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and town hall meetings are used to reach out to diverse listeners in the community. Information about faculty as well as university and program accreditation relationships are accessible on the CSU website.

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity. The CSU BOT operates autonomously and delegate the governance and responsibilities of the University to the President as evidenced in Article VII of the BOT Bylaws. Members of the BOT and officers of the University demonstrate anonymity by conducting their business affairs independent from donors, elected officials, or other external parties to avoid possible conflict of interests with their duties and obligations to preserve institutional integrity.

CSU is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning without censorship. Support for academic freedom from the Board of Trustees is evidenced through the incorporation of AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the Statement on Professional Ethics (2009 version) in the Board of Trustees Governing Policies, Section 5, "Academic Freedom and Responsibility".

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students, and staff. The Code of Excellence and Student Code of Conduct are policies adopted by Chicago State University to enforce academic honesty and integrity. In addition, the Research Integrity Officer and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) provide oversight over research misconduct and policies and procedures that guide the research process. Library guides are available to assist students with research, copyright laws, and citation instruction on the website. The electronic plagiarism tool, Turnitin, is used by faculty to introduce students to the ethical use of information and the appropriate citation of sources.

The team believes that Criterion Two is met.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.A.1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

The Assurance Argument and evidence verified during the team visit provide several lines of evidence that the University assures programs are current and require appropriate levels of performance.

- The University Curriculum Committee and/or the Graduate Council reviews and makes recommendations regarding requests for changes to the curriculum, including new programs and courses and revisions to existing programs and courses. A review of Committee minutes reveals that these reviews include, among other things, the currency of the proposed actions and the proposed levels of performance. The Program Review process assures that every program is reviewed for these and other matters on a five-year cycle. Academic Assessment, another internal process, continuously assesses student achievement and program learning outcomes, with annual reports reviewed by the University Assessment Committee.
- From documents on the institution's Assessment website, academic programs use varying strategies for benchmarking program expectations and student achievement against national standards. For example, at least 36 programs have met external accreditation standards. Some programs, notably Chemistry, Physics and Engineering, administer externally developed examinations to assess student academic progress. Other programs review and revise curriculum against national standards; For example, Communications, Media Arts, and Theater recently undertook such a comprehensive review and revision. Finally, the University now

requires senior capstones in all programs, and some departments now sample these as part of the validation of the academic assessment.

- The outcomes of licensure examinations, placement in graduate and post-graduate programs, and placement of graduates in jobs related to their majors provide further lines of evidence that the programs are appropriate and current.

3.A.2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

- As part of academic program assessment, programs articulate learning goals for each academic program. The assessment website provides examples. For instance, Geography's assessment plans and reports clearly differentiate between general education, the undergraduate major, the masters' degree, and graduate certificates. This pattern is replicated throughout the assessment documentation, although many programs do not have all types of and categories of credentials. This pattern provides clear evidence that the University differentiates between these various credentials in appropriate ways.

3.A.3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

- Confirmed through the Assurance Argument and conversations with appropriate institutional leadership, Chicago State University has one campus which offers traditional, online, and hybrid delivery of its academic courses. In addition to the approval process for traditional courses, the Distance Education Committee reviews and approves online and hybrid courses as part of the new course or revised course change process. Online and hybrid courses are created in partnership with the colleges and the Distance Education Committee to ensure a learning experience for students that is tailored to the subject matter and expected learning outcomes. Instructional design staff in the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) provide required online teaching certificate program instruction in the design and delivery of online or web-enhanced courses for all CSU faculty members. CTRE staff support faculty peer reviewers of Moodle course shells using a nationally validated scoring guide student learning outcomes for online and hybrid courses are assessed through the academic program assessment process. Thus, from inception, to delivery, to assessment all modes of delivery are consistent.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.B.1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

- Chicago State University's (CSU) general education program is aligned with their mission to promote learning as a continuous and lifelong process by critical reflection in a global society as evidenced in the general education outcomes mission statement. All freshmen and transfer students are required to meet the same basic general education requirements. The general education curriculum consists of 36 credit hours including the core component (15 credit hours) and the general component (21 credit hours) and is comprised of six areas: English composition, foreign language, mathematics, humanities, physical/life sciences, and social sciences. In addition, embedded courses are required in critical thinking, diversity, and fine arts as evidenced in the general education requirements section of the Undergraduate catalog. Some programs may include additional requirements tailored to satisfy specific disciplines. For example, in addition to the University general education requirements, the College of Arts and Sciences require students to complete an additional 3 credit hours from an embedded interdisciplinary course.

- The acceptance of transfer students is aligned within the mission statement providing access to

diverse students as well. The process of approving general education transfer credits is aligned with the requirements of the Illinois Articulation Initiative as evidenced on the state of Illinois iTransfer online portal. The Transferology tool is used to find courses that transfer between institutions in the state of Illinois as well as major degree requirements.

3.B.2 The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

- Since the approval of six general education outcomes in the Spring 2012 semester, CSU demonstrates commitment to a general education curriculum that is grounded in a framework established by the faculty, staff, and administration with oversight by the General Education Committee (GEC) and General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC). The mission, purpose, and Bylaws of the GEC are accessible on the General Education Committee webpage. These new outcomes span areas of critical thinking, methods of inquiry, responsibility and social justice, and science and society. Thus, a new general education curriculum was created in January 2013, then reviewed and approved by the GEC to reflect the needs of a diverse student population as evidenced in the March 5, 2015 General Education Meeting minutes. For example, oral communications was included in the curriculum to align with requirements of the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI). The recommended course list proposal for oral communications was presented to the Faculty Senate and was granted approval by Academic Affairs as evidenced in the December 2015 memorandum from the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3.B.3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

- Degree programs offered at Chicago State University demonstrate commitment to student engagement in collecting and analyzing information as well as mastering modes engaging students with methods of inquiry or creative works. For example, undergraduate students are exposed to methods of inquiry and creative works in humanities, fine arts, physical and life sciences, as well as social and behavioral sciences. Mastery modes of inquiry is culminated through the completion of a senior thesis or capstone project as evidenced in the senior graduation requirements on the Provost's Policies and Procedures web page. In addition, modes of inquiry for master's and dissertation level programs are culminated in a master's thesis or capstone and an approved dissertation, respectively, as evidenced by the approved University Graduate Council (UGC) forms for the ProQuest electronic Thesis and Dissertation process. Pharmacy students are engaged in a year-long capstone mentorship project with faculty during year 4 as a graduation requirement. Experiences acquired by students engaged in the capstone research projects contribute to the advancement of scholarly research on drug development.

3.B.4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

- CSU commitment to cultural diversity is evidenced in the composition of the programs, faculty, and students. The cultural diversity statement within the Code of Excellence promotes acceptance and respect for cultural differences of others. This document is accessible to the public in the student handbook.
- CSU offer academic programs designed to promote diversity and multiculturalism awareness as an integral component of teaching and learning. Diversity education is integrated within the general education curriculum to foster responsible sensitivities and respect about cultural diversity on a global scale as evidenced in the General Education Course Catalog. Students are required to complete a minimum of 3 credit hours to fulfill the general education diversity requirement to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of diversity. This requirement is evidenced in the University General Education outcome document and General Education mission statement that promotes understanding of cultural diversity and human and environmental interactions.
- CSU offers several academic programs that promote diversity and multicultural awareness activities. For example, the African American Studies Program prepare students to engage in theories, concepts, and intellectual work about the African American Studies discipline as stated on their website in their mission statement. The International Studies program provide students with multicultural perspectives that include a service learning component and study abroad opportunities. The Office of International Programs promote cultural diversity by assisting students with travel abroad to Haiti and Guatemala where they may provide clinical care and medical missions as evidenced in the 2016 Medical Mission to Guatemala and International American Medical Mission reports. In 2016, the College of Pharmacy was recognized by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy for having the 10th highest underrepresented minority enrollment in the nation.
- Diversity is evidenced in the faculty and student composition. The total fall 2014 full and part time female and male faculty are 48% and 52%, respectively. In addition, the faculty race/ethnic composition is 46% White, 34% Black Non-Hispanic, 5% Hispanic, and 14% Other. While CSU is federally classified as a Predominantly Black Institution, the student population is diverse with a composition by gender, status, and age as follows: 29% male and 71% female; 64% are full time and 36% are part time; approximately 40% of the student population is between 22 and 29 years of age. Whereas 72% of the student composition is Black, 5%, 7%, 6%, and 11% are Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White, and Other, respectively.

3.B.5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

- Students at CSU engage in research scholarship, creative work, and discovery of knowledge under mentorship of faculty as evidenced by activities such as capstone projects and research scholarships. For example, discussions in an open forum revealed that the College of education improve writing skills for students by embedding writing within the curriculum. In addition, the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) provide opportunities for faculty and students to receive recognition for creative scholarship work.
- CSU faculty are expected to engage in research and contribute to research scholarship and the discovery of knowledge. Faculty accomplishments are acknowledged by the Board of Trustees (BOT) as evidenced on the BOT report. The Office of Grants and Research Administration

coordinates faculty participation in programs sponsored by the Fulbright Foundation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.C.1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

- From the institution's Fact Book, as of Fall 2015, Chicago State University had 264 full-time and 97 part-time faculty members; this results in a healthy 19:1 student-to-full-time-faculty ratio. There are three tracks among full-time faculty: tenure, tenure-track, or non-tenure full-time lecturer. The Assurance argument states that fifty percent (50%) of the full-time faculty have been at the institution for more than seven years and 30% have been employed between four to six years, providing ample evidence for stability. Of the current 152 tenure/tenure-track faculty in Fall 2016, 143 have Doctoral degrees (94%) and nine have Masters degrees.
- Through the faculty contract and the Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) for retention, promotion, and tenure, faculty members have a role in establishing the academic credentials for instructional staff within their units as implemented by Department Personnel Committees (DPC). Additionally, the University Personnel Committee (UPC) is responsible for reviewing Unit A personnel decisions related to tenure, promotion, and professional advancement.

3.C.2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

- From the Assurance argument and the Provost's website, the educational requirements for tenure-track and clinical or research faculty appointments in Unit A is primarily a doctoral degree in the discipline or related discipline, except for visual art professionals or faculty in performing arts, creative writing, library and theater for which the Master's degree is considered to be the terminal degree. A Master's of Fine Arts or a Masters degree with credit hours beyond the degree may be considered to be the terminal degree in some areas, with Provost approval. Hiring of faculty and instructors follows a process established by the Human Resources office to allow selection of the most qualified candidate.
- Credentials for temporary instructional faculty, including those teaching in dual credit programs, are reviewed by the academic program, the college, and the Provost prior to appointment for appropriate degree and level as well as other appropriate credentials. The process appears to be assure faculty hold appropriate credentials for teaching the assigned courses.

3.C.3. *Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.*

- All faculty members are annually evaluated on their teaching and primary duties by students, peers, and their department chairperson, providing a standard for acceptable levels of instructional performance. The Assurance Document and the University Professionals of Illinois Faculty Contract provide details on the process, while consultation with the Provost provided further explanation and exemplar documents.
- The University Professionals of Illinois Faculty Contract outlines the policies and procedures for regular evaluation of all full-time faculty members and, for tenure, tenure-track, and clincial faculty specifically includes scholarship as a mandated element (19.3.a(1)). Each department has an approved Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC), which defines the specific departmental implementation for the evaluation of each duty of a faculty member in the areas of teaching, research or creative activities, and service. The DAC is revised and updated with each new faculty contract to ensure rigor and currency for the program. A portfolio method is used for the submission of materials.
- The Contract provides that "Unit B" faculty, i.e., permanent, non-tenure-track instructional faculty, be reviewed primarily based on teaching effectiveness, as implemented in Departmental Application of Contract (DAC) documents. A review of exemplar DACS showed a thorough review of teaching effectiveness based on portfolios which include syllabi, student evaluations, peer reviews of instruction, and professional development activities.
- Part-time faculty members are evaluated by the department chairperson along with student evaluations of teaching. Their reemployment is determined by this evaluation process and program needs.
- Additionally, the Graduate and Professional Studies Council considers and approves applications for the appointment of graduate and professional program faculty status, providing an extra level of scrutiny for faculty involved with graduate and professional studies.

3.C.4. *The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.*

- The faculty evaluation process described in 3.C.3 includes processes for assuring that faculty are current in their discipline and adept in their instructional roles. In the case of tenured, tenure-track, and clinical faculty currency in the discipline is directly assessed by the professional and scholarly activities of the faculty. In the case of Unit B faculty, course syllabi, peer review, or professional development activities are among the ways the institution assures currency.

- The Contract provides that all faculty members be annually evaluated on their teaching and primary duties by students, peers, and their department chairperson. The University implemented an online student evaluation system in Fall 2012, permitting real time modifications and quality improvements by the faculty for the subsequent semesters. Additionally, the on-line system allows department chairs and deans to review all courses whether taught by part-time or full-time faculty. Finally, instructional, research or creative, and service activities of faculty members are evaluated annually by a committee of peers as part of the review procedure for promotion.
- The Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) offers financial resources along with ongoing educational seminars to address the professional development of CSU faculty. Individual colleges sponsor faculty development opportunities to address discipline-specific issues. Department chairpersons work with individual faculty to address their individual needs in teaching and scholarship.
- The CTRE offers Online Certification Training (OCT) every eight weeks throughout the academic year as required by Appendix G of the CSU University Professional of Illinois 4100 2010-2015 Contract. OCT is an eight-week training program that prepares faculty to teach online. OCT provides an introductory overview of these topics, and prepares faculty to meet the requirements of the Illinois Online Network Quality Online Course Initiative (QOCI) rubric used by CSU's Distance Education Committee to review the quality of online courses.

3.C.5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

- From the Contract, all faculty must maintain office hours to provide accessibility to students outside the classroom. The mandated office hour requirements are defined by the faculty contract. Faculty must post schedules of four hours a week across three days or five hours across two days for office hours. Office hours are included in each course syllabus, as well as posted on each faculty member's office door. Online course faculty post their office hour availability in the Moodle course shell. Faculty members also set up appointments during other times to accommodate student needs. The availability of faculty for students during a semester is an item assessed on each course evaluation. Students confirm that faculty are available even beyond office hours.

3.C.6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

- Each month, the CTRE offers events, workshops, and information sessions for academic advisors. The developmental opportunities range from specialty training to off-campus networking opportunities. As of April 30, 2016, attendance for the CTRE workshops, information sessions, webinars, events, and academic advising related activities average 12 participants per session, which resulted in an estimated total of 500 participants annually. In addition to providing academic advising development, CTRE also collaborated with departments across campus on various projects to enhance the active learning process.
- Tutors are hired through the Learning Assistance Center and individual departments. Since 2012, the number of tutors has increased. Consequently, almost all subjects have at least one tutor. Tutors receive periodic training on best practices. In addition, in 2014 during midterms and finals, the Learning Assistance Center started a program for faculty to volunteer a few hours of their time tutoring students in their disciplines in preparation for testing.
- The Office of Human Resources also provides ongoing employee enrichment for all levels of faculty and staff. The Employee Development Center offers online as well as face-to-face training in a wide range of topics that encourage continuous quality improvement of services.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.D.1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

The Assurance Argument, the team visit, and the CSU website provide several lines of evidence that the institution provides services to support students.

- For example, the Library is open 84 hrs./week, and electronically 24/7. It provides a broad information literacy program for tutorial and class instruction in library use, an information skill set, and bibliographic knowledge. The library's physical collections number nearly 500,000 volumes and are augmented by electronic journals and 3000 e-books, microforms, and audio-visuals, amounting to a total bibliographic unit equivalency of over a million volumes. Various sharing arrangements permit state-wide access to public university libraries, to the Chicago Public Library System, and, of course, indirect access through CRL and OCLC to national resources.
- The CSU library has 176 open seats for study (carrels and tables) and 60-person café seating. The Information Mall provides 36 user multi-media workstations and a 30 workstation Bibliographic Instruction Studio and Laboratory.
- The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) assists students in achieving academic success through supportive tutoring and resources. All services are provided free of charge to currently enrolled students, active alumni, and faculty of Chicago State University.
- The Career Development Center is responsible for developing and implementing career, employment, and graduate education options for students and alumni. The Career Development Center strives to help CSU students and alumni meet their overall employment related goals by offering assessments needed to help individuals identify a potential career. In addition, students

are invited to targeted career fairs and workshops and are assisted in preparing resumes.
- The Wellness/Health Center Mission provides primary healthcare and wellness programs for all CSU students.

3.D.2. *The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.*

- From the Assurance Argument, prior to registration, all new students must complete Cougar Start U, the recently re-designed student orientation. Students complimented this program during the Open Forums during the team visit.
- From the institutional website, all incoming students are required to comply with a University wide requirement to demonstrate proficiency in the subject areas of English Composition, Reading, and Mathematics. Transfer students without an associate's degree and all incoming freshmen must complete the university's qualifying and placement examination. Test results are immediately available after completion and includes information on course placement.
- The Academic Evaluations and Advisement Unit of the Academic Advising Center provides an online degree audit system for students and advisers to assist with progress to degree and course selection. It includes an evaluation of prior coursework, both at CSU and other institutions, to further assist advisers in placement.
- The University College Program assists incoming, freshmen students whose pre-college education did not fully prepare them to reach their academic potential. The program offers an enhanced, five-week Summer Bridge program, specialized orientation, advising, and registration, and individualized attention from the faculty and advisers in the University College Program. Specialized Freshman seminars are also available to students in the UC Program.

3.D.3. *The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.*

- The institution provides a comprehensive array of advising services, described in the Assurance Argument and the institutional website.
- The R.I.S.E. (Retention Initiative for Student Engagement) Academy, which is open to all incoming Freshman, is an academic enrichment program designed to help students become academically successful in their first year of college. Freshman Seminars that focus on improving academic skills and on understanding the role of self-esteem in college, risk taking behaviors, stereotypes, familial relationships, and academic support systems are also available.
- The Abilities Office assists students in assuring that any barriers caused by a disability will be accommodated and that students will have access to all of CSU's programs and facilities.
- The Honors College provides enriched general education curriculum, expanded research in students' fields of study, and supportive faculty attention in a stimulating and rigorous academic environment for students with exceptional talent and motivation.
- The Early Alert Warning System provides early intervention by advisers for students performing below the "C" level in their classes.
- Students on academic probation receive additional, mandatory advising sessions and participate in programs from the Office of Academic Support, the Academic Success Program, and the R.I.S.E. (Retention Initiative for Student Engagement) Academy.
- The Department of Student Affairs (DSA) offers free tutoring services through the Learning Assistance Center. DSA also sponsors over seventy student organizations, many dedicated to supporting and enriching the academic experience of students. For example, the Teaching and

Educating Men of Black Origin (TEMBO Club). The African American Male Resource Center and the TEMBO Squad provide a platform for Chicago State University's African American male students, staff, and faculty who are dedicated to bringing about positive social change through the teaching and learning of traditional African values, customs, traditions and practices. The Women's Resource Center (WRC) addresses the needs of female students while providing gender education, support, services, and resources to the campus community. The SafeZone Project addresses the concerns of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer community at Chicago State University and the surrounding community. These and many other examples show the institution's commitment to providing a positive, and appropriately contextual environment for its diverse student population.

3.D.4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

- The Center for Teaching and Research Excellence (CTRE) offers professional development opportunities for faculty to engage in teaching and learning tools through participating in professional development opportunities and seminars.
- Online classes use Moodle as a learning management system. The CTRE manages Moodle, and provides technical assistance to users, both students and faculty. Students can obtain assistance with Moodle from the Faculty Support or Student Support pages and directly from CTRE.
- Academic programs have a variety of labs and facilities available for teaching, learning, and research. For example, the Department of Biological Sciences and Health Professions maintains specialized facilities for learning and teaching in Aquaponics, Flow Cytometry and Microscope Imaging. The program also has an Herbarium and a Prairie Garden. The Department of Communication, Media Arts, and Theater includes specialized learning environments such as radio and television studio, a multimedia lab with state-of-the-art software, nonlinear video auditing and editing suites, a 3D HD television studio, several specialized camera packages, and the 350-seat Breaky Theater for student performances.
- The Provost provided a comprehensive list of the over 40 computer labs on campus, distributed throughout various academic, library, and residential spaces used by students. Software, running on both Apple OS and Windows, includes Adobe Creative Suite, MS Office, SPSS, Music software, and Mathematica.

3.D.5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

- The syllabus for Freshman Seminar 1500 includes information literacy and use of the library among its topics. The library website includes an "ask-a-librarian" online feature for real-time consultation with a library professional. In addition, the library website includes a data resources guide for students to access the multiple databases available through the institution.
- The University Catalog lists research courses in nearly every department that engage undergraduate and graduate students in research. The CTRE grant program includes provisions for faculty to support undergraduates on research projects. The recently approved senior capstones provide a further, mentored opportunity guide students on the effective use of research and information resources.
- In an open forum, faculty and staff described several different ways that students are guided on the effective use of research and information resources. These included internships internal to CSU (in Internal Audit and Institutional Research, for example), clinical internships, internships

with community partners (such as a local radio station), and the introduction of industrial projects and applications into the mathematics curriculum. These and numerous other examples the institution at all levels strives to enhance student learning on the effective use of research and information resources.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

3.E.1 Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

- Co-curricular programs grow out of and support the mission of CSU. Focused on student learning and engagement, community support, and diversity, the CSU mission is lived out through a large number of co-curricular activities. For example, the collaboration between the College of Pharmacy and the Office of International Programs allowed pharmacy students the opportunity to serve Haiti and Guatemala. The students provided support and medical attention to these populations. Closer to home, the College of Health Sciences partners with the Familia Latina Unida Medical Resource Corps-Youth Service to serve the Pilsen community in Chicago. This program works with high school youth to help them encourage the Pilsen community to seek health screening for identified chronic diseases found in the community. Service is also provided through the Honors College and the Presidential Scholars, providing 50 hours of community service per semester.
- CSU provides resources and programming to provide cultural awareness and cultural heritage programming. The Latino Resource Center and the African American Male Resource Center were mentioned by students, staff, and faculty as exemplary programs that serve the students and the community surrounding CSU.
- CSU has started several new organizations to meet student needs and to better serve the mission of CSU. Some of these include the Masters of Public Health Student Association, the National Council of Negro Women, The National Society of Black Engineers, and the National Organization for the Professional Advancement of Black Chemists and Chemical Engineers. These new organizations help CSU to meet its mission and purposes and supports the learning environment for students to succeed.

3.E.2 The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

- A review of surveys, the website, materials related to programs at the University, and

discussions in the Open Forums verify that CSU regularly examines its claims that it makes related to aspects of its mission. External validation is also used in claims made by the University related to the diversity found in the School of Pharmacy and the College of Health Sciences. Awards from external competitions such as the Honda Campus All-Star Challenge also support the claims made by the University. The University publishes support for its claims on its website and through various published materials.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Based on the information provided in the Assurance Argument and other supporting documents reviewed by the team, and as confirmed in interviews during the visit, Chicago State University meets all the expectations for Criterion 3. The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered. In addition, the University provides excellent programming and support for its surrounding community.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.A.1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

- Academic program review follows guidelines established by the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). Reviews occur on a five-year cycle, except that new programs undergo updated review three years after initial approval.   IBHE guidelines call for data-based reviews grounded in, among things, enrollment, retention, graduation rates, degrees awarded, alumni outcomes, and program cost. At Chicago State University, the Office of Curriculum and Assessment sets the institutional template, framework, schedule, and deadline for program review submission, as published on the CSU website. The current cycle runs through the 2021-

22 academic year. Academic programs prepare a self-study in accordance with the above. Subsequently, a committee of faculty and administrators review the self-study and generates a recommendation report. The Provost and President then prepare a program review outcomes report which they in turn forward to the IBHE. The IBHE annually reports to the Governor, the Illinois Secretary of Education, and the leadership of the Illinois legislature.

- Since the Fall of 2012, CSU has completed 43 reviews. The institution identified one program- -Economics--for teach-out and elimination. A review of the minutes of the Provost Council meetings reveals that the Council regularly discusses Program review.

.

4.A.2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.

The Assurance Argument, the team visit, and the institutional website provide evidence regarding the evaluation of various types of credit.

- For courses offered by CSU, in accordance with US Department of Education policy, the institution has an established and published on their website credit hour policy which includes guidance for online courses. Experiential learning courses, such as clinical and professional experiences, must document compliance with the expectations of credit hour policy.
- For credit by examination--including Advanced Placement and CLEP examinations, CSU has established minimum score requirements. The institution publishes these expectations in the Undergraduate Catalogue and the institutional website.
- Students at CSU may, under certain circumstances, receive credit for prior experience. For example, the Individualized Curriculum Program accepts up to 42 credit-by-experience hours, provided that the student demonstrates required competencies by a grade of C or better on an examination. Students in other programs may petition, through course credit portfolios, consideration for similar credit-by-experience assessment through the Division of Continuing Education and the associated academic departments.

 In conclusion, CSU has robust, clear, and rigorous policies for evaluating all credit that it transcripts.

4.A.3**. **The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

- CSU publishes transfer credit policy in the academic catalog or the Graduate and Professional Catalog. In general, in order to qualify for transfer, credit must not be remedial, technical, vocational or doctrinal in character; it must have been completed with a grade of C or better; it must have been awarded for college-level work by an institution accredited by a regional or national accrediting organization recognized by the Higher Learning Commission; and it must be similar in nature, level, and content to a course in the CSU curriculum.
- Per the Assurance Argument, CSU uses third party entities, such as World Education Services (WES) or Educational Credential Evaluators (ECE), to evaluate credentials from international sources. This evaluation is a mandatory part of the admission process for all international students, and is documented in the University Catalogs.

The published practices, confirmed in conversations with administrators and faculty, provide evidence that the institution has appropriate policies to assure the quality of transfer credit.

4.A.4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of

courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

- The Provost confirmed that all faculty teaching in dual credit programs are fully vetted by the academic program, college, and Provost, applying the standard institutional practice for temporary instructional staff.
- The institution exercises review of and control over rigor, for prerequisites, and degree requirements through the curriculum process, described elsewhere. A review of program assessment documents, program reviews, and external accreditation all provide evidence that the instution reviews the rigor, expectations for student learning, and student outcomes.
- The institution assures that students have appropriate access to learning resources, regardless of location, through the activities of several offices, including the Library, the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence, the Office for Distance Learning, undergraduate and graduate advising, and the Office of First Year Experience. The Learning Assistance Center offers numerous services as well, including tutoring services. In each case, the institutional website and the assurance argument provide details, verified by extensive discussion with administrators, staff, and faculty.

4.A.5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

- From the institutional website, at least 36 professional and academic programs have met external accreditation standards, including those from Council on Social Work Education, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, American Library Association, Accreditation Council for School of Business Programs, National Association of Schools of Art and Design, and Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education, to name a few. .

4.A.6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

- As noted above, alumni outcomes are part of the rubric for program review, and hence every program must undertake a review that connects these outcomes with program design and delivery. The assessment process requires that each academic program develop outcomes appropriate for the discipline, ranging from a professional post-graduate match in Pharmacy to student placement in graduate programs. The Chicago State University website includes a consumer information page with extensive information on the placement of graduates, including employment, success rates on licensure examinations, and professional placements. The institution surveys graduate employment at the one, five, and nine year points after graduation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.B.1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

- The website for Chicago State University includes extensive information on the goals, processes, and outcomes of its extensive and comprehensive program assessment. A review of annual assessment reports makes it clear that, as claimed on the CSU website, "program-level assessment at CSU is faculty-owned and driven." Each program has a compensated faculty assessment coordinator who works with the program faculty and administration on all matters related to assessment. This level of investment and commitment shows in the detailed assessment documents in the Assurance Argument.
- The faculty in each academic program establish program goals, learning outcomes, and processes for assessing student learning and program effectiveness, including at least two direct and one indirect measure of learning. Nearly every program far exceeds these minimum standards.
- Conversation with the Provost and relevant faculty and staff confirmed that 100% of the academic programs engage in assessment.

4.B.2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

- The University Assessment Committee Bylaws and website provide substantial detail on the assessment process at CSU. All assessment coordinators prepare an assessment plan that is aligned with the specific learning outcomes of the program. The Assurance Argument provides evidence that the programs regularly revisit their stated outcomes for clarity and relevance as well as for alignment with institutional mission. Coordinators submit an annual assessment report to the University Assessment Coordinator who, with the assistance of the University Assessment Committee, provides feedback on the report, including alignment of the learning

outcomes to University and program mission, program goals, degree requirements, and external accreditors or other relevant stakeholders. Department websites publicize learning outcomes and assessment processes on websites and other publications.

- Per the Assurance Argument, the Department of Student Affairs houses co-curricular activities. The Department's most recent strategic plan includes five strategic goals, each of which has an associated student outcome. The Department annually assesses each co-curricular program using various measures such as GPA, graduation rates of participating students, and the number of students served.

4.B.3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

- The Assessment Website and related documents provided in the Assurance Argument show that the institution applies assessment results to improve student learning. Assessment coordinators, both program and general education, annually report significant changes made as a result of assessment findings at the course level on trend data forms. The forms document a three-year (six semester) cycle of changes, allowing ongoing evaluation of the success of implemented changes.
- Changes resulting from assessment are broad, ranging from course re-design, addition of senior capstones, to addition of a "black box" theater for students in Communications, Media Arts, and Theater. Following the implementation of changes, the institution revisits student learning outcomes to assess the effectiveness of the changes.

4.B.4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

- As noted above, the faculty are at the heart of the assessment of academic programs, including peer, compensated assessment coordinators. At the Provost level, the University Assessment Coordinator and the associated University Assessment Committee provide support to academic units, as does the office Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Additional staffing comes from the academic units and the colleges. The assessment process uses direct and indirect measures of student learning, follows a regular schedule, and publishes its results. Programs have clearly stated values, goals, and outcomes. Assessment is a continuous process, and uses longitudinal data. Assessment at Chicago State University employs best practices.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

4.C.1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

Various initiatives, including the Interim Monitoring Report cited in the Assurance Argument, establish goals for student retention, persistence, and completion:

- university advising center for undergraduate students,
- creation/renewal of transfer articulation agreements,
- freshmen enhancements through First-Year Experience office, and
- academic program recruitment initiative. The Enrollment Planning Strategic Plan outlines seven key strategies to increase enrollment, recruitment efforts, and scholarships.
- A focused meeting with the enrollment management and recruitment staff, provided in-depth insights into the planning, tools, goals, and metrics being used in enrollment management.

The institution has an aggressive recruitment plan for first-time freshman, with special emphasis on feeder high schools selected for their history, demographics, and other factors making them likely sources of new students. Recruiting activities include personal visits, online touches, online marketing, and engaging high school counselors. They will bring online before Fall 17 customer response metrics to assess which contacts are effective with which groups of students.

Similarly, the University is partnering with a targeted set of local Community Colleges to encourage transfer students, using similar techniques. Historically, transfer students have out-numbered first-

time freshman at CSU, so the attention to this group is critical to the institution's overall recruiting success.

The institution has started using the Common Application, which substantially increases the potential applicant pool. In addition, they have the ability to mine internet traffic from this pool in order to refine marketing efforts and increase yield. They are placing a particular emphasis on nearby in-state and out-of-state applicants.

The Common Application is part of a broader strategy to expand the source of potential students to include the eight-state region bordering Illinois. Students from this region may attend CSU paying only in-state tuition. Broadening their market coupled with price-discounting in this way will doubtless pay long-term benefits.

The institution tracks year-to-date application data, admits, and commits (as measured by a commitment fee), to provide a baseline against past enrollment cycles. The baseline provides relevant and useful data for budget and other projections, although the recent move to the Common application makes the historical data not strictly comparable.

The institution has established clear and specific goals for its recruiting initiatives, based on historic data, the recruiting context presented by their present situation, and the distinct advantages the institution enjoys relative to market competitors. For example, the goal is to enroll 100 freshmen from the targeted feeder high schools mentioned above.

The institution has articulated clear, attainable, and realistic goals for recruiting.

4.C.2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) collects, analyze and publishes information on enrollment trends, retention, persistence, and graduation rates by college, program, and demographics as evidenced in the CSU Fact Book and program review reports. Information about enrollment, persistence, and completion rates are collected, analyzed, and published in the Census Registration Headcount report. In addition, enrollment trends, retention, and persistence rates are included in the Enrollment Management section of the Board of Trustees report. Graduation success rate metrics are analyzed and reported for first-time, full-time freshmen athletes as defined by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

4.C.3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

The University's annual Planning, Measurement, and Effectiveness (PME) process specify program/unit goals, objectives, and learning and program outcomes as evidenced in the PME unit plans and assessment reports. The use of data to set specific targets for program and learning outcomes is uneven. For example, the PME First Year Experience unit plan report show measurable program outcome goals for students who participate in the Summer Bridge program. Also, targets were set for first to second year retention rates and the use of baseline data to gauge success provided by IER. However, some PME unit plans lack specific measurable targets to gauge achievement of expected results. For example, the Neighborhood Assistance Center documented goals and objectives related to the application of discipline specific skills to increase community service levels in their unit

plan. However, baseline and target data were not specified for learning outcomes to determine success metrics for academic programs in Geography that support enrollment goals.

4.C.4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

The Fact Book and other publications from the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness reveal that the processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on retention and graduation rates are based on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS) definitions for first-time freshmen and new transfer cohorts. Methodologies for calculating fall-to-fall retention and 6-year graduation rates are consistent with definitions used by federal definitions and reflect good practice.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

Based on the information provided in the Assurance Argument and other pertinent materials reviewed by the visiting team, and as confirmed in interviews during the visit, Chicago State University meets all of the requirements of Criterion 4. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

5.A.1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

- As shown in the Assurance Argument, the State of Illinois typically provides 30% of the Chicago State University (CSU) revenue or approximately $35 million; however, since the State has not appropriated consistent levels of funding to CSU since the summer of 2015 and the Board declared financial exigency, the University has undergone an extensive review to reduce expenditures, increase revenues, and become less dependent upon state resources. Following the financial exigency declaration, CSU reduced an additional 300 faculty and staff in the spring of 2016. According to financial statements provided by the University, first quarter FY17 total operating expenditures of $14.1 million are $8.3 million or 37% below the first quarter of FY16. A 5% reduction in revenue or $1.4 million was realized from the first quarter of FY16 as compared to the first quarter of FY17. These reductions show CSU to be responsive to their financial constraints.
- The HLC financial indicators represent a comprehensive overview of the financial strength of the university. The information below is evidenced in the HLC financial ratio reporting tool for

FY14 and FY15 actuals.

- The Primary Reserve Ratio (PRR) identifies the university's financial strength and flexibility by identifying how long the university can function by using reserves without the generation of any new net assets. The PRR changed from 0.24 in FY14 to 0.34 in FY15. CSU can pay its long term obligations and fund its operations for approximately four months without any new resources. Additionally, the CSU Foundation is ready to assist in covering cash shortages to bridge any cash flow gap including MAP funding for students.
- The Net Operating Revenue Ratio (NORR) identifies whether or not the university is living within its available resources. A positive ratio indicates the university is in good financial condition while a negative ratio indicates an operating loss for the year. The NORR changed from (0.31) in FY14 to 0.72 in FY15.
- The Return on Net Assets (RONA) ratio provides the most comprehensive measure of the growth or decline in the total wealth of the university. An improving trend in this ratio indicates the university is increasing its net assets and is likely to be in a position to set aside financial resources to strengthen its future financial flexibility. The RONA changed from (0.36) in FY14 to 1.00 in FY15.
- The Viability Ratio (VR) measures the availability of expendable net assets to cover debt should the university be required to settle its obligations as of the date on the balance sheet. The VR changed from 0.9 in FY14 to 1.19 in FY15.
- The Composite Financial Indicator (CFI) combines the four core ratios identified above into a single score. A negative CFI is indicative of a university that may be struggling financially. A ratio of 1.1 or above is above the zone. The CFI changed from 0.5 in FY14 to 3.2 in FY15. This does not trigger a review unless CSU remains below a 1.1 for a second consecutive year.
- According to projections by the University financial staff, CSU has enough resources to operate through FY18 even without the second half of the stop-gap funding for FY17 or a state appropriation for FY18. This funding comes from the projected FY17 ending cash balance and a foundation loan of $5 million, if necessary, as evidenced in the financial planning documents in the Assurance Argument:
- Increased revenues are evidenced by new major donations including Walgreens for $1 million, CVS Pharmacy for $250,000 both for the Pharmacy program. Further evidence of new efforts include fundraising expectations of the Deans and fundraising events by the Colleges and other groups, and the reinstatement of the Chicago State University Foundation.
- According to the VPFA, the stopgap funding from the State of Illinois has helped address some of the shortfall. It does not provide consistency or dependability for planning purposes. Based on that situation, CSU is working toward a reduced dependency of state resources for its base operating needs.
- As documented in the Assurance Argument, although investments in capital projects including the William Science Center Interactive STEM Learning Laboratories, Douglas Hall Renovations and Improvements, Campus Wide WiFi Upgrade, Jacoby Dickens Center Upgrades, Baseball Field Improvements and outdoor campus beautification, have continued in spite of decreased revenues, CSU shows a $13.5 million backlog in its capital projects. Discussions at the budget and planning focus area indicated ongoing investments to facilities and infrastructure are treated with a high priority in the budget allocation process. The institution's facilities are sufficient to fulfill its mission and are addressed in the planning process.

5.A.2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

- The Board of Trustees' (BOT) University Budget Committee (UBC) bylaws outlines the process for budgeting including membership on the UBC, which includes membership from administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This committee, which makes recommendations to the executive team and the President who makes recommendations to the BOT, listens to budget presentations from all units requiring them to report on the link between their budget and the University's strategic plan. The Planning, Management, and Effectiveness (PME) process ensures budgets are in accordance with the University's strategic plan goals and objectives. Based on information from the budget and planning focus area discussion, the budgeting process is extremely inclusive and transparent starting with faculty and staff in each department.
- The university's resource allocation focuses on its educational purposes and are not affected by elective resource allocations.

5.A.3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

- The University's strategic plan is strongly connected to its mission and was adopted in 2012. As reflected in the meeting with the BOT, the plan was set to be revised this year; however, the BOT extended the current plan for two years to allow the current president an opportunity to provide input. According to the budget and planning focus area discussion, funding is aligned specifically to meet the strategic plan priorities and is reviewed regularly to ensure it is within cash projections.
- The goals in the mission statement are realistic considering the university's organization, resources, and opportunities.

5.A.4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

- As stated in the Assurance Argument, CSU's staff is qualified and trained as evidenced by job descriptions, interviews, reference checks, transcript evaluations, and the requirement to attend a university orientation before beginning their specific work. The University continues professional development after the initial hire through on-going opportunities including lectures and boot campus for staff and the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence for faculty. Base resources are dedicated to on-going training opportunities for faculty and staff. Annual evaluations ensure feedback is provided to the staff based on a limited number of job functions provided in their job descriptions. Annual workforce plans are reviewed to ensure current funding levels are sustainable and staff are functioning as needed.

5.A.5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

- The institution has a well-defined process in place for monitoring expenses as supported by the on-line real-time access to their funds, monthly fiscal officer meetings to ensure fiscal issues are communicated regularly, and the extensive purchasing approval process requiring five approvals and two purchasing reviews to ensure no non-sufficient funds purchases are made.
- When the University declared financial exigency, the BOT created the Management Action Committee (MAC), a four-member board, to address the financial shortfall. This group met weekly to provide regular reports to the BOT. The BOT also created the University Advisory Committee (UAC), comprised of a wide cross section of university employees and reports to the MAC, recommends expenditure reduction strategies.
- CSU has three fiscal years of progressively better audits reducing findings from 44 to 15 since FY12 as documented in the annual audit documents. Internal controls include active cash flow

management to ensure all payroll and invoices are paid and current. Adjustments are made regularly by allocating budgets quarterly rather than annually allowing for immediate modifications if necessary.
- CSU has a well-developed, inclusive, and transparent process in place for budgeting and monitoring expenses. Discussions with the broad-based budget committee verify that every facet of the campus constituency is represented.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

This criterion is met with concerns. Based on review of the budget, cash balances, and discussions with budget and finance staff, it is evident that fiscal resources are reliable through FY18, but uncertainty of state resources and reduced enrollment make funding beyond that time frame unclear. The review team has concerns and suggests continued monitoring to determine dependability of resources beyond FY18 as more information becomes available. Specific monitoring should include:

- ending cash projections for FY18 should clearly identify the resources necessary to meet expenditures
- an update on the appropriations from the State of Illinois
- FY16 HLC ratios should improve
- FY18 enrollment impact on budget

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

5.B.1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

- The Board of Trustees (BOT) is the governing board for the university and is knowledgeable about the institution. The BOT provides oversight of the financial and academic policies as evidenced in their quarterly meetings where they review and approve spending reports and large purchases; operating budgets, budget requests, and budget priorities; and tuition, fees, and waivers. University staff provide updates to the following committees: Academic and Student Affairs, Finance and Audit, Human Resources, Legal, Enrollment Management, Facilities, Information Technology, and Safety. Additionally, the BOT implements campus-wide policies including recent additions for alcoholic beverage use, concealed carry, cyber-bullying, and information security.
- Through conversations with the incoming chair and new board members, it was clear the board is knowledgeable about the university, is familiar with their strategic plan and the initiative to update it, and the need for stabilization of the administration. They are ready to move forward and restore the university's credibility through a long-term vision. The BOT was engaged with the university directly during the recent budgetary reductions.

5.B.2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students in the institution's governance.

- The university has an institutional policy manual that is online for easy access. A formal process for reviewing policies and procedures is in place to allow input from all internal constituents including the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Policies are reviewed by

the BOT at their quarterly meetings if necessary. Examples of the topics covered in this manual include tenure policy, cash management procedures, fixed assets procedures, Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws, and the student government constitution.

5.B.3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

- The University has multiple venues for administration, faculty, staff, and students to be involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes. The university committees met with during the visit, including budget and enrollment, were inclusive, representing a large cross section of the university's departments. As witnessed during these meetings and at the open forum, there are collaborative efforts happening in many areas across campus including the Pharmacy department sharing academic space, Facilities Services engaging in pedagogy discussions before renovations are completed, and financial aid working with the academic departments.
- The BOT mandates shared governance in its policies, which engages the University's internal constituencies through a series of committee work including the General Education Committee, the university Curriculum Coordinating Committee, college curriculum committees, and Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee. As evidenced during discussions with the Provost and att the open forum, the University has a defined program review process. The Provost is required to attend the monthly Faculty Senate meetings and provide a report of university activity, which keeps the faculty informed of administrative decisions on a regular basis. Student Government Association meetings are attended by administrators, faculty or staff as requested and students are engaged in resolution of student grievances.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

5.C.1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

- The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities. The strategic planning committee includes multiple constituents of the institution including all academic departments and a Board of Trustees (BOT) member. The strategic plan, mission, and vision was approved in 2012 and has guided the university in its alignment of its resources connecting it with its mission and capacity. This is coupled with the Planning, Measurement, and Effectiveness (PME) tool whereby each department at CSU is required to annually review their goals and objectives to match the overall university's strategic goals and priorities.
- The University Budget Committee, which is comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students per BOT policy, makes recommendations on the allocation of resources based on the University's strategic priorities and mission and the assessment of those priorities through the PME. They also consider the University's mission, vision and core values and the Illinois Board of Higher Education priorities in their recommendations.
- As discussed during the budget/planning focus meeting, all university departments with a budget must connect their budget to the strategic priorities including funding requests as well as realignments and savings. The departments review this during the year and plan for the future year months in advance.

5.C.2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

- As shown in the evidence files and noted earlier, the institution links its assessment processes and evaluation of operations with planning and budgeted as documented in the PME process which encompasses all departments in the university. As discussed at the budget/planning focus

meeting and shown in the evidence files, the PME tracking document is very detailed and is directly tied to the university's strategic priorities which focuses on student learning.

- The assessment committee, the University budget committee, faculty senate, and the student government association all work together at different times throughout the year. The students are engaged on the university strategic planning committee and reach out to administrators, faculty, and staff when they would like more information at their meetings.

5.C.3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

- The Strategic Planning Committee includes representations from all academic departments and the BOT. A multitude of other university committees including the assessment committee, the university budget committee, the faculty senate, the tuition, fees, and waiver committee, student government association, the enrollment, retention, and graduation committee, the accreditation steering committee, and others all work together putting student assessment as a top priority and focusing on the mission, vision and strategic priorities.
- As noted in the BOT policies, external constituencies are represented with a BOT member as part of the strategic planning committee. The BOT also hears all budget requests, budget priorities, and approves operating budgets. Additionally, budget reports and requests are provided to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Governor's Office of Management and Budget and the Illinois State Legislature.

5.C.4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

- The University has a healthy outlook on a dismal economic outlook by considering new opportunities to become more efficient and raise new revenues. After the State of Illinois failed to allocate the expected appropriation of state resources, CSU underwent a series of expenditure reductions and pursued new revenue streams to recognize the reduction of revenue and also declining enrollment. The BOT declared a financial exigency allowing the university to fully respond to the changing financial situation. The University restructured their workforce and reduced their dependence on state funding in order to prepare themselves for the future.
- The university continues to focus on planning for fluctuations in revenue and enrollment while prioritizing student learning and ensuring mission goals are met. As discussed at the budget/planning focus meeting, budgets are allocated quarterly rather than annually so immediate adjustments can be made to budgets if necessary. Budget projections are made on flat enrollment and are adjusted after each census period to reflect the most current enrollment data. Multiple budget scenarios were presented to the BOT to reflect many different options from the volatile state funding levels. This provided a thorough analysis of the situation and reflected several options for sustainability regardless of the State's decisions.
- As shown in the assurance argument, enrollment declines in the College of Education due to students not being fully prepared to pass the State of Illinois Test of Academic Proficiency have been addressed with additional resources. The Music Department has redesigned the music education program to address declining workforce needs as well. In response to changing demographics, the BOT approved adjacent state resident tuition to expand the main recruiting area.

5.C.5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

- The university responds and anticipates emerging factors as evidenced by a change in the College of Education responding to a shift in the workforce for degrees and instituted an entirely on-line program for the Masters of Science in Technology and Performance Improvement Studies. Globalization is demonstrated by the growth in the international student enrollment, with a sustained graduate enrollment of over 250 students as a result of the establishment and continued relationship through memorandums of understanding.
- During the open forum, the modernizing of the residence halls with a possible public/private partnership was mentioned to address a change in demographics and the needs of CSU's student body. This indicates a willingness to be creative in meeting the needs of the future for CSU students.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

5.D.1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

- Since the implementation of the Performance, Measurement, and Effectiveness (PME) process in the Fall of 2012, the University has demonstrated evidence of performance in its operations through annual planning that guides implementation of the strategic plan goals and objectives for each unit. Further evidence shows annual assessment and evaluation of these goals and objectives are used to make changes to operations and future plans through the allocation of resources in the budgeting process. Each budgeted unit presents an annual plan that aligns it with the goals and objectives of the University's strategic plan including specific information on enrollment and communication. During the budget/planning focus area discussion, staff discussed how the PME documents are tied to the strategic initiatives and adjusted to reflect performance of the unit. On-going conversations occur in individual departments throughout the year as they prepare their PME documents and prepare to present their budget needs at the annual hearing.
- As shown in the evidence files, the annual external audit required by the State of Illinois documents the financial compliance of CSU is improving by a significant decrease in the annual audit findings from 44 to 15 since FY12. The University prepares internal financial statements that are shared with the BOT and other agencies as requested.

5.D.2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

- The University learns from its operational experience and applies that to improve as shown in the PME process when action plans are developed based on assessment results to improve its operations services, processes, or instruction. As discussed with the budget/planning focus group, the budget requests are responsive to the University's strategic initiatives and budgetary constraints. Furthermore, revenues are only allocated quarterly to the departments, so close monitoring can occur for all fiscal expenditures during this time of reduced cash flow.
- The University strives for sustainability as it reviews and revises each department's workforce plan annually to reflect current goals and initiatives developed from current funding and

enrollment data. Further evidence of learning from its experience is documented in the establishment of an Office of Compliance and Office of Internal Audit, which had a direct impact on the reduction of audit findings in CSU's annual audit. The internal control checklists, which are updated annually, are a useful tool to keep all constituents informed on the fiscal requirements and restrictions and a detailed tool to use in their financial activity throughout the year.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

Based on the information provided in the Assurance Argument and other pertinent materials reviewed by the visiting team, and as confirmed in interviews during the visit, Chicago State University meets the requirements of Criterion 5 with concerns. The institution's structures and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. Cash resources are available through FY18 to fund current budget levels, but additional monitoring is necessary to ensure those resources are available for FY19 and beyond.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	Met
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	Met
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	Met
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	Met
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met With Concerns
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	Met With Concerns

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date
6/1/2018

Report Focus
The team believes that Chicago State University has addressed the immediate reduced funding issues related to the inability of the Illinois Legislature to pass a budget funding public higher education. While the decisions made have been painful, the team found an institution that is realistically facing the future without a dependency on state funding. While this is commendable, the team believes that there is still a need for one monitoring report to provide assurance to the Commission of the following:

- A report due June 1, 2018, that indicates Chicago State University is less dependent on one time resources, i.e., cash balances, assets in the foundation to meet ongoing operating expenses by improving recurring revenues, reducing expenses, or a combination of both;
- A report due June 1, 2018, that contains a written contingency plan for FY 19 addressing various potential funding scenarios;
- A report due June 1, 2018, containing evidence of the effectiveness of the new strategic approach to enrollment and the implementation of the enrollment initiatives.

The team believes this report will provide important assurance to the Commission since it will also benefit from two sets of additional data, three additional CFI Ratios, and additional enrollment analysis.

Conclusion

Chicago State University has experienced a great deal of stress due to the inability of the State of Illinois to pass a budget that funds higher education institutions. While the University has taken important steps to address the budget shortfall and has reduced expenditures anticipating that funding may not be forthcoming, the University remains in a situation that will require some careful planning and monitoring to assure that it moves forward. Its current plan and conservative budget forecast indicates funding is sufficient through FY 18 and FY 19. The team believes the Standard Pathway provides the structure to continue to monitor the progress of Chicago State University. The team recommends removal of the Notice sanction with interim monitoring as outlined above.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation
Met With Concerns

Sanctions Recommendation
No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Limited to Standard

Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

FORM

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

This worksheet is to be completed by the peer review team or a Federal Compliance reviewer in relation to the federal requirements. The team should refer to the *Federal Compliance Overview* for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation.

The worksheet becomes an appendix in the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

Institution under review: Chicago State University

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

☐ Evaluation team

☒ Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the Evaluation Team Chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Michael W. Westerfield

☒ I confirm that the Evaluation Team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 1

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition
(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*. Submit the completed worksheet with this form.

   - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:

     o Associate's degrees = 60 hours

     o Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours

     o Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree

   - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.

   - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.

   - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.

2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

   Rationale:

   The team verified that the degrees offered meet or exceed the minimum number of hours for degrees in higher education.

   Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints
(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 2

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

    - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.

    - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.

    - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.

    - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.

    - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

    ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

    ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

    ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

    ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

    Rationale:

    Student Complaints are monitored and students are aware of the complaint process.

    Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies
(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

    - Review the institution's transfer policies.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 3

- Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.

- Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

- Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.

- Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

All such agreements are appropriate and reviewed.

General requirements for transferring to CSU are located at http://www.csu.edu/admissions/transfer.htm . For graduate students, the Graduate and Professional Credit form, located at https://www.csu.edu/GraduateAdmissions/admissions/documents/transfercreditform.pdf, provides information on the transfer of credit criteria. Each program in the Graduate Catalog contains requirements for transfer credits (https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Graduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf). For undergraduate students, requirements are located at https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Admissions.htm. The academic advisement section of the undergraduate catalog (https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Academic_Advisement.htm) describes the process (CSU X-press) that students can use to see the results of transfer evaluations. In addition, located on this page is information related to the Illinois Articulation initiative, which

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 4

provides an additional means of transferring credit into CSU. The CSU has an articulation agreement with Moraine Valley Community College, located at https://www.csu.edu/provost/documents/Recreation_Moraine_Valley_Community_College.pdf. The guide is clear in terms of credit transfer and requirements. The Provost site contains links to all transfer guides, located at: https://www.csu.edu/provost/transferguides/index.htm. Prospective and current students can easily click the college from which credit will be brought and the college or program into which it will be brought; submission results in the appropriate transfer guide. Transfer guides for the College of Pharmacy are located at: http://www.csu.edu/collegeofpharmacy/studentaffairs/transferguide/. All information can be easily found by typing *transfer credit* into the CSU website search tool.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity
(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.

   - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.

   - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The team verifies that the institution is meeting the expectations.

CSU offers online and hybrid courses in addition to traditional face-to-face courses. The process for student identify verification is published on the CSU website at

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 5

http://www.csu.edu/prospectivestudents/studentidentityprocess.htm. The university provides secure logon names and passwords that students must use to enter the Moodle classrooms to complete coursework. The process also includes collecting information at enrollment that allows for student records to be formed and access logon identifications to be generated. Students are required to change their passwords every 150 days. There is no evidence of fees related to verification. There is an additional 50.00 added to the tuition for distance education courses; this is clearly presented on the website (https://www.csu.edu/financialaffairs/bursar/tuition/fall2016.htm).

> Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities
(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.

    - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:

        o **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.

        o **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)

        o **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.

        o **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.

        o **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 6

information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

- o **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

- o **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- o **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)

- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.

- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.

- If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.

- If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity *(Core Components 2.A and 2.B)*.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 7

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institutions received provisional certification in March 2013 to expire no later than December 31, 2015 and has applied for re-certification; according to the letter from the US Department of Education, CSU can continue to receive Title IV funds while awaiting the decision. The reasons for the provisional certification were described in the letter: "The Department of Education outlined in CSU's current Program Participation Agreement (Attachment G) that recent audits and/or a recent program review of the institution's performance of its responsibilities as a participant in the Title IV, HEA programs have disclosed serious, repeated or systemic deficiencies that directly relate to the regulatory elements identified in 34CFR.668.16. These regulatory elements are essential to an acceptable level of administrative capability. Accordingly, the institution's participation in the Title IV, HEA programs will be restricted to a provisional basis. Upon the expiration of the PPA, return to a non-provisional basis will occur only when the institution is able to demonstrate that its level of administrative capability is commensurate with the standards established in the referenced regulation."
Financial Responsibility Requirements: The Department of Education completed a review of CSU and submitted a final resolution on March 4, 2013 (*Attachment K DOE Final Program Determination*) indicating that a repayment of $311,963 was required to correct for incorrect disbursement of Title IV aid to students, and from the application, the matter was resolved through reallocation of funds. Review of the financial audit report for 2015 on the Illinois Auditor General website (http://www.auditor.illinois.gov/audit-reports/CHICAGO-STATEUNIVERSITY. asp) indicates that the only significant deficiency involved the university failing to account for accrued compensated absences. The Single Audit and Compliance Examination (http://www.auditor.illinois.gov/audit-reports/Compliance-Agency-List/CSU/FY15-CSU-Comp-Digest.pdf) also noted, from a financial perspective, that the Perkins Loan default rate exceeded the required threshold (20.5% and 15%, respectively). The institution's response indicated that it was restructuring collections to help correct this deficiency. Corrective action plans based on the audits were requested from the institution, reviewed, and found to be satisfactory (*Attachment H Corrective Action Plans for FY'13 Audit (5); Attachment I Corrective Action Plan FY14; Attachment J Corrective Action Plans FY15*). CFI ratios for FY2014 and FY2015 were less than 1.0, and in FY2015, the ratio was 3.28, indicating a significant improvement in financial health.

Default Rates: Current cohort loan default rates were requested from the institution, and the reported values are**:** FY 13 - 21.69%; FY 14 - 18%; and FY 15 - 20.59%. The CDR values are

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 8

substantially higher than those reported for the previous three-year period (FY 11 – 13.8; FY 12 – 13.4; FY 13 – 10.2) but still below the US Department of Education threshold of 30%. They are, however, now significantly above percentages reported by CSU for peer institutions.

Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures: The 2016 Campus Security and Fire report (http://www.csu.edu/csupolice/documents/AnnualSecurityReport.pdf) provides policies and statistics for the 2016 calendar year. The document contains information on procedures regarding safety on campus; sexual assault; sexual harassment and misconduct; Title IX; and statistics regarding reporting required by the Clery Act (p. 57). Athletic participation reporting and participation in federal financial aid is reported in the annual Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act report (viewed at: http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/Equity_in_Athletics.pdf). Information regarding financial aid, tuition and fees, and net price calculator are displayed publicly on the website (http://www.csu.edu/IER/consumerinfo.htm).

Student Right to Know: The CSU website (http://www.csu.edu/IER/consumerinfo.htm) contains information for students, including information related to tuition and fees, net price calculator, alumni outcomes, and information on gainful employment, among other types of information. Tuition and fees are also located in the University Catalogs (https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/graduate/Financial_Information.htm; https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Financial_Information.htm). The CSU publishes a Fact Book (2015 is located at http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/factBook2015-2016.pdf) that contains more detailed information on a variety of student outcomes (retention, degrees awarded) and financial information including cost of enrollment and internal CSU budget; these fact books are available back to 2001. The institution appears to present itself clearly to its students and to the public.

Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance: The website has clearly stated policies around satisfactory academic progress (http://www.csu.edu/financialaid/documents/CSUpolicyFA_SAP_1-2013.pdf) that includes policies on minimum GPA requirement, minimum completion rate requirement, and maximum time frame. The satisfactory academic progress policy as it relates to financial aid is also available on the CSU website at https://www.csu.edu/financialaid/satisfactoryacademicprogress.htm as well as in the Undergraduate Catalog (beginning on Page 50: https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Undergraduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf) and in the Graduate Catalog (beginning on Page 44: https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Graduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf).

Contractual and Consortial Arrangements: The CSU reported no contractual or consortial arrangements in the application and in the 2016 institutional update (Evidence File: *1077 160404 Institutional Update-Survey*).

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public
(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 9

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

    ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

    ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

    ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

    ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

    Rationale:

    The team reviewed publications and found they were accurate and timely.

    Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information
(See FCFI Questions 28−31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

    - Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC's web address.

    - Review the institution's disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.

    - Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.

    - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 10

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The team verifies that the institution has documented and clearly communicated its accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission as well as with external accreditation agencies.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 32−35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.

   - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.

   - Review the institution's explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

   ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 11

The institution collects a variety of data related to student outcomes and presents this information to the public. These data can be accessed through the Consumer Information tab on the CSU website at: http://www.csu.edu/IER/consumerinfo.htm. This includes retention, completion, graduation, and transfer-out data (http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/GradRateforTransfer.pdf; the current data listed are from 2014 and are out of date); degrees conferred (listed in the Fact Book; http://www.csu.edu/IER/factbooks.htm); and University Satisfaction, Employment Outcomes, and Academic Experiences Report located at http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/Baccalaureate_Graduate_Survey_Analysis.pdf. Also collected are data on alumni (http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/AnAnalysisofIBHEPostBacSurveys.pdf). The assurance argument was reviewed for evidence that the information uses this information to made decisions about academic programs and requirements (https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=306361). Notes from the Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Committee were reviewed. There is evidence that some changes have been accomplished. For example, on Page 27, there is a detailed timeline that shows tracking of enrollment and persistence data. In 2012, new admissions standards were put in place. In 2014, the first class of General Studies (replacing the existing BOG program) students enrolled; sunsetting the BOG program was a result of academic program review (https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=306360). Thus, there appears to be some attention to data regarding persistence that is resulting in decision-making regarding programs and requirements at the institution. The institution recently filed a required report as a follow-up to the 2012 HLC comprehensive visit (https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=306360); the report is included as part of the review the HLC team during the 2017 Standard Pathway 4-year visit. The institution provided evidence of processes in place to closely monitor enrollment, retention, and graduation. The assurance argument (Criterion 4C) also provides examples of initiatives put into practice to address retention and persistence, including inauguration of a university advising center for professional advising of undergraduate students; the creation, implementation, or renewal of a number of transfer articulation agreements; enhancements in the programming for freshmen students through the First-Year Experience office; and academic program recruitment initiative. Thus, the institution appears to be using data from the outcome metrics to review and improve programs and requirements.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.

    - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution's website—for instance, linked to from the institution's home page, included within the top

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 12

three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.

- Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The publications containing programmatic outcomes were reviewed and verified by the team.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies
(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

   The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

   Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

   - Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.

   - Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 13

- Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The team verified   that CSU appropriately lists all accreditation relationships and its standing with state agencies.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment
(FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the assurance section of the team report.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution's notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

- Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 14

☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The team reviewed the notices for public comment and found them to be appropriate and timely.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement
(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)

   - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.

   - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.

   - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   ☒ The institution meets HLC's requirements.

   ☐ The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 15

☐ The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The team verified this aspect of the review.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition
https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=284180
Syllabi provided by the institution:
Fall 2016 Schedule:
93416 ACCT 2110 and 90290 ACCT 2110 (Web version) Intro to Financial Accounting
90094 BIOL1080 Bi Sci Survey II (full semester version)
94206 COUN5600 Intro to School Counseling
94207 COUN5611 Clinical Mental Health Counseling (Web Version)
90724 CJ2309 and 93575 CJ2309 (Web version)
93541 EDDL6050 Educational Statistics
93678 ENG4327 Meth/Mat Lit Research
95266 HSC4423 (Hybrid version) Intro to Environmental Health
93510 NURS3050 Fundamentals Nursing
90021 PHAR6120 Health Care Systems
91244 MATH 1410 (Calculus 1 – full course version)
96193 PE5240 Capstone Project 1 (Online)
96165 READ5560 Master Thesis/Project

Summer 2016 Schedule
52693 BIOL1080 (5-week version of this course)

52679 MATH1410 (Calculus 1 - 5 Week version)
52671 SWK5411 Social Policy II (5 Week course)

Institutional Records of Student Complaints
https://www.csu.edu/judicialaffairs/documents/Judicial_Hearing_Sexual_Assault_Procedures.pdf.
http://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Graduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Undergraduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/dosa/dean/students/documents/Student_Handbook2016-2017.pdf

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 16

https://www.csu.edu/nursing/grievancepolicy.htm;
https://www.csu.edu/collegeofeducation/policies/grievance.htm;
http://www.csu.edu/collegeofbusiness/
Documents requested of and provided by the institution:
Attachment A Federal Compliance Student Complaint Summary 2011-2012 (Undergraduate)
Attachment B Federal Compliance Student Complaints Summary Spring 2013 (Undergraduate)
2014 Undergraduate
2015-2016 Undergraduate
2016-2017 Undergraduate
Attachment C Federal Compliance Student Complaints Summary 2013-2016 Graduate

Publication of Transfer Policies
Comments:
http://www.csu.edu/admissions/transfer.htm
https://www.csu.edu/GraduateAdmissions/admissions/documents/transfercreditform.pdf
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Graduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Admissions.htm
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Academic_Advisement.htm
https://www.csu.edu/provost/documents/Recreation_Moraine_Valley_Community_College.pdf.
https://www.csu.edu/provost/transferguides/index.htm
http://www.csu.edu/collegeofpharmacy/studentaffairs/transferguide/

Practices for Verification of Student Identity
http://www.csu.edu/prospectivestudents/studentidentityprocess.htm
https://www.csu.edu/financialaffairs/bursar/tuition/fall2016.htm

Title IV Program Responsibilities Financial Responsibility Requirements
http://www.auditor.illinois.gov/audit-reports/CHICAGO-STATE-UNIVERSITY.asp
http://www.auditor.illinois.gov/audit-reports/Compliance-Agency-List/CSU/FY15-CSU-Comp-Digest.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/csupolice/documents/AnnualSecurityReport.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/Equity_in_Athletics.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/IER/consumerinfo.htm
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/graduate/Financial_Information.htm
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/undergraduate/Financial_Information.htm
http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/factBook2015-2016.pdf

From the Assurance Evidence File:
1077 20160527 Advisory Visit – Team Report
1077 20160711 Advisory Visit – Action letter
1077 20160211 Official Correspondence – Letter
1077 20160225 Correspondence – Letter
Additional evidence supplied to the Federal Compliance Reviewer:
Attachment H Corrective Action Plans for FY'13 Audit (5)
Attachment I Corrective Action Plan FY14
Attachment J Corrective Action Plans FY15
Attachment K DOE Final Program

Required Information for Students and the Public
http://www.csu.edu/calendar/
https://www.csu.edu/coursebulletin/spring2017/documents/AcademicCalendarSpring2017.pdf
https://www.csu.edu/coursebulletin/spring2017/documents/AcademicCalendarSpring2017.pdf
https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Graduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf
https://www.csu.edu/financialaffairs/bursar/refunds/

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 17

https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Undergraduate_Catalog2016-17.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/catalogs/documents/Course_Listing_2016-2017.pdf
Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information
http://www.csu.edu/accreditations/index.htm
http://www.csu.edu/IER/collegeofed.htm
https://www.csu.edu/accreditations/accreditedprogram.htm
http://www.csu.edu/accreditations/AccreditedColleges/documents/ILNCLEX_RN_Passage_Rate_2015.pdf
Review of Student Outcome Data
http://www.csu.edu/IER/consumerinfo.htm
http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/GradRateforTransfer.pdf
http://www.csu.edu/IER/factbooks.htm
http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/Baccalaureate_Graduate_Survey_Analysis.pdf.
(http://www.csu.edu/IER/documents/AnAnalysisofIBHEPostBacSurveys.pdf
Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Committee Report (from the evidence file at:
https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=306361), Criterion 4C.
Monitoring Report on Enrollment Planning Response to the Higher Learning Commission's 2012
Comprehensive Evaluation Visit (from the evidence file at:
https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=306360), Criterion 4C.

Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies
https://www.csu.edu/accreditations/accreditedprogram.htm

http://www.csu.edu/accreditations/index.htm
Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment
http://www.csu.edu/accreditations/publiccomment.htm

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Federal Compliance Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 18

FORM

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Chicago State University

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions
Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses
A.   Answer the Following Question

> 1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

⊠ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Programs were reviewed in the University Catalogs and on the CUS website. The
number of credits for undergraduate and graduate programs are consistent with similar programs.
Also, maybe of the programs, such as teacher education, social work, and nursing programs,
among others, have professional accreditation; this provides another indication that the programs
        meet best practices in terms of content and practice requirements.

B.   Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

> Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 1

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team's review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.

2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).

   - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.

   - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)

   - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.

   - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.

4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.

   • For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

   • At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.

   • For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.

   • Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.

5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.

6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:

   • Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?

   • Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?

   • For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?

   • Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 3

institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?

- Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?

7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:

- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.

- If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.

- If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours
A.   Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

B.   Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

   a. Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

   ☒ Yes   ☐ No

   Comments:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 4

The credit hour policy was reviewed from the assurance file (4.a.18; https://assurance.hlcommission.org/review/2827/evidence/viewfile?fileid=284180). The policy covers both traditional, hybrid, and online formats.

b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

The policy specifies the amount of instructional time and homework expectations to support the credit hours awarded.

c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

For example, in the 112.5 hours designated for a typical 3 credit semester based course, the policy specifies that these hours can include the following activities: Face-to-face course meetings; virtual course meetings or student instructor and student-student interactions; time to read/view assigned texts or other assigned materials; experiential learning activities consistent with the learning objectives of the course; and synthesis/processing/reflection time and activities (may be used for writing or production of creative work which may take many forms including but not limited to journals, formal papers, projects, blogs, art, music, etc.)

d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

The published policy is consistent with the federal definition of the credit hour.

2. Application of Policies

a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 5

HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

The syllabi were reviewed for required meeting times and required assignments. Syllabi reviewed reflect consistency with the institutional credit hour policy.

b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Learning outcomes are referred to in a variety of ways, including program objectives, course objectives, and course goals. The outcomes identified in the syllabi are appropriate to the content of the courses.

c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

The CSU offers a number of different formats in the semester term. Modalities include face-to-face, hybrid, and online. Course lengths within a standard semester include 14-17 week terms with 12-week compressed format. During summer term, there are 5 and 10-week courses, and during Spring Intercession, there are 4-week compressed format courses. There are no non-standard term courses identified by the institution. Syllabi across formats were reviewed, and all were satisfactory in terms of work required to meet the federal definition

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

See comments above.

e. Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☒ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

See comments above.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Rationale:

Chicago State University is in compliance.

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 7

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

> Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

☐ Yes   ☒ No

If the answer is "Yes," complete the "Worksheet on Clock Hours."

Note: This worksheet is <u>not</u> intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution's overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student's work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

> Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):
>
> 1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
> 1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction
>
> Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution's requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours
A.   Answer the Following Questions

> 1. Does the institution's credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 8

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

3. Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

B.   Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

C.   Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2016 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Credit Hour and Clock Hour Review
Contact: 800.621.7440
Page 9

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Chicago State University, IL
TYPE OF REVIEW*:*	Standard Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation to include embedded interim report on enrollment planning. Embedded monitoring is to be addressed by the institution in the applicable core components of its Assurance Argument. The review team is to ascertain whether the institution has satisfactorily addressed the monitoring issue(s) and will document its findings in the conclusion section of the team report.

The Board required that the University remain on the Standard Pathway but that its fall 2016 comprehensive evaluation be postponed until Spring 2017. The Comprehensive Evaluation will include a Federal Compliance Reviewer. |
| **DATES OF REVIEW:** | 1/23/2017 - 1/24/2017 |

☐ No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: No Change

Degrees Awarded: Bachelors, Masters, Doctors

Recommended Change: No change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

 Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2012 - 2013

 Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2022 - 2023

Recommended Change: No change

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

 Accreditation at the doctoral level is limited to the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership and the Doctor of Pharmacy.

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Recommended Change: No change

Additional Location:

Prior Commission approval required.

Recommended Change: No change

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: No change

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway   Standard Pathway

Recommended Change: No change

Upcoming Events

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2022 - 2023

Recommended Change: No change

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change:

A single report due June 1, 2018, that indicates:

- Chicago State University is less dependent on one time resources, i.e., cash balances, assets in the foundation to meet ongoing operating expenses by improving recurring revenues, reducing expenses, or a combination of both;

- The report also contains a written contingency plan for FY 19 addressing various potential funding scenarios;

- The report also contains evidence of the effectiveness of the new strategic

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

approach to enrollment and the implementation of the enrollment initiatives.

Institutional Data

Educational Programs

Recommended Change: No change

Undergraduate

Certificate	19	_____
Associate Degrees	0	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	36	_____

Graduate

Master's Degrees	24	_____
Specialist Degrees	0	_____
Doctoral Degrees	2	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: No change

Additional Locations

None

Recommended Change: No change

Distance Delivery

13.1309 - Technology Teacher Education/Industrial Arts Teacher Education, Master, Technology/Industrial Arts Teacher Education
13.1314 - Physical Education Teaching and Coaching, Master, Physical Education Teaching and Coaching
25.0101 - Library and Information Science, Master, Library and Information Science

Recommended Change: No change

Correspondence Education

None

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Recommended Change: No change

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: No change

Consortial Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: No change

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION