

Washburn University of Topeka - KS

HLC ID 1303

OPEN PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review

Visit Date: 3/25/2019

Dr. Jerry B. Farley
President

Tom Bordenkircher
HLC Liaison

Karen Kirkendall
Review Team Chair

Bryan LeBeau
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Casmir Agbaraji
Team Member

Mark Arant
Team Member

David Callejo Perez
Team Member

David Pecha
Team Member

Karen Zunkel
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

3/25/2019

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)

- Federal Compliance 2018

Institutional Context

Washburn University (Washburn) is a public, regional institution in northeast Kansas with a unique character. It was founded in 1865 as a private Congregational school and renamed a few years later after a benefactor who was impressed with the college's commitment to educating women and African Americans. The Washburn School of Law was founded in the early 1900's and continues to thrive to date. On the eve of its closure in the 1940's the City of Topeka voted to support Washburn College with property taxes. In the following years the institution met the needs of returning veterans after World War II, rebuilt its campus after a devastating tornado and began receiving state funds as a university in the Kansas Board of Regent's system. In more recent years the City of Topeka voted to support the University through sales tax revenue rather than property taxes allowing the campus to begin to build a residential campus. Washburn University is one of the few higher education institutions in the country that still receives municipal funding. At the time of its last accreditation visit (2008), Washburn was in the process of adding a technical campus, Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech). This was completed shortly after their visit and more recently (2016) they added a Cosmetology site. Currently, they are in the process of adding a third technical site on the east side of Topeka (undergoing approvals). Washburn began to offer distance education courses over ten years ago and continues to develop online programs at certificate, graduate and undergraduate levels. The American Bar Association has recently lifted its restrictions on distance education and the Washburn School of Law has begun to develop online offerings. Further, Washburn added a Doctor of Nursing Practice in 2013, along with certificates and masters degrees in health services areas, during the last ten years. The addition

of technical education to Washburn University's liberal and career education, entry into the distance education market and programmatic responses to the need for health-related degrees mark the institution's response to the needs of the local community and region. Currently, Washburn University of Topeka offers 39 certificates, 21 associate degrees, 79 baccalaureate degrees, 18 master's degrees and 2 doctoral degrees.

Washburn University has been in good standing with the HLC since its last accreditation review in 2008. It is approved for distance education and programs, but not correspondence education. It has two approved additional locations in the city of Topeka, with no branch campuses. Washburn was granted an extension until September 1, 2022 to become compliant to the faculty qualification requirement.

Interactions with Constituencies

Academic Affairs Committee (4 members)

Academic Effectiveness Analyst (2)

ADA Coordinator

Assessment Committee (10 members, including student representative)

Assistant Dean – Admissions (School of Law)

Assistant Director – Application Services (IT)

Assistant Director – Instructional Services (IT)

Assistant Director – Systems and Networking (IT)

Assistant Director – User Services (IT)

Associate Dean – Academic Affairs (School of Law)

Associate Dean – Instruction (Washburn Tech)

Associate Dean – Mabee Library/Student Success and Retention

Associate Dean – Student Services (Washburn Tech)

Associate Dean-Administration (School of Law)

Associate Director – Admissions (Washburn Tech)

Associate Director – Budget, Planning and Analysis

Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Board of Regents (5 members including Board chair and KBOR appointee)

Chair – Graduate Council

Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services

Co Chairs (2) – Curriculum Committee (Washburn Tech)

Controller

Coordinator – Institutional Research (Washburn Tech)

Coordinator – Office of Tutoring and Writing

Coordinator – Online Education Support

Dean – College of Arts and Sciences

Dean – School of Applied Studies

Dean – School of Business

Dean – School of Law

Dean – School of Nursing

Dean – Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech)

Department Chairs (5) -- Tour

Director – Academic Advising

Director – Admissions

Director – Advantage Center (Washburn Tech)

Director – Assessment

Director – Athletics

Director – Budget, Planning and Analysis

Director – Career Services

Director – Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning

Director – Equal Opportunity

Director – External Relations, Student Success and Retention

Director – Facility Services

Director – Financial Aid

Director – Residential Living

Director --- Strategic Analysis and Reporting

Director – Student Involvement and Development

Director – Student Recreation and Wellness Center

Director – Undergraduate Initiatives, Student Success and Retention

Director – University Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity Committee (2 members including chair)

Drop In Sessions (3 participants)

Executive Director – Enrollment Management

Faculty (5) -- Washburn Tech Tour

Graduate Council (9 members)

Instructional Designer (2)

Open Forum (Criteria 1 and 2) – 76 participants

Open Forum (Criteria 3 and 4) – 80 participants

Open Forum (Criterion 5) – 32 participants

President

President of Alumni Association and Foundation

Research Analyst – Strategic Analysis and Reporting

Special Assistant to the President

Student Records Administrator (School of Law)

Student Success Evaluation and Retention Specialist

University Counsel

University Registrar

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Vice President for Administration and Treasurer

Vice President of Academic Affairs for the Kansas Board of Regents

Vice President of Student Life

Additional Documents

Two online courses were reviewed within their learning management system

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

Meeting minutes for the Washburn Board of Regents (WBOR) provide evidence that the institution developed its mission statement, vision statement, core values (i.e., integrity, excellence, accountability, respect, collaboration, and innovation), and strategic plan through a collaborative and committee-based process. The WBOR created an executive strategic planning council to oversee the University strategic plan. To make Washburn University (Washburn) strategic planning inclusive, in February 2009, the council met and established a fifty-member strategic planning committee, which consisted of students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, and civic leaders as recorded in the minutes of the council. The strategic planning committee worked with five subcommittees (i.e., academic programs, assessment development and stewardship, enrollment management, learning environment, and student life) to identify opportunities and challenges, and gathered information from different stakeholders. Washburn aligns its strategic planning with its mission "enriches the lives of students by providing opportunities for them to develop and realize their intellectual, academic, and professional potential....".

At the time of the site visit, Washburn provided additional evidence that affirmed a new five-year strategic plan was approved by the WBOR in December 2018. The new strategic plan has five priorities, i.e., academic excellence and innovation, student engagement, engaging work environment, valuable community partner, fiscal and operational excellence. Interviews with campus constituents and a review of Faculty Senate minutes and agendas indicated that stakeholders had an opportunity to provide input to the new strategic plan.

All academic programs and services at Washburn are aligned with the mission of the university. During the program review process, each program articulates how its mission aligns and supports the

mission of Washburn University. Interviews with campus constituencies and a review of documents indicated that the mission and priorities are well integrated into the campus culture. The campus mission, goals and priorities were well articulated in interviews with all campus groups. The curriculum, co-curricular activities, student affairs initiatives, community outreach and events and student and faculty support were evidence of a "lived" mission at Washburn University. For example, Through the office of Associate Vice President for Academics, Washburn University provides internal research grants for its faculty as well as online and face-to-face training for teaching excellence.

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

The mission statement is clearly stated on the university's website with links provided to multiple iterations of goals, planning and values statement. Responsibility for fulfilling the mission is dispersed broadly and the Washburn University (Washburn) logo is found throughout institutional publications, programmatic materials and student programming. Washburn University aligns the mission statement with its vision "providing a superior student-centered, teaching-focused learning experience...." In addition, Washburn University adopted the following seven (7) core values: integrity, excellence, inclusion, accountability, respect, collaboration, and innovation. Both the graduate and undergraduate catalogs contain the University's mission, vision and core values, and these documents are publicly available on the website.

To ensure that its mission is made available to all students, Washburn University utilizes a master syllabus for all courses and the master syllabus contains the mission statement. The Washburn strategic plan theme (i.e., academic excellence, educational opportunities, community connections, working environment, and fiscal stewardship) emphasizes different parts of its mission.

Mission documents clearly identify the scope of the institution and intended constituents. Numerous support programs exist that are designed to support the articulation and success of some of the more at-risk constituencies. Further evidence to this commitment is with changes in admission standards, the campus has developed programming to assist these at-risks groups in their admission and articulation to higher education.

Currently, Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech), Washburn School of Law and Washburn Athletics have separate websites from that of the rest of the institution. Career/education search engines and other links connect the three sites. It is clear from website verbiage that Washburn School of Law and Washburn Athletics are part of Washburn University. Washburn Institute of Technology also has direct links to HLC accreditation information on the Washburn site. However, the Washburn Tech website portrays a different mission statement from that of

Washburn University and links to the Washburn mission site were not noted. The Team is concerned that this gives the public the impression that Washburn Tech operates as a separate institution rather than as a part of Washburn University. The Team understands that Washburn Tech serves a different population of students but campus constituents articulated the pride in those Washburn Tech students who continued on with their education at Washburn University (and even on to Washburn School of Law) and hoped to see more students make this transition and were building services to assist with this transition. It seems that building a stronger connection between these websites would be a natural way to assist with the transition.

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

Collaboration and respect form parts of Washburn University's (Washburn) core values and emphasizes the need for diversity in its efforts to meet the Washburn mission. Currently about 30% of Washburn students are from a diverse population. This percentage is representative of the Topeka area. Enrollment data and regional demographic data shows that minority enrollment has increased as the local minority population has increased. Washburn University has improved processes to recruit, retain, and graduate minority student body by offering an application fee waiver and Spanish Financial Aid night for the local Topeka public schools.

Washburn University acknowledges the need to enhance efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty. While the diversity of its student population steadily increased, faculty recruitment efforts have not generated an increase in minority faculty. In an effort to address this issue, Washburn has enhanced language in their job advertisements, provided search committee training and are considering other recruitment initiatives. Interviews with faculty and administrators provided evidence that the university understands the need to recruit and retain a diverse faculty and will launch additional efforts to do so. This may be an area where an outside consultant could benefit the institutions efforts to develop faculty recruitment initiatives.

In 2017, the university changed the Multicultural Affairs and Student Services Offices to the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion to address campus diversity issues and potential barriers. The mission of the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion is to provide leadership and support to the campus community as well as a welcoming and respectful working and learning environment for stakeholders. The university organized a variety of activities such as International Brown Bags, Women and Gender Studies program, Hermanitas Conference, Women in Science Day, and DiversiTea events to support and serve diverse populations in its community.

Washburn University integrates the value of diversity experience in its curriculum, events, faculty and staff training, and student body. The General Education curriculum incorporates courses in global citizenship, ethics, and diversity. The Office of International Programs (OIP) at Washburn provides programs designed to enhance access to global experiences for its students and support Washburn international students. The OIP assists Washburn University students in their search for study abroad and international internship opportunities. In addition, the university provides and supports international travel for faculty.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has academic, research and service programming that provide evidence for their understanding of their role in the local and regional community. Washburn has close ties to the city of Topeka and the region. The campus is located near the heart of Topeka and provides an excellent site for community activities. Members of the Washburn Board of Regents (WBOR) indicated that the campus is widely respected by members of the Topeka community. The addition of technology certificates and degrees in Health Services are in direct response to community needs. The addition of an east side campus for Washburn Institute of Technology (currently under review) is in response to community requests. Many academic programs at Washburn have advisory board members from the community who help advise them concerning community needs and the adequacy of the curricula. These advisory boards help ensure that graduates of Washburn University have the soft skills they need to succeed in their chosen careers.

As part of its mission Washburn University helps students develop their academic and professional potential so that they may become productive and responsible citizens of the society. As an open enrollment institution, Washburn offers a variety of student support services in recognition of the needs of the students they serve. Washburn University's new strategic initiative for "Learner Success" (Approved by WBOR in 2018) is evidence of the university's commitment to helping students succeed in their academic pursuits. Programmatic efforts include the Center for Student Success and Retention, Passport for Success program, Ichabod Success Institute, Ichabod Ignite, and the Advantage Center.

Washburn University encourages leadership development of its students through leadership challenge events, leadership labs, and a high school leadership academy. Washburn School of Law supports the community it serves by hosting the Washburn Agricultural Law and Tax Report, Institute for Law and Learning, law clinics, tax returns assistance, and Georgia Project, which was founded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

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

Washburn Board of Regents minutes provide evidence that Washburn University developed its mission statement, vision statement, core value, and strategic plan through a collaborative and committee-based process. The university provides extra support for students to succeed in their academic pursuit through the Center for Student Success and Retention; developmental advising; tutoring center; Passport for Success program; Ichabod Success Institute; Ichabod Ignite; and Advantage Center. Many academic programs at Washburn University have advisory board members who help advise different programs about community needs, review curricula and ensure that graduates of Washburn University have the soft skills they need to succeed in their chosen careers. Based on interviews with Washburn Board of Regents and employees, Washburn University develops programs based on community and industry needs. Washburn University acknowledges the need to enhance efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty while the diversity of its student population has been steadily increasing.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) operates with integrity in its daily operations, including management of finances, personnel and auxiliary functions, under the guidance of the Board of Regents (WBOR), campus-wide offices, and documents (Faculty Handbook, WBOR Bylaws) that have established ethical policies and procedures to guide practices. Washburn University prepares annual financial audits for the institution, University Foundation and for its television station (KTWU). Washburn has a separate Board of Trustees for the University Foundation who are responsible for the strategic plan and policies/practices of the Foundation.

The Washburn University argument, supporting documents, and campus visit verify that the institution has established appropriate policies and procedures for faculty and staff (e.g., Faculty and Technology Instructor Handbooks, Adjunct Faculty guides, policy sessions and orientations), academic issues (FERPA), a student code of conduct (Student Code of Conduct), responsibilities of students (grade grievance and handbook procedures for academic integrity), and an Honor Code for the School of Law students as well. During the visit, evidence showed that the institution has committed resources to improve the process and tracking of student conduct and policies. The institution is working on a policy for intellectual property that is not yet complete. The institution's conflict of interest policies for all constituencies and research ethics policies are documented through print, website, and in the learning management system (LMS).

Washburn provides training, workshops, and online resources for students and faculty on Title IX, FERPA, course materials, and course assessment. Research integrity training is conducted for both faculty and students through the LMS and during student orientation. Students at Washburn University (undergraduate and graduate) and at Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) receive training on academic integrity through various means including the Student Success Center, orientation, student life, living learning centers and student conduct programs.

Washburn University provides extensive details on employment expectations, benefits, and working conditions that includes processes for staff reviews and the tenure and promotion process for faculty.

Survey data shows that there is a clear understanding of expectations for faculty. Washburn has an engaged Faculty Senate and Staff Council that interact with each other, administration, and students. Although the Staff Council includes representatives from Washburn Tech, the Faculty Senate does not. In effort to be more inclusive of shared governance structures across the campus, Washburn University and Washburn Tech are encouraged to think about how to collaborate on faculty governance. In order to better serve the campus community, Washburn's Wellness Center provides wellness programs for both faculty and students in collaboration with Kinesiology, Biology and Counseling Services.

Washburn University has due process for tracking student conduct (Residence Life, Residence Halls, Academic Integrity, Title IX). Washburn has invested in software (Maxient) to track student conduct cases. The university has also instituted several systems where information can be entered, tracked and maintained to provide reports for the campus. Student conduct has adopted a restorative justice model and engaged in forward thinking practices such as accessible mental health services and a food pantry that are allowing them to meet the needs of their changing student demographics. The Student Code of Conduct outlines policies and procedures for student conduct. Further, programs have their own policies that are in line with the institutional Code of Conduct. The importance of academic integrity is further promoted by the Code of Conduct and template syllabus language adopted across Washburn University. The Academic Integrity policies are listed in the multiple websites that students can access. Washburn University is encouraged to continue to develop these policies and include Washburn Tech students, especially with the recent collaboration of student degree pathways within Washburn.

Washburn University provides training in ethical and fair policies related to discrimination, accessibility, practices around diversity. The Washburn Board of Regents has extensive policies on conflict of interest and attends the Association of Governing Boards meetings to improve practices, conducts Board member training, and regularly communicates with the campus community.

Washburn has provided updated resources on grant funding for faculty and staff, including pre- and post- award services. Washburn University has done a great job of providing research ethics courses for faculty. The Team encourages Washburn to build on the recent work in research ethics and create a set of robust policies on academic integrity for faculty.

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

Washburn University's (Washburn) website provides the public access to institutional information about its academic programs such as curricula, graduation requirements, academic integrity, accreditation relationships, faculty credentials and student completion, graduation, and retention rates. The requirements for degrees and programs are clearly outlined in the university catalog and specific program handbooks.

The Washburn University Office of Strategic Analysis and Reporting (SAR) provides an extensive set of data and information on their website that is easily accessible to the public, and includes the data book, common data sets, and evaluation reports on student experiences. Additional information on Washburn can be found through the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR). Faculty expertise and qualifications can be found on Washburn's main and technical campuses. During the campus visit, the Team verified that the data is being utilized campus units to improve student success.

The Federal Compliance reviewer verified that Washburn has Satisfactory Academic Progress and Academic Probation policies. The Team learned that Washburn has recently invested resources to better reach online and commuter students. Specialized accreditation for programs are clearly found across institutional webpages.

Washburn has multiple methods to allow students to be well-informed about the costs of attendance. The cost of attendance calculator can be reached at several websites (Financial Aid, Admissions). The calculator provides an accurate estimate of tuition and cost of living estimates. The institution provides extensive information and resources on their Financial Aid and Admissions websites that outline the cost of attendance, syllabi, faculty qualifications, programs and policies on refunds. The information is also provided by Washburn Institute of Technology and the Washburn School of Law. The Team encourages Washburn to create a central space that allows the public to see Washburn University as a comprehensive institution that meets the needs of the community.

Washburn Board of Regents Bylaws and the Kansas Open Records Act require that meetings, dates, and locations are publicly listed. All meeting agendas and minutes can be found across the website.

The office of Strategic Marketing and Communication was created in 2017 in order to provide marketing materials, financial aid information, and general housing information for students. The office was created to address the lack of updated program information. School of Law information, student recruitment and admissions is handled by their Director of Admissions. Washburn Tech

meets quarterly with this office to update their materials, and also work with Student Services to ensure appropriate information is communicated to the students and public.

In order to maintain transparency in communication, the university has created a process and team to improve marketing, communications, and web operations. The process was created to improve the university websites and materials. Interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, College Deans and faculty showed that the university acknowledges that this process is just in its beginning stages. The Team recommends that Washburn continue to improve its processes for communication to the larger community about undergraduate, graduate and technical education. (see 1B for more detail on this)

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

The Washburn Board of Regents (WBOR) functions, as cited in published policies, in the best interest of the university and are directly involved to the institutional mission. The university is classified as a municipal university by the state of Kansas. The Board members (9) are appointed by the governor and represent the city, county and state (per Kansas state law). Rotation of terms and the term limit ensure diversity of board members and restrict the influence of the governor and his or her political party. Board members receive extensive training through an orientation. The WBOR follows the Kansas Open Meetings Act. The open board meetings also provide an opportunity for various constituencies to provide presentations to keep the Board up-to-date on academic and non-academic programs and activities. Board meetings provide communication between the board and the president, faculty leaders, and student representatives from the campus.

WBOR policies regarding the delegation of management state that the board delegates all operations to the president, except for the hiring and evaluation of the president, management of university property, overseeing the academic enterprise, establish governance policies, and provide financial stewardship. The Board is also coordinated by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR), which oversees aspects reporting, funding, and degree programs dictated by state statutes governing higher education. The coordination reduces the duplication of programs and improves how students transfer courses. The Team met with the Vice President of Academic Affairs from the KBOR, who explained how the KBOR and Washburn Board interact regarding oversight of the university.

The WBOR appointment process, as well as purview of the Board as provided in bylaws, ensures governing board independence both financially and ethically. Board members sign conflict of interest forms and follow clear bylaws that govern budgets, revenues, financial audits, oversight of facilities, legal matters, and renovations and construction. Bylaws also highlight the differentiated roles of the Board and university officials. Specifically, policies recognize the faculty as having the authority to recommend actions on academic matters including graduation and program requirements, new

programs, elimination of programs, new majors, faculty governance, and creation of academic departments.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) protects freedom of expression of all groups, as expressed in its policies and training. The Washburn Board of Regents' Policy of Academic Freedom and the "Statement on Academic Freedom" (Faculty Handbook) support that faculty are entitled to academic freedom. The Student Code of Conduct and the Academic Impropriety Policy states that students are to preserve academic freedom.

Washburn has several procedures and safeguards in place for faculty, staff and students to exercise their rights of expression. Evidence presented through the Climate Survey (2012) and the Higher Education Research Institute Survey show that faculty and staff strongly agree that there is freedom of expression at Washburn. The Team discovered that Washburn has been working on following up on the Climate Survey and has begun to look at consulting firms to help conduct the study. Interviews showed that two weeks ago there was a discussion on how to move forward in conducting both a qualitative and quantitative study to provide metrics for the strategic plan. The institution hopes to launch this initiative in the fall of 2019.

The university supports academic freedom through the campus newspaper and magazine. Speakers are invited to campus to speak on a variety of topics; which demonstrates that Washburn is engaged in academic freedom and expression. During the visit, the Team discovered evidence that Washburn University, responding to changing student demographics, has actively encouraged students to become involved in community engagement within the community and to develop social justice projects across campus that support the university mission.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has several policies that deal directly with responsible research and scholarship (both for faculty and students). Training can be found online and is easily accessible. Faculty applying for internal and external grants have to review this training course prior to submission of their materials. There are additional policies and workshops for faculty that include student and faculty training in responsible use of library, information technology or online resources and in practicing academic integrity. The Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning (C-TEL) provides workshops that address online education, academic integrity, universal design, appropriate use of technology, and diversity.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) have oversight for training of faculty and new committee members to ensure consistent policies and enforcement of IRB and IACUC protocols. Policies are presented during faculty orientation and prior to receiving grants. The Statement of Professional Ethics and Policy Concerning Scholarly Misconduct outline policies and procedures for ethical scholarship. Washburn University has syllabi templates that outline all policies that pertain to many diverse issues from research integrity to open carry laws.

Students are provided academic integrity guidance through a variety of methods, including in their introductory courses and the Student Handbook. The Associate Vice President for Student Life oversees the offering of workshops on plagiarism, academic integrity, and "file sharing." There is a clear policy on academic impropriety and for student conduct that includes due process and outcomes that are clearly spelled out. The School of Law has a separate Honor Code that addresses Academic Impropriety policies and cases. At Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) the Associate Director of Student Services oversees the implementation of student conduct policies.

Washburn University provides training on grants, grants management, export control, and processes related to grants management. The institution has a grants manual and requires that principal investigators meet a set of requirements to both apply and manage a grant and research. During the campus visit, the administrators and faculty revealed that the university had recently hired a grant accountant and a contract employee to assist in the development and growth of Sponsored

Programs. As Washburn continues to grow graduate enrollment and invest in faculty internal grants and as Washburn Institute of Technology continues to receive external funding, the university would benefit from investment in staffing to support faculty research.

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

Washburn University has been deliberate in its efforts to ensure integrity of its actions as an institution as well as actions of its faculty, staff, and students. The institution has strong and transparent policies for faculty and staff information regarding professional development, job expectations, tenure and promotion, and professional resources. Evidence presented during the campus visit, including the application to become a Community Engagement participant, various student success initiatives, the development of a new climate study, inclusive language policies and increased social services for students demonstrate the institution's commitment to evolving policies and procedures in response to their changing campus community. The Washburn University Board of Regent's policies are clear and widely understood and the relationship with the university community and the Kansas Board of Regents is clear. Information on institutional procedures, academic integrity, and student data are well documented and transparent. Recent policies and training show an institutional commitment to a culture of social justice and meeting the needs of students through a variety of wellness initiatives.

Washburn has begun to adopt many forward thinking policies and enact responsive programs for student success. During the campus visit, the Team learned that many of the initiatives were grassroots responses to meeting the needs of the changing demographics of Topeka and their students. The Team recommends that Washburn improve its processes for communication to the larger community about undergraduate, graduate and technical education, as well as initiatives to highlight its commitment to students and their community. Washburn has changed the institutional website, invested in technology, and shifted resources to meet the needs of students. In order to be more effective in communicating to their stakeholders, Washburn would benefit from more clarity in communication across websites and university materials. Internally, Washburn would benefit from more effective campus communication about research, student life, and opportunities for students and faculty on campus. Overall, the Team recommends that Washburn university better communicate across the entire institution and larger campus community that includes Washburn Tech and the School of Law.

Processes also need to reflect a unified system that encompasses the larger campus community. Washburn University should invest in the promotion of a robust research culture that includes leadership in sponsored programs, increased undergraduate research, and continued growth of scholarship of engagement that was highlighted during the campus visit. The organizational chart and evidence presented to the Team showed that the campus is undergoing a current transition across administration, faculty, and staff to improve enrollment management, communication of its mission, and branding. Washburn should continue its strong policies regarding ethics and build on communication initiatives across the entire institution.

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

The current structure of Washburn University (Washburn) was influenced by strategic changes through the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR). According to the history page on the KBOR website: *“By 2008, plans were finalized for the last of the area vocational and area vocational-technical schools to either merge or affiliate with existing public institutions of higher education or seek individual accreditation as a technical college. The resulting Board of Regents system included six state universities, nineteen community colleges, six technical colleges and one municipal university.”* The combination of two entities with differing academic missions would present difficulties in promoting a singular general education philosophy. However, It was evident from the campus visit that Washburn embraces the “nobility of technical education”.

There have been successful efforts in establishing transitions between the entities allowing Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) students to complete associate degrees and beyond. On-campus interviews revealed several examples of the academic colleges at the university campus collaborating with Washburn Tech. Academic programs at Washburn University and Washburn Tech have advisory boards who, evidenced by the board minutes, provide timely input on learning outcomes for students. The minutes reveal both pedagogical and practical suggestions from board members, indicating engagement. The learning outcomes published by Washburn Tech are clearly constructed to meet employer demand. Washburn Tech faculty and staff stated often during campus conversations that they seek to remain nimble in their service to the local communities.

Programmatic and organizational accreditations are cited and maintained on all websites (i.e., Washburn University, Washburn Athletics, Washburn Institute of Technology and Washburn School

of Law).

The survey of graduating seniors does gather perceptions regarding employability preparedness such as ethical behavior, communications skills, and reasoning abilities. During the campus visit, faculty and curriculum committee members cited examples of programs using alumni feedback for program improvement. The application of these surveys is uneven across Washburn, excluding the School of Law and Washburn Tech.

The program review guide outlines measures that are used to determine departmental quality. Within that document, the programs are asked to demonstrate their efforts in assuring and advancing instructional quality. The findings of the Program Review Committee are forwarded to the Washburn University Board of Regents through the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President to ensure communication to the upper levels of governance. A schedule kept in Academic Affairs shows a regular program review occurs with many levels and follows Board policies in approval protocols. The minutes reflecting approval of the Associates of Art in laboratory science showed attentiveness to policy. Annual review documents contain sections for reflection on knowledge gained from those assessments and changes that would be made to the program for continuous improvement. Faculty at the graduate and undergraduate levels during the campus visit indicated faculty involvement in the program review process.

All catalogs outline requirements for degree attainment. Comparisons of the published program goals and program student learning outcomes (PSLO) indicate appropriate rigor for the degree levels. There is progression to evaluation and synthesis through the use of research studies, design projects, and intensive clinical experiences. Syllabi for dual listed graduate/undergraduate courses show heightened expectations from graduate students compared to their undergraduate colleagues. Annual program assessment reports discuss the PSLOs in detail providing mechanisms for analyzing and disseminating the results of the learning goals. The same process is used for all modalities of instruction. University Student Learning Outcomes are primarily course-embedded and follow a review regiment. The results of these reviews are published on the website. Also present are the ETS Proficiency Profile results which are showing improvement in key areas. Other university wide assessment results, also published, include critical and creative thinking, leadership, and communication.

Evidence exists that the online delivery modality is a priority at Washburn. Course design workshops as well as seminars highlighting the best practices of online instruction are regularly offered to the faculty. Participation is incentivized. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides faculty an opportunity to have their courses peer reviewed using a rubric that appears to be based on the work of Quality Matters or QOCL. However, this process is not mandatory for new courses. The argument provides an example of the process that was used to move the RN-to-BSN program to an online environment. The hire of a course designer and the use of the IDEA system for assessment provide an indication of quality assurance. A review of online courses indicate the instructional designers are diligent in following established protocols and evidence of support mechanism for the online student. The Team encourages Washburn to increase the number of online designers and to extend the online development and assessment efforts to the School of Law and Washburn Tech. During discussions with the both School of Law and Washburn Tech faculty and staff, new opportunities exist with the recent changes in the American Bar Association (ABA) restrictions (increase from 18 to 30 hours of online hours) and distance education with technical programs in Kansas high schools.

Dual enrollment classes are subject to review by academic liaisons. The liaisons review the course, the course materials, and classroom interactions with the high school instructor to ensure consistency

with the Washburn course. Concurrent enrollment classes are subject to the oversight of the Kansas Board of Regents. According to KBOR 2018 Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) report, Washburn had more enrollment in its dual credit programs than all of the other state institutions combined (949 vs. 783). Washburn currently serves over 50 high schools according to data provided by the president's executive team. The negative impact on the university's revenue streams and instructional quality efforts were cited in several venues during the campus visit.

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

Washburn University's (Washburn) general education program is distributed into three divisions: Arts and Humanities; Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Statistics; and Social Sciences. The university has specific guidelines in its undergraduate catalog on how different degrees will fulfill the requirements of the general education curriculum. It is applicable to all baccalaureate and associate degrees. A report from Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) shows that each program has measurable learning outcomes. The graduate programs have agreed upon universal learning outcomes.

Faculty during the campus visit expressed concern regarding the quality of the dual credit instruction, most of which are general education courses. The best results in dual credit course quality are coming from recent graduates of Washburn. The Team recommends that Washburn continue to address dual credit challenges.

The university explains the philosophy and implementation of the general education curriculum in the undergraduate catalog along with its impact on the various degree offerings. Courses included in the general education curriculum are reviewed and approved by the General Education Committee to determine whether they still meet at least one University Student Learning Outcome (USLO) and how well the outcome is met. Meeting minutes from the General Education Committee's website demonstrates the approval process. The catalog, process guidelines, and website information present a consistent message that references the mission statement. Records of meeting minutes indicate that

the faculty and Washburn Board of Regents support the current general education curriculum.

Washburn University's undergraduate catalog states that the general education curriculum includes five learning outcomes: communication; quantitative and scientific reasoning and literacy; information literacy and technology; critical and creative thinking; and global citizenship, ethics, and diversity. As mentioned, the general education courses are regularly assessed for effectiveness and relevance. According to a report by the General Education Committee, departments have identified courses within degree programs that cover ethics; synthesis/integration; collection, analysis, and communication of information. As shown in the syllabus provided for CRN265 - Workplace Skills II, some of Washburn Tech's programs share learning outcomes with Washburn University.

The syllabus and assignments provided show that WU 101 engages the students in various opportunities in diversity. The relevant USLO (Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity) is covered in many general education courses and assessed for outcomes at Washburn University as cited in the review report from the General Education Committee. Other optional opportunities, found on the Office of International Programs website among others, exist for students to travel internationally and within the US. Some academic units, such as the School of Nursing, advertise study abroad programs within their websites. Reports from the Office of International Programs chronicle fiscal support for travel for faculty and students. Articles in the student newspaper and testimony during the campus visit indicate support for diverse student populations should be addressed, especially in light of the marked increases in minority student demographics.

Faculty and students have chronicled research and creative activity for all colleges. Sabbatical reports and tenure and promotion guidelines demonstrate expected modes of scholarship and dissemination. Financial assistance is available from the university to aid in the fulfillment of this outcome as demonstrated in the Recent Awards section of the Office of Sponsored Programs website.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has demonstrated through a faculty roster that it has a sufficient number of faculty to offer its certificate and degree programs. The faculty roster demonstrated that most of the full-time and part-time faculty have the appropriate academic credentials. A process is in place to properly certify faculty without academic credentials and guidelines for faculty qualifications are outlined in the Faculty Handbook. Dual credit instructors follow an established process for certification through Academic Affairs, which includes a communication from the university to encourage obtaining the proper credentials through an academic plan. The university has been given an extension to come into compliance with the revised Assumed Practices as by September 1, 2022 as evidenced in a letter dated February 22, 2017 from HLC. Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) has similar policies to those of the main campus for certifying faculty based on the requirements outlined in the instructor handbook. The Team encourages Washburn to strengthen its efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty. A plan should be developed and executed to this end.

Annual activity reports and tenure and promotion processes exist for the faculties at both Washburn and Washburn Tech as demonstrated in the respective faculty handbooks and by documented evaluation instruments. Merit criteria have been developed by all academic units at Washburn University and are published. These are used for annual salary adjustments. Tenure and promotion expectations for all academic units are also documented and available in the respective academic unit. Several examples of tenure criteria were dated. The Team recommends a review and updating

of these documents.

Student review of courses and instructors is regularly conducted though the provided instruments vary from college to college. Online courses are reviewed through the Quality Online Course Initiative process based on standards from the Illinois Online Network. Information from these reviews are used in the annual activity reports of the faculty. Washburn Tech faculty follow the evaluation guidelines in the instructor handbook that include proof of reflection, classroom evaluations, and instructional effectiveness. Dual credit instructors are evaluated by the academic liaison per university requirements.

The Washburn Tech instructors with certifications or licensures are required to keep them current as indicated in the Performance Expectations and Numerical [sic] Rating Codes in the Instructor Handbook. University faculty are required to publish their annual activities through the activity reports through which reviewers can follow the efforts toward maintaining current knowledge within the field. Published protocols for internal grant programs, sabbaticals, and professional development opportunities through the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning exist within the website. As evidenced by outcome reports for the sabbatical program, grants, collegiate travel logs and a Higher Education Research Institute survey, approximately half of faculty take advantage of these opportunities. The university has developed a plan (published) through the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning to improve participation rates. The university has chronicled within its Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning artifacts its efforts toward developing its adjuncts and part-time faculty through summer institutes and orientations.

The university has an office hour requirement in its handbook as well as an encouragement toward tutoring students. A statement on faculty advisers also exists. The Washburn Tech handbook does not specifically address accessibility outside of class.

Job descriptions for key student support personnel were provided. The incumbents' credentials provided by the university matched those of the job descriptions. Notable are the staff development initiatives for student support staff. Washburn listed 45 individual conferences, webinars, and memberships attended or held by student support staff from 2015 to 2017.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

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

Key student services are in place at Washburn University (Washburn) to support its students. The Student One Stop Shop, the Financial Aid Office, Student Health Services, Counseling Services, Career Services, and the Office of University of Diversity and Inclusion describe their services and how to access them on their respective websites. Descriptions of these services also appear in the student handbooks. Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) student privileges on the Washburn University campus are outlined in the Washburn Tech catalog. Usage and assessment reports from the each of these areas reveal the level of engagement of the students with the programs. Washburn Tech's student handbook describes a Care Closet for students facing financial hardships. Emergency loans are available per the Business' Offices website, which provides processes and guidelines eligibility, and the Bursar's report on loans granted totaling \$93,785 from 2011 to 2017. Guidelines for placement testing upon admission are published on the Admission's website and on the website for the Center for Student Success under Prior Learning/Testing.

Washburn University has developed a number of academic support programs for new students who meet certain demographics. The website for the Ichabod Success Institute provides information regarding qualifications, expectations, and enrollment instructions. Another program designed to help student transitioning from high school that do not meet the University's initial entrance criteria is Ichabod Ignite. The website gives a description of the intended audience and outlines the program. Both efforts provided assessment information and success measures for their attendees. Students who are conditionally admitted participate in the Passport for Success program. The example of the contract provided shows the responsibilities of the student and university.

Student persistence at Washburn University is facilitated by both organizational and technological ventures. The Center for Student Success and Retention's website catalogs all of the monitoring and

intervention activities and provides fundamental assessment data on its overall success. Students facing academic probation are directed to the Students Taking Academic Responsibility program. A website for access instructions as well as a report for the Registrar was provided as evidence for the program's success. Tutoring services are provided as demonstrated by the websites for the Math Tutoring Center and the Tutoring and Writing Center. Data provided by both entities reveal that several student avail themselves of these offerings. Washburn Tech provides tutoring, employment assistance, computer access, GED attainment while working on a certificate, and adult education opportunities. Contact information and instructions are provided on its website.

Both Washburn University and Washburn Tech provided websites as evidence of central advising models. Both sites provided contact information and instructions on how to access their services. Evidence of program-level advising was provided through advising handbooks. Information regarding how students can monitor their on academic process through degree audits was provided on the local Degree Works website. At-risk students are monitored through the use EAB's Student Success Collaborative. According to the instructions provided to the student on the website, advisers and students have virtual tools to enhance their student success initiatives.

Washburn made significant efforts to address the concerns expressed in 2008 regarding the development of libraries on campus. The provided reports indicated strategies involving programming and capital efforts. Budget reports revealed a fiscal commitment and assessment reports show increased usage. The provided campus master plan demonstrate continued commitment to the libraries.

Evidence was provided through websites and campus tours of a variety of academic and creative spaces present on the Washburn and Washburn Tech campuses. Laboratory space and computer classrooms are appropriate for the degrees and certificates offered at both campuses. This educational space was documented in reports from the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Assistant Director for Information Technology Services. Evidence gathered during the campus tour confirmed the adequacy of the facilities in supporting the academic mission of the institution. Both campuses use Desire2Learn as the learning management system according to the Washburn D2L website.

Washburn's undergraduate catalog documents that the university student learning outcome of Information Literacy and Technology. This material is integrated into two courses that were specifically designed to address this USLO: WU 101 (required for graduation) and IL 170. There is proof in the WU 101 syllabus that this is covered in the course. The library offers information literacy seminars to faculty for incorporation in their classes as proven by the provided request form. The number of sessions and the attendance for 2017 was reported by the Mabee Library.

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

The published mission of the Office of Student Life shares the language and ideals of the mission of Washburn University (Washburn) that appears on the website and undergraduate catalog. Minutes from the Washburn Student Government Association demonstrate many activities that are in keeping with intellectual and professional development statements of the mission. Over 100 student organizations, dedicated to the tenants of the mission, are registered with the office of Student Involvement and Development. Also present is a student organization handbook, which reinforces the purposes of the organizations. Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) has a Student Activities and Advisory Board that was implemented in 2017-2018 (removing the Student Government Association). This change still allows the Washburn Tech students to retain a shared governance function and maintain a voice in student decision making. Washburn Tech has a number of student organizations and many of these organizations provided evidence of community involvement programs for its students, such as the Recycled Rides program.

Washburn University offers the Washburn Transformational Experience (WTE), which according to the website, offers four areas in which students can enhance their education: community service, international education, leadership, and scholarly or creative activities. Each area has a dedicated webpage providing contact information and instructions on how to get involved. Schedules provided by the Campus Activities Board reveal a number of enrichment opportunities for the students. Numerous opportunities for enrichment are available from a very active visual and performing arts programs as well as advertised engagement programs with international students. Health and wellness opportunities are offered through the Recreation and Wellness Center as shown on its website and in the undergraduate catalog. The Washburn Tech catalog specifies that its students have access to the Center and its programs. Residential Living and Enrollment Management provided examples of engagement activities for on campus students, including learning communities and new student orientation activities that introduce students to these opportunities from the start of their academic careers. Informational brochures and other artifacts highlighted Washburn's commitment to community engagement and economic development. Examples include the Washburn Pitch Competition offered through the School of Business, the winners of which are eligible for cash awards. Another example of note is the Washburn School of Law Clinic that, according to its ad in

Bod Magazine, gives students “hands-on” experiences in helping the community with legal questions.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) students can select from over 200 options including certificates, baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees. Faculty oversee curriculum origination and review processes. The curricula that exist at Washburn and Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) are relevant and reflective of the mission of a municipal institution with a law school. Though protocols differ between the Washburn and the Washburn Tech, quality is maintained. The facilities, instructional support organizations, co-curricular offerings, and key staff are effective in furthering the instructional quality of the institution. New horizons in online education exist and Washburn appears to be poised to take advantage of the new markets. The efforts in virtual education should be universally distributed with investments made in staffing and infrastructure to ensure quality instruction and student support. Encouragement of the students toward enrichment in areas such as international study and leadership development is noteworthy. The efforts of the Washburn Institute of Technology to connect students with degrees at Washburn University or jobs in industry is admirable. Graduate education has been an emphasis for some time but, as indicated by the faculty through the on campus visit, greater collaborations and potentials exist.

Faculty credentialing is diligently maintained. The faculty roster reveals diverse academic backgrounds from notable institutions and industries. Most faculty hold the appropriate degree and have support mechanisms, such as sabbaticals and travel funds, for professional development. They are evaluated regularly by established policies. Academic faculty and staff are very passionate about the individual attention they can give to the students' academic and career goals. Investments in faculty diversity will be rewarded as the Washburn seeks to diversify its student body. A full faculty qualifications review will occur in in September of 2022 (per extension of the HLC).

Co-curricular efforts on campus appear to be effective in student recruitment, retention, and enrichment. Almost every student academic demographic from Washburn Tech through to the doctoral students had academic success programs in place to assist in their certificate or degree attainment efforts. Counseling, fitness, and civil engagement opportunities are available as well as cultural enrichment opportunities in the university and surrounding community. Career planning efforts engage students early in preparation for their post-graduation pursuits. The Team encourages Washburn to continue its efforts toward diversifying its student representation in racial, social, and geographical categories as well as providing key support programming to ensure student well-being and matriculation to credential attainment.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has processes and schedules in place for regular program reviews. In Fall 2018 the frequency of reviews was re-evaluated to allow more flexibility for programs that also go through accreditation reviews. (The previous practice was a review every five years.) The institution has a program review guide (dated 2015-16) that establishes a detailed framework on expectations for the program review document. The Faculty Senate governance website indicates that the University Program Review Committee is composed of 18 members with an additional ex-officio members. This committee includes faculty from Washburn departments, students, and administrators. Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) has a separate program review committee that reviews the programs offered at the Washburn Tech locations. The 2018-19

committee is composed of seven instructors from those programs. Washburn Tech's program review schedule requires that programs will be reviewed every five years. Documentation on the review of the Communications Department shows that program reviews result in actionable recommendations and timelines. Faculty confirmed during the visit that they are engaged in the development and review of the program review documentation. Faculty members from the School of Business provided evidence that improvements are being made based on program reviews, such as a refocusing of student outcomes from eight down to five and an increased expectation in the area of global dynamics.

The Washburn transfer policy is outlined in the undergraduate catalog. Washburn maintains a publicly available transfer guide for frequently transferred courses. Washburn also accepts courses from other Kansas institutions as outlined by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) Transfer and Articulation website. Washburn has documented processes for transferring in General Education credits and technical credits. The transfer website maintained by the Registrar (<https://www.washburn.edu/registrar/transfer.html>) outlines the process for students to appeal transfer credit decisions. Washburn University participates in the KBOR Kansas Core Outcomes Project. This project creates a statewide acceptance for transfer courses in general education. As presented in the assurance argument and verified through faculty interviews on campus, faculty are involved in establishing prerequisites and associated curricular matters.

The catalog outlines the credit awarded for prior-learning assessments including Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and DSST (DANTES). KBOR has set score recommendations for state universities. Washburn's cut points are equal to or higher than the scores identified by KBOR. In addition, the institution accepts military credit based on American Council on Education (ACE) recommendations using the student's Joint Services Transcript (JST).

Washburn uses a master syllabus, common assessments and rubrics to ensure that concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) classes are of equal quality and rigor to courses offered at Washburn University. Each CEP course has a Washburn faculty liaison who provides a written annual report on the quality of the course and instruction at each high school location offering the course. The instructors teaching CEP courses have a mixture of academic credentials, with 33 of the 53 currently meeting HLC expectations. Washburn has plans established to ensure that the remaining faculty members will meet expectations by the 2022 HLC extension deadline. During the visit, there were concerns expressed by Washburn faculty that the rigor and quality of the courses taught in CEP through Washburn were not always at the level of courses taught on campus. Washburn will want to continue to work with CEP instructors to ensure the quality of those courses are on par with the on campus offerings.

As a part of the standard hiring process, department chairs (College of Arts and Sciences) or the deans in consultation with the faculty (Schools of Applied Studies, Nursing, and Law and at Washburn Tech) set the required qualifications for positions. A review of the faculty roster shows that faculty qualifications are consistent with the Assumed Practices established by the HLC. Washburn has a process to grant exceptions by approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) based on tested experience.

The Washburn Tech Instructor Handbook outlines that instructors teaching courses within a technical program that leads to a KBOR-recognized certificate shall have either a Bachelor's degree with 48 credits in the subject areas related to their teaching field or at least a high school diploma or equivalent, a valid industry-recognized credential (if available), and a minimum of 4,000 hours of

work experience in the specific or related technical field.

Washburn maintains 27 specialized accreditations across a wide range of program offerings. A sampling of accreditations verified against the accrediting body websites showed that Washburn programs were in good standing with the specialized accreditation agencies.

The University Career Services office tracks graduates in alignment with NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers) standards and follows standard methodologies for tracking outcomes of graduates. The Career Services website provides data for the past eight cohorts of graduates. The information for the 2017-18 graduates shows a knowledge rate of 69.8% (which exceeds the NACE recommendation of 65%), with 92.1% of the graduates having positive career outcomes. In addition, Washburn Tech tracks the outcomes of all students who complete their programs and reports data as required to the state. The School of Law also tracks students separately.

Washburn has participated in the Higher Education Data Survey since 2014, to supplement institutional surveys. In this survey of Washburn alumni (excluding Tech and Law) at 1, 5, and 10 years out, Washburn data is comparable or better in most areas than the benchmark institutions.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has extensive processes in place related to student learning outcomes and student learning outcome assessment. The Washburn University Assessment Guide outlines the processes and responsibilities. At the undergraduate level, both university-level (USLO) and program-level (PSLO) student outcomes are in place. Washburn has defined USLOs for all undergraduate students in the following categories:

1. Communication
2. Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning and Literacy
3. Information Literacy and Technology
4. Critical and Creative Thinking
5. Global Citizenship, Ethics, and Diversity

USLOs were developed and adopted from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) outcomes and rubrics. Each general education course must address at least one USLO. Syllabi for general education courses identify the USLO tied to the course as evidenced by the syllabus for the Principles of Microeconomics spring 2019, where the USLO outcome of Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning is present. Washburn is utilizing direct assessment measures embedded within general education courses to assess achievement of USLOs. The institution has implemented a three-year rotating review of each USLO.

PSLO's are in place for all programs, undergraduate, graduate, law, and at Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech). Evidence is available for some programs that shows the institution is closing the assessment loop and making changes based on assessment. For example, for Diesel Technology Program Student Learning Outcome #3 (Brakes) satisfactory student outcome achievement increased from 25% to 85% over three years.

There are two separate assessment committees in place: one for Washburn and one for Washburn

Tech. These committees are comprised of faculty members and meet regularly to provide oversight on assessment progress. At Washburn, each academic program is also required to submit assessment plans to the Assessment Committee for review. Faculty members conduct annual reviews of these plans and summary results are available on the Washburn Assessment website. The 2017-18 annual review of assessment plans showed that 73% of the 78 program plans reviewed had demonstrated processes for continuous improvement (closing the loop). There are still a small number of programs (4%) that are at the beginning stages of identifying measurable outcomes. Program plan annual reports Section IV is focused on what changes the program plans to make based on the assessment results from the current and previous years.

Evidence that departments are using the feedback from assessment plans was confirmed in meetings with the faculty members of the Assessment Committee. An example cited was the Criminal Justice program. Criminal Justice restructured their curriculum to eliminate numerous special topic courses and streamline the curriculum creating clearer pathways for students and improved student learning outcomes success.

During the site visit, faculty members on the Graduate Council shared that the institution has agreed upon three common outcomes for graduate programs: communication, ethics, and critical thinking. Minutes of the Graduate Council meetings confirm these outcomes and show that the Council is still working through the implementation and assessment strategies for these outcomes. The American Bar Association in 2015 provided guidance documentation that set expectations around student learning outcomes and assessment of outcomes for accredited law programs. Washburn School of Law has adopted outcomes that align with these standards and made them publicly available on their website, as of May 10, 2017. The School of Law faculty are developing assessment and reporting strategies for their programs.

As stated in the assurance argument and confirmed during in the visit, the office of student life has established co-curricular student outcomes and is in the early stages of implementing assessment strategies. In addition they regularly conduct satisfaction and needs assessments of individual programs and initiatives.

Washburn has hired staff to assist in the monitoring of assessment outcome plans and university-level outcomes. The institution has created a culture that values assessment. The VPAA provides funding for assessment grants to encourage the development of innovative assessments of PSLOs or USLOs or the development of the knowledge base related to discipline and university-wide learning outcomes assessment. Washburn also has faculty development programs in place to develop assessment expertise within its faculty. The institution has developed a series of training videos related to assessment and includes a one and half hour assessment workshop as a part of new faculty orientation.

Washburn has modeled many of their assessment strategies and outcomes from national best-practices (e.g. AACU outcomes and rubrics, *Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience* (NASPA/ACPA), and the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education). The university is striving to use direct measures of assessment and utilizes national surveys to benchmark their institutional results.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has aligned its retention and graduation goals with the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) *Foresight 2020* document. The goal across all institutions is to increase first-time, full-time student retention and graduate rates by 10% compared to the 2010 cohort. Based on this, the first-year retention rate goal by 2020 for Washburn University bachelor students is 72.1% and the six-year graduation rate goal is 51%. The Kansas Board of Regents website, tracks the progress of all institutions. Washburn has made progress on the retention data, with the Fall 2018 entering class having a one-year retention rate of 70.1%. As reported on the Kansas Board of Regents website, over the past eight years Washburn's six-year graduation rate has fluctuated between 38% and 45% over the past eight years, with a 42.8% graduation rate for the most recent cohort (students entering Fall 2012), significantly lower than the goal of 51%.

Washburn uses the IPEDS definition for first-to-second year retention, and three-year and six-year graduation rates. The student population of focus for these are first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students, which is the majority of Washburn incoming students. Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) submits separate IPEDS data to KBOR under the Technical Colleges data. The KBOR website shows that Washburn Tech's retention rate has been within +/- 5 percentage points of the average for technical colleges in the state over the past 6 year. The most recent data reported for 2018, showed a retention rate for Washburn Tech of 61.5% compared to the technical college average of 65.2%. Since many of the programs offered at Washburn Tech are short-term programs, lasting less than a year, one year retention is not a strong indicator of success. Washburn Tech faculty and student services review class rosters at various points in time in the program. If concerns

exist, additional data is requested and intervening program improvements steps are taken. However at this time, Washburn Tech does not systematically track and report cohort short-term retention across all programs.

Washburn School of Law tracks attrition rates of students from J.D. cohorts in alignment with American Bar Association (ABA) accreditation standards. This information is available from the consumer information tab on the main webpage for the School of Law.

Washburn retention and graduation data are available via IPEDS and a website maintained by KBOR. Washburn's Strategic Analysis and Reporting Office (SAR) and the Center for Student Success and Retention (CSSR) analyze retention and graduation success data to detect trends and to identify areas that need improvement. The analysis of student retention is compiled in an annual internal retention report. Washburn tracks and analyzes success data for various student populations (e.g. first-generation, Pell-eligible, low-income students, and underrepresented racial and ethnic groups) and also associated with various Washburn programs (e.g. athletes, honors program). Washburn also participants in the Student Achievement Measure, to gain insights into tracking students who don't fit the normal pathways and definitions of the IPEDS. Retention and graduation rates analysis is included as a part of Washburn's program review process and is a required data reporting requirement for many of the specialized accreditations maintained by Washburn.

Washburn has demonstrated commitment to student success through the creation of the CSSR in 2011. The unit is staffed with seventeen full-time faculty and staff and over one hundred peer leader/mentors. The CSSR offers a broad array of student success/support programs aimed at improving retention and graduation rates, including programs for academic at-risk students, tutoring, a social worker, and a staff member to work with veterans. The institution has invested in software systems to aid in their success efforts, such as Degree Works and EAB Navigate. Washburn has also developed a new onboarding course for undergraduate students, WU 101 - Washburn Experience, that focuses on student success as students transition into the institution.

Washburn is proactive in seeking external funds to support retention efforts. Washburn received a Title III grant in 2019 for \$1.646 million for Strengthening Advising and Academic Resources. The components included: 1) strengthening instructional support services to better coordinate advising and instructional support services (tutoring, supplemental instruction) in an effort to reduce poor performance in remedial and gateway courses and 2) develop a co-requisite mathematics course to increase the percentage of students successfully completing developmental and college-level math classes. The grant will allow Washburn to hire 5 positions (Project Director, 3 student success coaches, and Math Lab Coordinator) to meet their goals of improving retention. The Math department is working to initiate a co-requisite model, to address remedial math needs. The Dean stated that 2 math faculty will be assigned to the Math Lab.

Washburn Tech has a one-stop student services Advantage Center to serve the certificate seeking and dual enrollment students at their locations. The center provides tutoring support, computer labs, and career/employment search assistance. The center also provides referrals and connects students to community resources, such as child care options.

Through documentation provided in the assurance argument and discussions with faculty/staff on campus during the visit the institution was able to provide examples of how they are using data to change programs and processes to improve student success. The new programs created within the CSSR are a direct outcome of analyzing success data of distinct populations and providing differentiated resources to support those students. Many of these efforts are too new to show impact

on graduation; however initial indications are promising. For example in the first cohort (fall 2017) for the Ichabod Ignite program, the most academically at-risk remedial students, 17 of the 39 students (or 44%) were enrolled at either Washburn or Washburn Tech in spring 2019. Student Life efforts in the areas of food insecurity and counseling are based on data and aimed at improving student success.

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

Washburn has established a strong culture of assessment across campus. Program level outcomes assessments are in place for all programs (including undergraduate, graduate, Washburn Tech, and the School of Law). In addition, university level outcomes are in place for undergraduates with embedded course outcomes through the general education courses. Graduate programs have agreed on three common outcomes and student life has also identified co-curricular outcomes.

Washburn has extensive standardized processes and reporting requirements for program reviews and student outcomes assessment. Washburn has recently aligned program review timelines to create efficiencies for accredited programs. Washburn has dedicated staff to analyze and monitor the implementation of these processes. Faculty committees are engaged in assessment and were able to provide evidence that they are using assessment data to improve their programs.

Washburn has committed significant resources in the area of student success (including the creation of CSSR and adoption of EAB and Degree Works). Washburn has seen success at increasing the retention rates of first-time, full-time students, and is now adding focused efforts on addressing six-year graduation rates.

While there are still a few areas for improvement (e.g. assessment of newly identified common graduate outcomes, co-curricular outcomes, and outcomes at Washburn School of Law; and systematic tracking, reporting, and analysis of short-term programs at Washburn Tech), overall Washburn has demonstrated a strong commitment to student success and assessment that involves faculty and staff across the institution.

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

Evidence

Washburn University (Washburn) operates through funding from five revenue sources. The largest percentage of revenue is from student tuition and fees (59%), local sales tax (20%) and from Kansas State Funds (13%) as identified by the FY19 budget. These revenue streams provide a sound basis for funding the general operating expenses for the University. Washburn University is designated as a municipal university allowing for the receipt of sales tax revenue of which part of the revenue is earmarked for capital projects. Washburn Institute of Technology (WashburnTech) operates with three primary revenue sources. These include student tuition and fees (36%), technical state aid secondary (31%) and technical state aid post-secondary (27%) per the FY19 budget. The Washburn University Foundation, a separate legal entity, provides financial support for student scholarships, faculty, programs and facilities. In FY19, the foundation support amounted to approximately \$880,000 or one percent of the total university budget.

To confirm that Washburn University is currently a stable entity, evidence provides a cash-on-hand balance to cover three to five months of expenses. State appropriation funding is always a concern for Washburn as expressed by the senior leadership and the Washburn Board of Regents. There is no

immediate indication that state funding will increase significantly anytime in the near future.

Washburn strives to maintain adequate faculty and staff to support student learning needs. Evidence shows that employment has increased over the past ten years. IPEDS data provided in the addendum reflects relatively steady employment trends for Washburn University. Slight increases were noted over time to reflect the changing complexion of the campus. For FY08, full-time faculty were reported at 265 and increased to 273 for FY18. Full-time staff were reported at 489 in FY08 and decreased slightly to 461 in FY18. Washburn Tech reflects significant increases in their campus staffing. The same IPEDS data show 22 full-time faculty in FY08 compared to 61 in FY17. Full-time staff were reported as 25 in FY08 and increased to 44 in FY18. Both of these increases are due to the increase in enrollment and new programs being offered at Washburn Tech.

In 2013 a campus master plan, with the help of a consultant, was prepared and presented to the campus community along with the Washburn Board of Regents. This plan lined out possible strategies for ten plus years looking at all aspects of the campus. A utilization of space study along with a housing demand study were also compiled. Results show that the campus has a student capacity possibility of 9,700 individuals.

Tours were taken of both Washburn University and Washburn Tech during the accreditation visit. Overall the buildings, grounds, parking lots, sidewalks, and infrastructure were in very good condition. With the exception of Carnegie Hall, the oldest building on campus and a building that is not ADA accessible, the buildings are well maintained. Survey data provided to the Team referenced Carnegie Hall and challenges with the building not being handicapped accessible. This was confirmed while on campus through conversations with faculty and staff. No immediate plans are in place to renovate the building that was said to be on the National Historical Register. Cost estimates are projected to be several million dollars to bring the building up to ADA compliance. When asked, administration confirmed that classes would be relocated if a handicapped individual needed access to the building. At some point in the future senior leadership and the Washburn Board of Regents will need to address the future of the facility. Some comments leaned towards relocating offices as space became available across campus. Additional buildings toured on the Washburn campus included Bennett Computer Center, Lincoln Hall, Washburn Village, Living Learning Center, White Concert Hall, Phi Delta Theta, Student Recreation & Wellness Center, Lee Arena, KBI Forensic Science Center, Morgan Hall, Benton Hall, Henderson Learning Resources Center, Mabee Library, Stoffer Science Hall, Petro Allied Health Center, Art Building, and the Law School.

At the time of the campus visit, groundbreaking was being planned for a new indoor athletic facility. Work on this \$20 million facility began several years ago along with fundraising efforts. Evidence uploaded to the addendum provides a chronological review of Washburn board minutes reflecting progress towards fundraising goals, board approval to move forward with the project, bidding/awarding updates, and architect renderings of the facility. Letters referencing the project were documented from the Washburn Student Government Association and the Faculty Senate. Funding for the project will be from three sources consisting of fundraised money, bond proceeds, and use of university reserves.

A separate tour was taken of the Washburn Tech East and West Campuses. The cosmetology building was toured at the east location. At the west campus buildings and program homes toured included locomotive diesel, auto technology, building technology, climate and energy, and CNA/phlebotomy. Noteworthy is the fact that at the Washburn Tech campus over \$4.5 million has been invested in renovations allowing for new academic programs to be offered. Training centers were created and enhanced for five corporations, a medical simulation center, and a cosmetology

program. These resources were confirmed during the campus tour.

A Technology Strategic Plan was developed in 2011 as a roadmap for technology improvements. This plan is overseen by the Chief Information Officer (CIO). Quarterly reports are generated to show progress in working toward stated goals. During the campus tours, classrooms and laboratories were seen where technology was in place for faculty, staff, and students. Discussion heard during the open forums and many of the focus groups confirmed that a long-term replacement plan is not in place. Funds are allocated for the initial purchase of technology, but no master plan exists to show the time or funding source for replacement. Overtime, the technology budget was increased several hundred thousand dollars campus wide.

In 2017, a new CIO was hired by Washburn University. During the past two years, the technology strategic plan at Washburn University and Washburn Tech has focused on three areas: 1) new enterprise software purchases related to student engagement (recruitment, success, and assessment), 2) upgrades to the campus infrastructure (routers, switches, servers, and lab technology, for example technology at Washburn Tech such as the simulation lab); and 3) campus equipment (PCs and classroom technology). During interviews with the technology staff, the Team learned that classroom and faculty/staff upgrades were on a seven year plan. The CIO confirmed that due to the replacement of Windows 7 machines the plan has been upgraded to five years for PCs, and the university is working on a classroom refresh plan currently. Servers, switches, and routers were replaced due to the need to increase “coverage” and numbers of people on campus who utilize technology. Currently, all servers are less than two years old and a replacement plan has been created.

The CIO and Information Technology Services (ITS) team also revealed that the requirement that all technology purchases (software) must receive ITS approval as well as enterprise software being moved to the cloud has improved service on campus. Software focused on recruitment of students, student success and advising have been purchased. These purchases will help meet the needs of off campus students. New security software to protect the campus has also been purchased. Web services were centralized to address consistency, ADA and UDL requirements, and service to users (extended hours of support for students). The Team learned that these updates are in the early stages, and the ITS is working on a replacement plan for all new technologies that will align with best practices across higher education.

Washburn University conducts comprehensive academic and administrative reviews every five years. Policies show that the academic guidelines were last modified in 2011, but are currently under review by the academic unit while the administrative unit guidelines were last modified in the summer of 2017. Evidence was provided to show FY17 academic program reviews for Communication Studies Department, Department of Social Work and Mathematics and Statistics. These reviews included focus on following the mission of the institution as well as student learning outcomes. A FY13 to FY15 document was provided in the assurance argument that tied long-term and short-term progress back to budget implications.

Washburn University provided copies of the most recent, as well as prior years external audits. These records confirm that no funds are used for superordinate entity activities. At Washburn, nearly 65% of expenses and at Washburn Tech, nearly 70% of expenses were spent on instruction, academic support, and student services.

Discussions referenced decision making at all levels within the organization. The mission leads decisions as it relates to the strategic planning process for Washburn University. The mission was also at center of budget decisions at all levels. One example of Washburn University working

towards meeting the intent of the mission involved applying for and receiving a Title III grant in 2019 for \$1.646 million for Strengthening Advising and Academic Resources. The components included: 1) Strengthening Instructional Support Services to better coordinate advising and instructional support services (tutoring, supplemental instruction) in an effort to reduce poor performance in remedial and gateway courses and 2) develop a co-requisite mathematics course – to increase the percentage of students successfully completing developmental and college-level math classes. The grant will allow Washburn to hire 5 positions (Project Director, 3 student success coaches, and Math Lab Coordinator) to meet their goals of improving retention. The Math department is working to initiate a co-requisite model. The Dean stated that 2 math faculty will be assigned to the Math Lab. The University has also purchased software (EAB, Navigate) to intervene early with low performing students.

A detailed document is available to assist supervisors and hiring committees on the established process and procedures in place at Washburn University. A New Employee Orientation Manual is given to all employees and they are invited to attend an orientation session shortly after being hired. The human resources staff coordinates various types of professional development training for staff. Evidence included shows for FY18 a variety of in-house training programs with the highest participation pertaining to topics of preventing sexual harassment, StrengthsFinder 2.0, and preventing employee discrimination. The budget provides funding for meeting and conference travel both in Kansas as well as out-of-state opportunities. Evidence uploaded to the addendum highlights such training as the Federal Student Aid Conference, Ellucian Live, and the National Association of College and University Business Officers Annual Meeting. Washburn University offers a tuition assistance program for full-time employees that have been employed for more than six months. From FY07 through FY16 more than \$1.1 million dollars has been spent on this valuable fringe benefit program assisting 193 employees.

The budgeting process at Washburn University begins with a meeting of university administrators. Factors taken into consideration leading into a new budget cycle include reviewing the status of faculty salaries, various revenue income stream, enrollment projections, building projects and the university debt ratios. Unit level administrators also have input for their respective areas to include salary, capital, operating, equipment and technology needs. These factors all play a crucial role in Washburn budget preparation work. The next step in the process takes the proposed budget to the budget/finance committee. This group also has a priority directive including salary increases, mandates, growth requirements, and the support of continued operations and strategic initiatives. The final step after the budget drafts are reviewed by the budget/finance committee, is approval by the Washburn Board of Regents followed by public hearings. This includes the budget for both Washburn University and Washburn Tech. Confirmation of this process was received during the open forums held on campus as well as a meeting with the VP for Administration and Treasurer, Controller, and Director of Budget, Planning and Analysis.

Checks and balances are in place to help monitor both the anticipated revenue budget for the fiscal year as well as the expenses that occur during the year. The Budget Office is tasked with monitoring the revenue with the three main sources being student tuition and fees, state appropriations, and local sales tax. If any of these trend below projections, immediate action is taken starting with the finance committee. Each department administrator with budget responsibility has access to monitor their expenses through the Banner software system. The Budget Director reviews various departmental expenditures looking for any trends or variances throughout the fiscal year. Policies are in place for mid-year budget transfers. In an effort to be more transparent and efficient, an Associate Budget Director position was added and filled during summer of 2017. A policy is in place allowing budget

administrators the authority to reallocate savings from vacant positions or retirements. Examples of funds reallocated include salary adjustments, travel and operating or capital needs. Final approval must be granted by the university president. During FY16 and FY17, evidence shows faculty and staff positions that were part of an early retirement initiative. Total university savings were over \$1 million. During interviews on campus, many of these early retirement savings are still being realized through budget savings.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) is governed by a nine-member Board of Regents (WBOR) that are appointed through the city, county, and state. One of their primary responsibilities is to ensure the financial integrity of the institution. Through visits with the WBOR and evidence of board minutes posted on-line, these requirements are being fulfilled specifically as they relate to budgets and audits. Being a municipal university and receiving local sales tax revenue, certain restrictions on spending those funds fall to the university administration and ultimately the WBOR. Examples of financial items to keep separate include funding for Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) programs and tax revenue received from the city of Topeka. External financial audits confirm the appropriate budgeting and spending of such funds is happening.

The assurance argument and additional documentation provided evidence of orientation sessions for new board members. Topics covered included explanation of bylaws and policies along with presentations on academic and fiscal affairs. Enrollment management materials are also included in the half-day orientation meeting. During the lunch with the WBOR, several members referenced the orientation program and felt the program was extremely beneficial. In addition, board meetings include updates by university administrators on informational items of interest to the WBOR including the campus master plan, social media, emergency response plan, and STEM outreach. At the present time no students serve on the board. During conversations, the board confirmed that student representatives, along with faculty and staff, regularly attend board meetings and provide input on topics being discussed. The WBOR has a long history of attending professional development meetings. One example includes attending the annual Association of Governing Boards conference. Evidence provided shows that from 2012 to 2017, between 6 and 8 board members attended each year.

The WBOR works with the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) to ensure academic coordination of programs and course credit transferability. Washburn University actively participates on state-wide

meetings involving the council of presidents and chief academic officers. Also noteworthy, one state regent is also appointed to serve on the WBOR.

During the open forums, faculty and staff acknowledged being aware of board meetings. They also discussed seeing board members at various campus activities and visiting with them on timely university topics.

Washburn has a clear administrative structure in place as evidenced by the organizational chart of the university. A number of organized bodies and committees are in place across Washburn University and Washburn Tech in an effort to show clear and transparent governance. The Faculty Senate, comprised of 35 members from Washburn University, meets on a regular basis as confirmed by minutes posted on the University web site. During FY18, the senate held 11 meetings discussing and addressing a multitude of topics impacting faculty teaching and student learning. Elected members serve a two year term. Faculty from Washburn Tech are not represented on the Faculty Senate.

The Staff Council, comprised of 16 members, represents exempt as well as non-exempt employees at Washburn. The council makes recommendations on policy and campus activities to the administration. Minutes located on the Staff Council web site reflect eight meetings held in calendar year 2018 where a variety of topics were covered reflecting the interests of staff including employee recognition ceremony, health insurance updates, employee handbook policy discussions and guest speakers such as the Chief of Police. Elected members serve a two year term and are comprised of staff from both Washburn University and Washburn Tech.

The Student Government Association at Washburn (WSGA) is strong and engaged. Membership is comprised 34 elected senators, five of which are incoming freshman elected each fall term. The purpose of WSGA is to represent and act in the interest of Washburn students. Minutes from the web site reflect discussions concerning higher education day, homecoming activities, and legislation impacting campus clubs and organizations.

A number of committees are in place to help guide policy decision across the institution. Evidence provided show various minutes for both academic and non-academic areas. Examples for faculty committees include general education, major research grants, and interdisciplinary studies. Non-academic examples include assessment, library, and technology steering committees. Washburn Tech also has several committee's that represent their campus. The assurance argument listed seven committees but review of the Washburn Tech web site shows eight committees are represented. Examples include assessment, safety, and program review committees. No evidence in the assurance argument was provided or on the web site to reflect meeting agenda's or minutes.

Washburn University has several elements in place to help set policy and review processes across the campus. University by-laws provide a system for faculty to bring forward academic requirements and processes to the president for review or recommendation and ultimately to the WBOR for final approval. This process applies to both campuses.

Washburn University and Washburn Tech both utilize advisory committees to provide feedback on academic programs. During the open forums, several areas from both campuses shared examples of using feedback to help strengthen academic programs. In addition to the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council and the Student Government Association all meet regularly and provide constant feedback on programs and activities that impact all of the campus community.

Both Washburn University and Washburn Tech have structured curriculum development and approval processes in place that start with the discipline faculty members. During the visit, faculty confirmed that the faculty curriculum committees are involved in reviewing both the curriculum and the financial pro formas when approving new program offerings. The assessment committee that reviews program outcomes and recommends potential program changes includes the president of the student government.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has a well-defined mission and vision statement. In using these as guiding principles, decisions involving budgets and personnel are carefully reviewed. The budgeting process described earlier outlines the various levels of input, discussion, and final decision making for the campus. Internal documents prepared to also help steer the decision process include the completed strategic plans Washburn 150 and Vision 2022, a campus master plan, and a university technology plan. This process was confirmed several times during the accreditation visit in meetings and public forums. Several examples were given where advisory committees of non-university employees provided recommendations for improvements.

Examples of academic programs added at all levels (doctoral, master, bachelor) since the last accreditation team was on campus include the Doctor of Nursing Practice, Master in Accountancy, and Forensics Concentrations. Non academic programs added include the Center for Student Success and Retention and the First Year Experience. A new dormitory and dining facility were also built on campus. All of these examples support the mission and priorities of Washburn University and were considered as part of the budgeting process. In reviewing other parts of the assurance argument, Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) appears to also be allocating resources to meet the needs of their unique population. As referenced earlier, expansion of programs has occurred over the past few years.

Washburn University uses assessment and planning as part of an on-going process. Student assessment analysis exposed several areas of need across the campus. As discussed during interviews while on campus, these needs were brought forward during the budget process. The assurance argument provided an example of pro-forma calculations of cost and benefits. In the area of student services, an additional social worker was hired to help provide relief to a taxed counseling center. Another example included student survey results identifying some food insecurity issues within the

student population. This resulted in the re-opening of a food pantry on campus. The Washburn Student Government Association switched from a homecoming king and queen to a neutral gender homecoming court. Observations on campus revealed a number of gender neutral restrooms. Feedback during the open forums and interviews confirmed that all new initiatives come through the yearly budget process and tie back to goals of the institution. Assessment data is also used to help tie these requests together.

Committee and advisory boards are in place to involve all stakeholders in discussion of policy recommendation for changes and upgrades. Examples of such groups include business and industry as well as health care, allowing for input about the needs for graduates to fit into the workplace. Alumni also play a critical role in helping provide input for changes. The assurance argument provided evidence of alumni survey data, but no evidence was given as to any direct specific changes that have occurred based on this data.

Washburn University involves current students in the decision making processes. Examples include input from the Washburn Student Government Association following their meetings. The University President also hosts dinners with various students once a month to get feedback on campus priorities. Student Life administrators seek student input using both informal and formal mechanisms to ensure the institution is meeting student expectations and needs. Students are included on some standing committees with faculty; the Assessment Committee is one example. Student opinions are very important to the senior leadership.

The Washburn Board of Regents (WBOR) stated that enrollment management and diversity are the two main focus areas of the board at the current time. Both of these areas were also highlighted during discussions with faculty and staff on campus in an effort to help strengthen the campus community.

At Washburn University, the Vice President for Administration and Treasurer is responsible for monitoring various elements that impact university budgets and spending. One document provided in the assurance argument that helps guide these decisions was a Tuition and Fee Report (FY17). Contained in this detailed report are tuition and fee analysis from the current year to the prior year along with tuition and fee comparison to other Kansas institutions. Both resident and non-resident rates are compared. For auxiliary operations an analysis of room and board costs are presented. Other academic documents that help assist with decision making is a program review summary prepared by instructional units and a strategic planning document that helps track academic changes over time such as staffing, operations, and equipment changes.

Evidence provided in the report reflect that physical space is available on the Washburn University campus to add more students and classes. In discussion with faculty and staff, some academic programs would have to rely on adjunct faculty to teach additional classes. Other concerns about expanding too rapidly centered around keeping the current faculty to student ratio which is described as being one of Washburn's strong recruitment features.

Another planning document provided in the assurance argument was an enrollment report prepared after the fall 2017 enrollment period closed. Data included in the document for both Washburn University and Washburn Tech includes headcount, credit hours generated (by college/school) as well as comprehensive data broken into various demographics. Even though these documents were referenced in the argument and during meetings on campus, no clear evidence was provided to demonstrate how these various documents help to guide a strategic enrollment strategy or long-term financial decisions of the institution.

The university employs a lobbyist to interact with the state legislature. Campus interviews with senior leadership as well as the WBOR confirm the positive impact of this investment. Board minutes reflect reports to the board on updates concerning interaction with state legislators on the topic of funding.

The assurance argument establishes a timeline for strategic planning beginning with Washburn 150 approved by the WBOR in 2010. This plan was followed by Vision 2022 approved by the WBOR in 2015. Following discussions on campus, the Team learned that a new plan had been discussed and developed. Upon review of the December 7, 2018 WBOR agenda, an approval item was submitted outlining a timeline for the new proposal. The process appeared to begin with an executive staff retreat where members brainstormed about university goals for the next three to five years. The agenda noted each member of the executive staff held sessions for their areas to discuss the draft and provide feedback. This included Academic Deans and Faculty Senate. The plan was presented with no financial implications. The plan was approved by the Washburn Board of Regents.

During open forums, staff confirmed they had been asked to provide feedback to the document, however, during the same session a faculty member indicated that no input was solicited. A search of minutes of the Faculty Senate for September 17th, 2018, through December 3rd, 2018, showed that during the VPAA update there was general discussion of the progress of this new strategic plan and the university's core values, including work groups at the general faculty meeting. Yet, minutes stated that no changes could be made to the plan and there is no evidence that it was ever presented at the General Faculty meeting per minutes of the meetings in November, 2018. In minutes of February 4, 2019, Faculty Senate meeting the VPAA directed that implementation plans for strategic initiatives from the Deans would be due in the Summer of 2019. Staff Council minutes provide no evidence that this strategic plan was presented or discussed with that group. Student Government Association minutes did not reflect any discussion during their meetings.

The development of the two most recent strategic plans were not outlined in the assurance argument and it was difficult to piece an activity outline together from minutes and agendas as to what actually happened to develop and approve the newest strategic plan. As a result, the Team could not validate whether these follow-up strategic plans were developed through a deliberative process. It is critical that strategic planning initiatives include systematic deliberative processes that include all constituencies.

During the open faculty forum, several comments were made concerning adding new programs over the past few years. Washburn University might consider the support structures needed to develop programs in new areas. One example of this growth was in graduate programs. If strategic plans are to continue to grow in that area, leadership needs to consider the implications on faculty workload (takes more time to work with graduate students on creative components, etc.) and the potential needs for policies/structures to support graduate students and graduate faculty in areas of recruitment, marketing, research support, etc. Washburn Information Technology Services noted their growth in graduate education students is significant and this requires more support services.

A multi-facet structure is in place to help review and enhance technology across the Washburn University campus community. The Chief Information Officer has the primary responsibility to keep abreast of changes involving new and trending technology. This position relies on the Washburn Information Systems Advisory Committee and the Faculty Information Technology Advisory Committee to provide guidance and input based on their experience in the classroom and with outside constituents. Recommended enhancements to technology follow the normal budget cycle and

process described earlier in the assurance argument. The CIO, new to the position, acknowledges that a long-term technology replacement plan is needed to include such items as faculty computers and student labs. Some faculty indicated their computer had not been replaced in the past 6 to 8 years. Discussions suggested these replacement plans should be part of the master information technology plan.

Demographic shifts and their impact on enrollments are always an important consideration for Washburn University. The assurance argument highlights several new academic programs that were added in an effort to increase credit hours/revenue. Evidence shows that undergraduate enrollment has declined in the past several years while graduate credit hours has slightly increased.

Conversations with campus representatives involved with enrollment management shared that informal written plans exist within respective departments. Examples include graduate programs, the School of Law, international students, undergraduate programs as well as Washburn Tech. Currently, there is no comprehensive plan that pulls all program enrollment plans into one document. Also, no formal committee is in place that is devoted strictly to enrollment management efforts.

International enrollment provides an example of diversity within the student body. Washburn University has a population of international students on campus. Numbers range from a low of 123 in the fall of 2007 to a high of 345 in the fall of 2015. Academically several international/global components have been added to the curriculum in various departments. One example referenced involved upper-level business students that had the opportunity to travel internationally to China and Brazil following project work. Scholarship funding was available to help defray costs of the trip.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) has mechanisms in place to track and review various operational performances across campus. These occur at various levels including at the departmental level, unit level, campus level, and external level. Specific examples included in the assurance argument and discussed at length on campus during the visit reinforce the question of reviewing and analyzing performance data. Departmental level examples include the Faculty Annual Activity Report highlighting teaching, scholarship, and service as well as course embedded assessment reports. Unit level activity reports are submitted by academic heads along with annual assessment reports that show student learning outcomes. Program reviews are performed on a regular basis. Campus level reports are grouped into several different, but important, areas from across the campus. In addition to assessment reports, reports on enrollment, retention, graduation, tuition/fees, faculty salaries, degrees awarded, alumni and common data sets are generated.

Washburn has employed the use of external consultants to analyze distinct aspects of the the institution, such as student housing demand, admissions, space utilization, information technology and marketing. Even though each of these reports exists independently, there was no documentation that showed how these reports fed into any comprehensive strategic planning.

Financial external audits along with NSSE results, HERI faculty surveys and a financial aid loan servicer snapshot also provide key information for the campus community. An example of an external level interaction would be with the Kansas Board of Regents as they review performance agreements and dual credit course reports.

Washburn University reports a strong Composite Financial Index (CFI). This measurement of financial health reflects an indicator of "above the zone" for composite scores of 1.1 to 10.0. For fiscal years 2014 through 2018, Washburn has a high of 7.56 and a low of 3.16. These shifts reflect various factors involving revenue, expenses, and investments as confirmed by yearly financial audits.

Washburn University and Washburn Tech both exhibit evidence of advancing forward the mission and vision of the institution year after year. Senior leadership in cooperation with an active Washburn Board of Regents makes conscientious and fiscally driven decisions to guide the teaching and learning of the student body. An example of using data and assessment to improve the institution and student success was provided by faculty on campus as the rationale for moving the

Ichabod Ignite program from Washburn Tech to the main Washburn University location. When offered at Washburn Tech the success rate of students continuing on into Washburn University was about 15%. Since integrating the Ichabod Ignite program into the Center for Student Success and Retention within the library, 44% of the students are being retained to the end of the second year. Further, to address student needs and provide increased long-term revenue streams, the institution invested in creating the new Lincoln residence hall connected to a state-of-the art dining facility. Occupancy of this new student housing unit is 92%. This facility provides an excellent opportunity for student learning and residence life to mature together. The institution looks for opportunities and efficiencies to be gained through partnerships between Washburn University and Washburn Tech and Washburn University and the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI). Examples include 1) The creation of new programs to attract students in the area of forensic anthropology, digital forensics, forensic investigation and forensic chemistry, and 2) Health programs at Washburn University and Washburn Tech collaborating on SIM facilities and curriculum.

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

Washburn University (Washburn) and Washburn Institute of Technology (Washburn Tech) use a variety of revenue streams to fund academic and support operations. This includes both human resources and physical facilities for student learning. Technology infrastructure is also in place to assist with this learning and working environment. Washburn and Washburn Tech operate under a transparent budget process and policies are in place to review expenses for both audit and planning purposes. Washburn University has a governing board that is engaged with the on-going activities of the institution.

As part of this review the Team found several areas that need to be strengthened to position the campus for meeting future challenges. Washburn has kept pace with technological changes but lacks a comprehensive master plan that includes replacement data and cost estimates for these expenditures. While enrollment management plans exist on campus, they are spread across colleges, schools and programs. A comprehensive enrollment management plan would benefit the institution in addressing future enrollment and retention issues. Further, the creation of an enrollment management committee that meets regularly to review historical data, external/internal variables and provide input in the development of strategic directions and goals would provide a more comprehensive enrollment management planning process. Finally, strategic planning requires transparency and involvement of all campus constituencies. In future strategic planning processes Washburn needs to clarify and publicly acknowledge the status of the strategic plan. This process should be well documented so that external reviewers can easily verify the process.

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	
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	
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	
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	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
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	

Review Summary

Conclusion

During the last ten years Washburn University has entered the Open Pathway program. After its last 10 year accreditation visit they completed a Quality Initiative Project that involved the creation of the Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning. During the last ten years the institution has been joined by a technical school (Washburn Institute of Technology) and a number of certificates and graduate degree programs have been approved. They have also added a doctoral program in Nurse Practitioner. Distance education has been embraced by the campus as more programs design courses and degrees for the online learner. The institutions successful and historic School of Law has now had the avenue of online education opened for them by the American Bar Association. As all of higher education finds it necessary to reach further and further for its students, Washburn University is expanding in every direction. It has placed tremendous resources in most of its support areas and is looking for ways to enhance its infrastructure. Washburn University has some unique opportunities before it and it seems ready to take advantage of all of them.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met

Sanctions Recommendation

No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Eligible to choose

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the [Federal Compliance Overview](#) for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

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 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 team report.

Submission Instructions

Federal Compliance reviewer: Email this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* in an editable format to the team chair. The team chair's email address is provided in the Assurance System.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the HLC staff liaison for review and then to the institution for corrections of errors of fact. Submit the final worksheets to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review:

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: Karen L. Kirkendall

I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

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:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - 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:

As per the Credit Hours review form, Washburn meets HLC requirements.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to be 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:

Washburn has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints. As it explains in detail, Washburn has different processes through different departments for handling student complaints depending on the type of complaint. More specifically, the handling of academic complaints begins at the department level and proceeds as necessary through the academic dean and finally to the office of the vice president for academic affairs, an appeal process is provided. Student life complaints are handled by the Associate Vice President for Student Life; enrollment complaints by the Student One Stop; financial issues by the Business Office; concerns regarding troubling, disruptive, or threatening behaviors by the University Behavioral Assessment Team; student disability concerns by the University Diversity and Inclusion

Office; and complaints regarding discrimination, harassment, or sexual violence by the Equal Opportunity Director. Students are provided with information regarding outside agencies which can deal with their complaints, if they are not addressed in a satisfactory manner by the University. These include the Higher Learning Commission, the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) state portal agency, the Attorney General's Office, and the Office for Civil Rights. This information is provided on the Student Life web page, in the Faculty Handbook, and in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

It has appended (Appendix C) data on student complaints since the university's last comprehensive evaluation: FY12-FY17 disaggregated by grade, faculty, transfer credit, course scheduling, program dismissal, and equal opportunity appeals. It has identified patterns of unusually high numbers for grade appeals, faculty conduct, and sexual harassment and sexual violence. In each case the number of appeals is included and the time it took to render a decision.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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.
 - 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:

Washburn appropriately discloses transfer policies to students and the public including information concerning the criteria it uses in making transfer decisions. Appendix D provides links to relevant information provided in the Undergraduate Catalog, on a general transfer webpage, on the Registrar’s transfer webpage, and on an International Student Transfer page. Information on a variety of different circumstances is provided, as well as a detailed explanation of the review process involved: “How Your Credits Transfer.” Appendix E lists the university’s articulation agreements and details the transfer policies in each.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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:

Washburn verifies the identity of its students in its distance programs and courses in taking exams and submitting assignments, while protecting student privacy. It details how it uses the following systems to verify student identity and protect student privacy in various situations: CAS authentication, Luminis 5 (branded MyWashburn), and Desire2Learn Brightspace. Instructors have the option of requiring the use of Respondus Monitor through the LockDown Browser for their exams. A Respondus Monitor exam creates a video via webcam of the student taking an exam. Accompanying this recording are still images of the student’s face and their photo identification, such as a driver’s license or Washburn iCard. The use of Respondus, Respondus LockDown Browser, and Respondus Monitor are all integrated through the learning management system Desire2Learn, so only the instructor and the student themselves can see the results.

No fees are charged to the student for test proctoring except the cost of a webcam if the student does not already have one.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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:
 - **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.

- **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.)
- **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.
- **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.
- **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 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.)
- **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.
- **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.)

- **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*).
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:

As further explained below, Washburn adequately addresses all of the above categories in its filing in its responses to specific questions and/or in its appendices, as appropriate. All information is current and no matters of concern relative to federal compliance are noted in any of the reports. Pointing to some key issues:

Washburn’s Title IV program was recertified on January 22, 2014 by the United States Department of Education. This certification remains effective through December 31, 2019.

The most recent Department of Education Title IV program review occurred in August of 2002. It focused on Washburn's procedures for independent appeals, but the onsite visit produced no significant findings. There have been no audits since HLC's last comprehensive evaluation, and there are no current limitations, suspensions, termination actions, fines, letters of credit or heightened monitoring.

Washburn complies with the federal annual single audit act. Over the past three years, two findings related to processing of financial aid were reported by Rubin Brown on the OMB Circular A-133 audited financial statements. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017, no findings were reported. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2016 and June 30, 2015, Brown noted a deficiency with the timeliness of exit counseling materials provided to graduating students. In response to these findings, Washburn created and implemented corrective action plans to address and amend this deficiency.

The U.S. Department of Education has not recently conducted a program review or inspection at Washburn. Therefore, the University has no findings which would subject it to fines, penalties, or heightened surveillance. Audit findings related to an A-133 review of Washburn are discussed in the General Program Responsibilities section of its filing. It appears that Washburn is financially healthy. The composite financial index scores for the past three years are provided, and they show that they are above the level necessitating HLC concern.

As shown in the above table, Washburn University's three-year cohort default rate for FFEL and Direct Loans has remained below the Departmental threshold for the three most recent cohorts. Washburn does not directly participate in private loans.

Taken as a group, Washburn provides ample data in its filing (and publishes in appropriate locations available to the public) data and information on campus crime, athletic participation and financial aid, equity and athletics, satisfactory academic progress, and attendance policies. It does note that in 2013 it entered into a consortial agreement with six community colleges and technical colleges, which was approved by HLC. But that that agreement was dissolved in 2016.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

Required Information for Students and the Public

(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

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:

Washburn publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on its programs, fees, and policies. It has included copies of this information, as published in most cases, in Appendix H. The Team has verified that this information is included in the university’s course catalogs and student handbook and on its website.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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:
 - 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:

As noted above, and as verified by the Team, Washburn publishes timely and accurate information on all of the topics noted above in its catalogs and student handbook, as well as in its brochures and recruiting materials. It publishes a list of accrediting bodies, including HLC, with appropriate and up-to-date information. (See the universities filing questions 28-31 for links and Appendix R for further details).

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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:

Washburn appears to collect ample student outcome data, and to use it effectively in making decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, and institutional effectiveness. It uses information from College Scorecard but also several other sources in evaluating the university's retention, completion, and loan repayment rates.

As to Student Learning Outcomes, Washburn explains that it “articulates student learning outcomes (SLOs) at multiple levels”: institutional, program, and course SLOs; SLOs for experiential learning opportunities; and SLOs for co-curricular programs. It also provides ample information as to what is involved, how it is done, and how it makes that data available to instructors, department chairs, deans, and in summary form, annually, to all faculty and administrators on the assessment website.

Washburn collects Course-Embedded University SLOs (USLOs) in a five-year summary report, which is made available online.

University-wide testing of general education outcomes for targeted populations is completed on a three-year rotating schedule, with the most current testing results published. University SLOs (USLOs) are supported by clearly articulated Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) in academic programs. These PSLOs are communicated to students and others in the appropriate course catalogs. An Assessment Report is submitted annually for each program that contains assessment results as compared to thresholds identified in the plan, evaluation of results by faculty and stakeholders, anticipated changes to the curriculum or the assessment plan, and responses to previous comments by the assessment committee.

Each summer, licensure pass rates are obtained by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs for the past year, compiled into a summary report, and posted on the Washburn web page. Career Services sends a survey to all graduating students after each semester and the summer session concerning career status, next destination, salary, and other information about their Washburn experience. The results of the survey are compiled and posted by academic year on their webpage. Strategic Analysis and Reporting posts Retention and Graduation Rates. Washburn reports that use of student learning outcomes data at both the university-wide and program-specific levels as well as licensure pass rates, retention/graduation rates, and graduate tracking informs strategic planning needs for faculty, infrastructure, and technology, and provides the foundation for the evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

While the College Scorecard link is available to students on the Consumer Right to Know web page, Washburn University does not currently use the College Scorecard to review federal metrics regarding student outcome data. However, as concern of national loan default rates and average loan indebtedness rises, Washburn University reports having attempted to provide better financial education and intervention to students. Through partnership with the i3 Group, a default prevention and intervention servicer, and creation of a Financial Literacy Coordinator position, the Financial Aid Office has begun to focus efforts on improving Washburn students’ financial understanding and health.

To measure the efforts of these new programs and their effects, the Financial Aid Office uses information gathered from: the university’s Common Data Set, IPEDS, ABA Surveys, Servicer Snapshot Reports, and other sources.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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 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:

Washburn makes student outcome data available in several locations including its website. See, for example, its Strategic Analysis and Reporting page.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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.
 - 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:

Washburn posts a list of its professional, governmental, and other accrediting agencies on its website. For purposes of this assessment, it has included copies of the most recent correspondence in each case, including HLC that indicates the accreditations are current without any sanctions or major concerns.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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 appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

- 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.
 - 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 evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Washburn has included a list of the various places where it notified potential stakeholders of HLC’s pending visit and review and issued a call for comments. It has included copies or scripts of each posting, which are appropriate.

Additional monitoring, if any:

None

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.
- 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:

N/A Washburn does not use competency based or direct assessment.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

The federal Compliance reviewer requested, received, and reviewed several syllabi, that have been submitted in the Addendum.



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

Institution Under Review: Washburn 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:

Washburn's calendar and term lengths, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, are within the range of good practice and as generally expected by HLC. A review of a dozen academic programs and the Gen. Ed./Core Requirements for the bachelor's and associate degrees, as well as 17 course syllabi clearly indicates that calendar and term lengths contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education. The unit used by Washburn is the semester hour. The fall and spring semesters include 15 weeks of instruction, plus one week devoted to examinations. Courses offered during non-standard terms are adjusted appropriately.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

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

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 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

Programs reviewed:

General Education/Core requirements for bachelor and associate degrees

JD/MSW

Social Work - BSW

JD/MBA

Early Childhood Education - AS

Elementary Education - B/Ed

Master's in Education – Ed Tech Emphasis – M.Ed.

Economics – BA

Nursing -- RN-BSN

LPN – BSN

BSN

MSN

DNP

Syllabi Reviews (included in the Addendum):

*ED 285**

ED 340

ED 353

ED 402

*ED 660***

ED 680

ED 685

*EC 200****

*EC 201****

EC 410

*NU 306****

*NU 322****

NU 494

NU 609

*NU 802***

NU 906

**Offered in on-ground and online formats*

***Offered online*

****Offered in a lecture/hybrid format*

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:

Washburn's credit hour policy (included in the master syllabus) states: "For every credit hour awarded for a university course, the student is typically expected to complete approximately one hour of classroom instruction, online interaction with course material, or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two additional hours of student work each week for approximately 15 weeks for one semester or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time." The university provides a chart that provides specifics as to the awarding of credit for courses with varying term lengths, instructional time, and number of meetings. With certain exceptions (commonly adding credits) credits required for graduation follow the standard numbers of 60 for an associate's degree, 120 for a bachelors, 30 beyond the bachelors for a masters, and 30 beyond the masters for a doctorate.

- 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:

See "a" above.

- 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:

The Team review of the sampled syllabi – on-ground, online, and hybrid courses -- demonstrates that this is the case.

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:

See "a" and "c" above.

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 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:

Both the course descriptions and syllabi sampled follow the university's policy on the awarding of credit. Any variations are explained and consistent.

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 clearly stated (although occasionally referred to under different titles (e.g. course standards) both in the sampled programs as described in the university catalog and in the sampled syllabi. They are appropriate to both and in keeping with Washburn's policy on the awarding of credit.

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:

A review of a sample of alternative-delivery (online) and compressed-format courses (shorter terms) shows that such courses are appropriately adjusted as to the university's policy on the awarding of academic credit.

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:

Online and compressed-format courses were sampled and found to be consistent with Washburn's policy on the awarding of academic credit. The learning outcomes for courses offered online and in compressed-formats are reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allotted. Where the same courses are offered in both formats (on-ground and online) and award the same credit hours, the learning outcomes are similar.

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:

The Team review of the undergraduate and graduate catalogs and a sampling of syllabi at both levels indicates that the university is consistent, reasonable, and appropriate in the application of its policy on the awarding of academic credit.

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:

N/A

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:

N/A

Rationale:

N/A

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

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 not 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:

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:

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Washburn University of Topeka, KS
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Open Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	The institution was granted an extension until September 1, 2022 to become compliant to the faculty qualification requirement. HLC will review that the institution is in compliance with the faculty qualification requirement at the comprehensive evaluation following the extension date. Visit to include a Federal Compliance reviewer: Dr. Bryan LeBeau.
DATES OF REVIEW:	3/25/2019 - 3/26/2019
<input type="checkbox"/> No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements	

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change:

Degrees Awarded: Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Doctors

Recommended Change: No change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2008 - 2009

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2018 - 2019

Recommended Change: 2028-2029

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior HLC approval is required for substantive change as stated in HLC policy.

Recommended Change: No change



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Additional Location:

Prior HLC 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

Open Pathway

Recommended Change: Eligible to choose

Upcoming Events

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change: No change

Institutional Data

Educational Programs

Undergraduate

Certificate 39

Associate Degrees 21

Baccalaureate Degrees 79

Graduate

Master's Degrees 18

Specialist Degrees 0

Doctoral Degrees 2

Recommended Change:

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

None

Recommended Change:

Additional Locations

Washburn Institute of Technology, 5724 SW Huntoon, Topeka, KS, 66604-2199 - Active

Washburn Tech Academy of Cosmetology, 109 SW 29th Street, Topeka, KS, 66611 - Active

Recommended Change:

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change:

Distance Delivery

13.0301 - Curriculum and Instruction, Master, Curriculum and Instruction

13.1399 - Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Subject Areas, Other, Master, Health Care Education

15.1501 - Engineering/Industrial Management, Bachelor, Technology Administration

22.0302 - Legal Assistant/Paralegal, Certificate, Legal Studies

30.9999 - Multi-/Interdisciplinary Studies, Other, Bachelor, Integrated Studies

43.0103 - Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Administration, Bachelor, Criminal Justice

43.0103 - Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement Administration, Master, Criminal Justice

44.0401 - Public Administration, Bachelor, Public Administration

44.0701 - Social Work, Bachelor, Social Work

44.0701 - Social Work, Master, Social Work

51.0707 - Health Information/Medical Records Technology/Technician, Associate, Health Information Technology

51.0707 - Health Information/Medical Records Technology/Technician, Certificate, Health Information Coding

51.0799 - Health and Medical Administrative Services, Other, Bachelor, Health Services Administration

51.0907 - Medical Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiation Therapist, Certificate, Radiation Therapy

51.0910 - Diagnostic Medical Sonography/Sonographer and Ultrasound Technician, Bachelor, Medical Imaging

51.0910 - Diagnostic Medical Sonography/Sonographer and Ultrasound Technician, Certificate, Diagnostic Medical Sonography

51.0920 - Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Technology/Technician, Certificate, Magnetic Resonance

51.0999 - Allied Health Diagnostic, Intervention, and Treatment Professions, Other, Associate, Human Services

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

51.0999 - Allied Health Diagnostic, Intervention, and Treatment Professions, Other, Certificate, Computed Tomography

51.1501 - Substance Abuse/Addiction Counseling, Certificate, Addiction Counseling

51.1501 - Substance Abuse/Addiction Counseling, Master, Human Services

51.1504 - Community Health Services/Liaison/Counseling, Certificate, Victim/Survivor Services

51.1599 - Mental and Social Health Services and Allied Professions, Other, Bachelor, Human Services

52.0206 - Non-Profit/Public/Organizational Management, Certificate, Nonprofit Management

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change:

Consortial Arrangements

None

Recommended Change:
