

Wright State University - OH

HLC ID 1611

OPEN PATHWAY: Mid-Cycle Review

Review Date: 6/29/2020

Dr. Susan Edwards
President

Linnea Stenson
HLC Liaison

Kelly Tzoumis
Review Team Chair

Jana Hanson
Team Member

Joanne Matson
Team Member

Scott Olson
Team Member

Richard Redner
Team Member

Michael Tew
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Review Date

6/29/2020

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

- Mid-Cycle Review

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

Wright State University (WSU) accredited in July 1968 as a public university carries the name of the Wright brothers (their bicycle shop was located in Dayton) who inspired their vision to offer a learning-centered and an innovative university. The university has established an underground tunnel system which represents one of the most extensive collegiate pedestrian tunnel systems in the United States. Nearly two miles of tunnels (10,436 feet) link 20 of 22 buildings in the academic section of Dayton campus. WSU is governed by a Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor of the State of Ohio. It has a commitment to inclusiveness as demonstrated in its vision and diversity statements. The mission is to transform the lives of their students and communities they serve based on four major points:

-build a solid foundation for student success at all levels through high-quality, innovative programs;

-conduct scholarly research and creative endeavors that impact quality of life;

-engage in meaningful community service;

-drive the economic revitalization of our region and our state and empower all of our students, faculty, staff, and alumni to develop professionally, intellectually, and personally.

The university has over 13,000 students with eight colleges, three schools and 292 degree programs that range from associates, specialists, and certificate to the undergraduate and graduate levels. This includes a majority of students coming from the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is located in Dayton, OH, with a branch campus in Celina,

Ohio referred to as WSU-Lake Campus. The main campus has 32 academic buildings on 73- acres across the two campuses. As of Fall 2019, it has over 700 full time faculty and 433 adjunct faculty. It has over 1000 full time staff. Its student population is approximately 21% minority, with African American students making up 10% of that total. WSU is committed to serving the educational, cultural, and economic needs of the region and the State of Ohio.

Interactions with Constituencies

This is a midcycle review which had no interactions with constituencies. However, the university maintains interactions with its constituencies.

The President's Office encourages open dialogue between all members of the Wright State community. President Susan Edwards held heavily attended one-hour President Chats twice weekly in Spring and Summer 2020 semesters to address questions about the university's response to COVID-19. Prior to these, Dr. Edwards held face-to-face meetings with students, department chairs, colleges, and campus organizations to answer any questions about the university.

The University's contribution to the community has a significant annual economic impact on the region, well-documented in the Economic Development Reports of the Southwestern Ohio Council of Higher Education that shows for the year 2015-16 alone, Wright State had an economic impact of more than \$1 billion on the Dayton region.

Additional Documents

There are no additional documents reviewed.

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

Rationale

The university provided evidence that its mission statement and strategic plan have been developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution. Wright State engaged in an inclusive strategic planning process that included six planning summits, a strategic planning "Open House," and seven Open Forums for the university to attend and comment. Participation in these events was broad and inclusive of the campus community. The committee tasked with the strategic planning process also had broad representation, which included students representing student government, faculty representatives from the faculty union and the President of the Faculty Senate, representatives of the staff, and administrators including deans and vice presidents. Unfortunately, the planning process and the implementation of the plan was delayed due to a faculty strike in Spring 2019 and a subsequent change in university leadership in Fall 2019. Due to this delay, Wright State continues to use the mission statement, vision statement, and strategic plan from a process concluded in 2013. Those statements are consistent with Wright State's institutional type, and despite the delay, the planning process that was being used up to 2019 was also consistent with Wright State's mission and institutional type.

Wright State provided evidence that it lives out its mission. Its motto of "*meet[ing] the students where they are*" is exemplified by the diversity of its enrollment and the manner in which students are served. The university offers a number of academic support services for students entering the university, including summer bridge programs in Writing and Mathematics and a First Year Experience program that provides tutoring and supplemental instruction. This has resulted in an enrollment mix consistent with the mission: 10% of Wright State's enrollment is Black or African-American; 4% of the students are of two or more races; 3.5% are Asian-American; 3.4% are LatinX; 0.2% are American Indian or Alaska Native; and 0.1% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. This

is fulfilling their stated goal and "meeting the students where they are."

The university provided evidence that appropriate support was provided to its students during the COVID-19 pandemic. Wright State's Center for Teaching and Learning worked with the faculty to equip them with distance learning tools and skills. Many student services went 100% online, such as Financial Aid, and advisors provided email and phone access. Physical and mental tele-health services were made available to students. Academic advising was made available. The policies surrounded "Pass/Unsatisfactory" grade options were expanded to give students greater flexibility and assuage their fears.

Budgets have been severely challenged at Wright State during the time period under review, and new investments have been rare. In times of budget-cutting, institutions generally prove their fidelity to their mission by what budgets are not reduced, or reduced less than other budgets. This section of the self-study indicates that specific details of the dis-investments and retained investments will be discussed later in the document. A more extensive discussion of Wright State's budget will be found under Criterion 5.C.1.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

None.

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

Rationale

A review of Wright State University's online publications identifies the institution's mission statement. However, the documents provided to the review team did not consistently articulate the mission, core values, goals, or institutional priorities of the institution. For example, the staff handbook provided did not explicitly communicate the mission and vision of the university. The handbook mentioned the Lake Campus Mission but this seemed separate from the overall university mission. More evidence and examples are needed to demonstrate how the mission is promoted through academic units and other publications.

The 2013-2018 strategic plan was provided as evidence of an overarching commitment to the missions of teaching, research, and community engagement were provided. As mentioned in 1A situational factors interrupted updating the institution's strategic plan. An updated strategic plan will be a priority for the institution.

This section referred to the 2013-2018 strategic plan but did not explicitly address the nature, scope and constituents of their programs and services offered. The mission focuses on high-quality, innovative programs, research that impacts quality of life, and meaningful community service. There is no indication of on how this is actualized through programs and services.

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

Rationale

Wright State University adequately addresses its role in a multicultural society. As documented in the Wright Core, all undergraduate students are required to demonstrate global and multicultural competence by the completion of two courses. The institution has a wide range of student service offices that include Bolinga Black Cultural Resources Center; the Latinx, Asian and Native American Center; Women's Center; Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, and Ally Affairs and many others.

The assurance argument notes that the institution recently hired a diversity consultant to review Wright State's diversity policies and practices and that the report was shared with the Faculty Senate in June 2020. The report is somewhat critical of the institutions progress stating that WSU has "No institutional vision for Diversity and Inclusion" and provided a number of areas for improvement. In the assurance argument the institution reports that they have formed a President's Council on Inclusive Excellence to review the report.

The assurance argument also notes that Wright State adopted a Faculty Opportunity Hire Program that permits departments to make additional offers to improve the diversity of its faculty. Wright State reports a 4% increase in the number of minority faculty over the last 12 years.

In addition, the institution supports a Veteran and Military Center. The institution takes pride in its Office of Disability Services and reports that WSU is a "top school for students with disabilities". The assurance argument documents 250 student services organization. Review of that list demonstrates a commitment to the diverse interests of its students.

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

Rationale

Wright State is a public institution charged with providing educational needs of the Dayton community. The institution reports the graduation of over 100,000 students with more than 200 degrees. Goal 4 of the Strategic Plan is to "Promote educational, social, cultural, economic, and sustainable development with local, state, national, and global partners ... and to create a campus culture that values and supports community engagement and economic development." In addition to meeting students' educational needs, the university also meets its public obligation through Boonshoft School of Medicine partnerships and the College of Education and Human Services partnerships with school districts. As evidence of the institution's commitment to service it was noted that Wright State was named to the White House Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll each year from 2010 to 2016. For economic development, the institution reports collaboration between Wright State's Lake Campus, the Mercer and Auglaize County Economic Development officials, and local businesses.

Wright State is a public institution and does not report to any superordinate entity other than State of Ohio. As a public, state-assisted institution, it is governed by a Board of Trustees who is appointed by the Governor of the State of Ohio. The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the University's mission documents make clear its overall commitment to the public good

The assurance argument reports that the Wright State Psychiatry Department expanded its telepsychiatry services to additional clients and the university faculty created a Shelter in Place online lecture series open to the public.

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.

Rationale

Wright State University's mission is clear and articulated publicly. More threading of the mission statement in documents and promoted through academic units could be useful.

The mission states that the university seeks to empower all students to excel in their lives and chosen careers through integrated learning, research, innovation, and experience. More indication of how this mission is actualized is needed particularly since the university has no guiding strategic plan.

As of the completion of the Assurance Argument, the Draft Strategic Plan of October 2018 is awaiting input from the Faculty Senate and approval from the Board of Trustees. In this period, the Strategic Plan Summary identifies the initiatives moving forward. However, the mission statement is the guidepost for the university. The goal is that by 2025, the university will provide a premium return on the investments of students and partners through a student-first system that leverages the unique strengths and resources.

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

Rationale

Wright State has demonstrated that it acts with integrity in all of its functions. The Board Bylaws contain a conflict of interest policy and as demonstrated in Board minutes, members are reminded of these obligations at each Board meeting. The institution has a University Ethics Policy that was created in 2011. That document obligates university officials and employees to the conditions of the State of Ohio ethics laws. The Board meetings by state law are public thereby providing an open forum for many Board decisions.

In its Assurance Argument, the institution openly disclosed a 2010-2013 H1-B ethics violation. The violation was reported to the Board and appropriate action was taken including the removal of several administrators. On November 16, 2018, Wright State University entered into a Non-Prosecution Agreement (NPA) with the U.S. Department of Justice. A copy of that agreement was included in the Assurance Argument. Given notification of an ethics violation, the institution responded appropriately and put policies in place to protect the institution from further H1-B violations.

However, the Ohio Inspector General investigation of the relationship between WSU and Double Bowler Property Corp. was not disclosed. Neither the existence of this investigation or the findings of the July 2, 2019 report of the Inspector General were disclosed in the assurance argument or reported to the HLC. This information should have been disclosed.

The Financial Governance Policy provides guidance for financial operations. Internal and external audits were regularly performed and the 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 financial audits were included in the assurance argument. The 2018 and 2019 audits contained no reportable findings.

In November 2018, Wright State was placed on financial monitoring by the HLC for a low Composite Financial Index score for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. As of June 2019, the Financial Panel at HLC recommended no further monitoring was required. The Panel reported that the University has undertaken serious initiatives to address the financial concerns and its reported

financial position and the implemented procedures will serve Wright State well in preventing future financial issues from arising.

Wright State supervises research integrity through its office of Research Compliance. The office manages Human Subjects Research through an IRB, Animal Welfare compliance through its IACUC committee and has reporting mechanisms for violation of research integrity. The most recent annual compliance report is a comprehensive review of a wide range of ethical and compliance issues.

The Student Code of conduct on the university website clearly defines terms such as hazing, academic misconduct and sexual harassment and provides procedures for the adjudication of student misconduct reports. The University Policy manual includes policies on academic freedom, professional responsibilities and policies on general standards of ethical conduct for all employees.

The institution provides access to an Ethicspoint website for anonymous reporting and demonstrates through its various policies its commitment to ethical conduct throughout the institution.

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

Rationale

The institution relies on its web pages to provide transparency regarding its programs, costs, and other pertinent information. For example, the University Fact Sheet and the Institutional Research website provide summary statistics about enrollment, graduations, employees, degree programs, facilities, and grant and sponsored programs. Prospective and current students can access the online course catalog to learn about programs of study, program requirements, and policies and resources. Admission policies can also be found on the Admissions website.

The reviewers were able to find an online directory for faculty and staff contact information within the Wright State website. The Assurance Argument also mentions faculty web pages which was not linked. It is important to provide these examples or links within the Assurance Argument.

Tuition and financial aid information is available from the RaiderConnect site.

Wright State University is governed by the Board of Trustees who are appointed by the governor. The organizational chart provided demonstrates the reporting structure of the institution and is publicly available on the website.

Information about Wright State University's university accreditation and accredited programs is located on the Accreditation website.

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

Rationale

Wright State's Board of Trustees meets at least four times per year and includes four Committees which are the Governance and Compliance Committee; Finance, Audit and Infrastructure Committee; Academic Affairs and Enrollment Committee and Student Affairs and Athletics Committee. Review of the last year's minutes, which include Committee reports, clearly show that the Board and its Committees preserve and work to enhance the institution. The minutes demonstrate careful review of the annual budget, approval of large expenses and show the Board's approval of a new president during the last year.

As a public state institution, Board meetings are public giving the community the opportunity to see actions taken by the Board. In addition to the actions mentioned above the Board is made aware of new hires and promotions along with potential legal issues and real estate purchases in executive session. Clear evidence of the engagement of the Board is their request that the 2019-2020 proposed budget be revised to conservatively reflect future student enrollment. In following meetings, the Board approved the budget. The Board includes two student members and received reports from the Faculty Senate providing input to the Board from its internal constituencies. The governing board reviews and considers relevant priorities.

Review of Board minutes demonstrate that the Conflict of Interest Statement is read at the start of every Board meeting. As noted in the assurance argument, every Board member is required to file a yearly Financial Disclosure with the State of Ohio the Board. Chapter 2 of the Ohio ethics Law for Board and Commission members specifies the financial disclosure laws for Board members.

Review of Board minutes provide evidence that the Board involvement does not involve day to day operations; that responsibility is delegated to the President. The President's reports that are attached to the Board minutes provide example of the President acting with their authority given to them by the Board. As confirmed in the Faculty Constitution, the faculty are responsible for oversight of the

curriculum. Responsibility of the faculty for promotion and tenure are outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

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

Rationale

The university has appropriate policies for faculty and students, demonstrating its commitment to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning. These statements and policies can be found in, for example, the Constitution, the Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibilities, the Diversity Statement, the Non-Discrimination Policy, and the Student Handbook.

Faculty and students are regularly informed and invited to discuss issues relevant to the campus community, and the assurance argument includes emails and articles about these discussions. Student complaints are documented and are submitted as part of the Assurance Argument.

Minutes are kept of the Faculty Senate, where the administration reports on budget and enrollment challenges, and senators engage in robust discussion. The Faculty Senate Minutes for 2018-2019 demonstrate a commitment to transparency and discussion. The University could augment its argument that it supports freedom of expression and provides timely information by including the minutes for all years as evidence. A link to the library's archive of minutes and agendas (https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/) would be sufficient.

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

Rationale

The university has established policies and procedures to assure research integrity by faculty, staff, and students. These policies and procedures have been included in the Assurance Argument or can be easily located on the University's website.

The Vice President for Research and Innovation is responsible for oversight and support for research policies and procedures. This unit has substantial resources on its web pages devoted to Research and to Compliance

The compliance section of the site provides links to the IRB, to CITI training, to forms, and to guidance for the ethical conduct of research. The Compliance Report (included in 2A) identifies additional training provided for IRB members and staff.

Some evidence demonstrating that these policies and procedures are effective could strengthen the WSU Assurance Argument. For example, has there been an assessment of the procedures and policies? Is there some basis for determining what needs to be changed, or what additional training and support to provide? Has the University evaluated their effectiveness?

Student Conduct is overseen by the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct (OCSSC). The Assurance Argument indicates there are statistics about student conduct compiled in this office. The argument would be amplified if those statistics were included and discussed in the Assurance Argument. Such a discussion might demonstrate the effectiveness of the University's procedures to promote student research integrity.

Students are offered guidance in ethical practices and research integrity--at the university level, at college levels, and at the individual course level. At the university level, student conduct is regulated through a Student Code of Conduct, which is administered and supported by the OCSSC. The OCSSC provides useful material on the principles of academic integrity and on the procedures for handling violations.

Additionally the library provides learning materials about conducting research with integrity. At the

college level, several colleges have their own ethical codes and instruction. Individual classes such as composition instruct students on searching for quality information and documenting their sources.

The argument could be strengthened by providing evidence of some of these practices and an evaluation of their effectiveness.

Component 2.E.3 requires the institution to have and enforce academic integrity policies. The Assurance Argument clearly demonstrates the University has such policies, and these policies are easily accessible on the university website through the OCSSC. The Faculty and Student Guides are particularly helpful.

The argument does not currently address enforcement. It would be fruitful to augment the argument by considering the enforcement of these policies. To what extent are students demonstrating academic integrity, and what are the issues being raised?

Faculty have added a Responsible Conduct of Research component to some programs. It would be helpful to know which programs are involved, and why this curriculum decision was made.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

Rationale

Wright State has demonstrated that it acts with integrity in its functions. It has a conflict of interest policy contained in the Board Bylaws that is used in each Board meeting as a reminder. An Ethics Policy was created in 2011 that obligates university officials and employees to the conditions of the State of Ohio Ethics laws. It has addressed issues in a timely manner for financial monitoring and put policies in place to deal with the 2010-2013 H1-B ethics violations which have been resolved. As of June 2019, a Financial Panel at the HLC recommended no further monitoring was required from low Composite Financial Index scores for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. The Ohio Inspector General reported July 2019 of an investigation into the university's relationship with the Double Bowler Corp is ongoing and should have been disclosed in the Assurance Argument to demonstrate its transparency in integrity issues.

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

Rationale

The institution has policies and procedures for new majors, minors, certificates and modifications to majors, minors, and certificates. Several committees (the University Curriculum Committee, the Undergraduate Core Oversight Committee, the Graduate Curriculum Committee and the Wright State Assurance of Learning Committee), the Faculty Senate, Provost, and Board of Trustees provide oversight and approval of curriculum adjustments. No examples of curriculum proposals for a new program or modification were provided. Examples would provide evidence the policies are being followed.

Oversight for the curriculum is specified by institutional policy, and further oversight is provided through specialized accreditation.

Evidence of student performance on national licensure exams demonstrates that students perform at or above their peers.

The institution identified a 100% placement rate for students in certain programs. An example from the School of Public and International Affairs (SPIA) and Medical Lab Sciences was provided.

There is no indication that placement rate is tracked at the university level or by all programs.

The Ohio Department of Higher Education guidelines and procedures for academic program review is provided in 3.A.2. A brief description of the process in the Assurance Argument would be helpful.

Besides faculty involvement, additional information on how the institution ensures their programs are staying current is needed.

Evidence of active program review is located on the Academic Affairs website. Program review reports are available through 2016 but nothing more current.

Evidence of the learning goals for the Wright State Core was provided. These goals and learning outcomes are also available in the Catalog. The Assurance Argument noted that learning outcomes are clearly articulated in the Catalog. A review of the Catalog indicated that learning outcomes are not available for all degree programs. It is important the the institution updates the catalogs to include the student learning outcomes statements for every undergraduate and graduate program.

It is unclear how the university differentiates learning goals at the different levels (undergraduate, graduate, or certificate programs). It is also unknown if there are policies on the level and course numbering to align with the program curricula. Additional evidence is needed to ensure the institution is meeting this core component.

The institution provided a new policy related to credit hour policy of online/hybrid courses. There is no indication that there are policies or procedures to ensure that the quality and learning goals were consistent across online/hybrid and face-to-face courses. There is training provided to faculty who may teach in an online or hybrid environment.

The Ohio Transfer Module provides ease of transfer of general education requirements among Ohio's public colleges and universities.

High school college credit is available through the Ohio College Credit Plus program. Standard course syllabi are used and there is coordination with Wright State faculty mentors. An example would provide evidence that this is occurring.

No evidence was included to indicate the university has systems in place for monitoring comparability of outcomes across modes of delivery and location. This is an area the institution could consider improving.

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

Rationale

Wright State University has a well established and robust General Education Program appropriate to the degree levels and educational offerings of the institution. The Wright State Core is a 38 credit hour program intended to establish a foundation for student acquisition of knowledge, skills, and perspectives necessary to allow for the application of insight to their degree programs and to their ability to negotiate their world. The program asserts that it will transform the lives of students and their communities. This incorporates direct language from the WSU mission statement. The program does suggest that it enables student engagement in their communities and the institution offers designated Service Learning courses though there is no indication that such courses are required as part of General Education.

The Wright State University General Education Program is grounded in the well established and broadly accepted framework of the American Association of Colleges and Universities as well as the Ohio Department of Higher Education's Six Principles of General Education. Through an iterative establishment and review process, the institution has adapted those principles to advance an institution unique set of purposes and learning outcomes. The 2019-2020 Wright State Core brochure (linked to the General Education Overview page of the institutional web site) elaborates the intellectual and knowledge concepts as well as the skills and attitudes Wright State believes are essential to its graduates.

Wright State has established 7 Core Learning Objectives that are required of all degree programs.

These objectives are specifically inclusive of collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and developing skills adaptable to changing environments. The institution conducts assessment to examine the extent that the learning objectives are being accomplished in degree programs. Assessment activity has been routine and has recently been expanded to be more regularly comprehensive. A review of sample academic programs indicates that for all programs, some or all of the 7 Core Learning Objectives are listed on the program catalog descriptions. There is no indication of the process that assures the inclusion of Core Learning Objectives in program design or curricula.

Human and cultural diversity are reflected in Wright State's educational and co-curricular offerings. Multicultural competency is one of the 7 Core Learning Objectives and students, as part of their General Education Program, are required to complete two courses designated as Multicultural Competency courses. Additionally, attention to diversity is evidenced in First Year Seminar content and through the Study Abroad and Ambassador Programs. Diversity is cited as a key component of at least two student support offices/programs.

Wright State University offers substantial research support programs to both Faculty and Students. Listings in the CORE Scholar archive and in recent programs for the Lake Campus Research Symposium and the Wright State Celebration of Student Research indicate robust participation and productivity. Each of the academic departments include the requirement for research and scholarship in faculty evaluation. The Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation web page articulates numerous support programs to encourage research activity.

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

Rationale

The number of faculty appears to be sufficient for the size of the university. There is no evidence provided on faculty continuity.

There is a strong sense of faculty governance through Faculty Senate and other similar committees. Wright State University utilizes the Collective Bargaining Unit to outline faculty roles and expectations, including oversight of the curriculum.

No evidence is provided on faculty members role in setting expectations and standards for student performance.

The Faculty Credential policy establishes the academic credentials for instructional staff. The institution also provided a list of faculty and faculty credentials was provided in 3.C.2.

The institution states faculty are involved in the assessment of student learning. Evidence is needed to better understand faculty involvement in and expectations of assessment.

According to the Credentialing Policy provided, faculty at Wright State University must possess an academic degree one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members must possess the same level of degree. This policy applies to faculty teaching in the dual credit

program as well. A list of all teaching faculty, including their credentials, was provided.

The university maintains a system of checking credentials at time of hire. This process includes verifying degrees earned and obtaining official transcripts. These are approved by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources.

The evaluation process is outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Faculty are evaluated regularly by their peers, supervisors, and students. They are evaluated on teaching, service, and scholarship as outlined in the CBA and bylaws established by each academic unit. The School of Professional Psychology and Boonshoft School of Medicine have separate bylaws that outline the faculty evaluation process.

Faculty are evaluated in each course they teach using an online University Student Evaluation of Instruction form approved by the University and the AAUP-WSU.

The institution provided a number of processes and resources that support faculty teaching and professional development. There is an option of Pedagogical Development Course release, Professional Development Leave (sabbatical) program, and training offered by the Center for teaching. The evidence provided focused on remote teaching due to COVID. It would also be valuable to provide a history of training and workshops that are offered to demonstrate additional pedagogical topics and ongoing opportunities.

There are funds and awards available that provide faculty members with opportunities to engage in professional development activities.

The CBA outlines expectations of faculty office hours and availability to students. Faculty must have office hours at least two days per week. The CBA also outlines expectations for faculty teaching for online classes.

The university supports staff by offering a number of opportunities. For example, HR provides a leadership series twice a year. Staff can also seek out opportunities for continuing education and involvement in professional organizations. Academic advisors are provided an Academic Advising Handbook and are encouraged to attend regional conferences on advising. Other units provide financial assistance for training opportunities.

This section could be strengthened by providing evidence of mandatory staff training and specific training provided to each student support service unit. It is unknown whether staff receive ongoing evaluation. It is also unknown whether the institution collects and utilizes student feedback on student support service units.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

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

Rating

Met

Rationale

Wright State University provides extensive student support services, largely through its newly organized Division of Student Success. Of the six department in this division, four (Academic Support, Academic Advising, Career Services, and Student Success Planning) are specifically devoted to offering direct services to its general student population. The web pages for these departments are extensive in describing the support offered and are easily accessible to both faculty and students. Additionally, the University maintains offices/centers tailored to specific students populations including Latinx, LGBTQ, Women's, and Black Students Centers (to name a few). The institution also offers structured support for Veterans and students with Disabilities.

The University provides specific and substantial tutoring as well as placement testing (math and writing) services. These services are detailed on the Student Success Services web page. The institution uses Math and Writing placement testing to determine appropriate course placement for all incoming students with no previous college credit. Tutoring, Supplemental Instruction, the Math Learning Center, and the Writing Center provide additional support for students.

The University Advising Center is comprised of General Advising and Advising specific to each of the six academic colleges. Students are assigned a primary academic advisor which students are encouraged to identify through the student information system. The University also provides Career development advising through its Career Services Center. The University Undergraduate Advising Council was established in 2006 to ensure consistency in advising practices among professional and faculty advisors.

Wright State University provides and maintains adequate and appropriate infrastructure to support teaching and learning on both its Dayton and Lake Campuses. The institution has made recent

investments in its physical facilities with a new Creative Arts Center, and new/expanded/upgraded facilities. The libraries at both the Dayton and Lake Campuses provide extensive resource support and assistance, particularly in the area of technology assistance. Clinical spaces for WSU's medical and nursing schools are provided through contracts with local teaching hospitals and community agencies. CaTS (Computing and Telecommunication Services) provides appropriate technology support to students via computer labs and to faculty via classroom technology. The CaTS web page indicates substantial infrastructure support following the move to remote instruction and operations resulting from COVID-19.

As mentioned in 3D4, extensive support for student use of information and research resources is provided by the University Libraries, CaTS as well as programs specific to each of the Colleges. The Assurance Argument provides an example through the College of Education and Human Services Educational Resource Center. This Center provides focused support and guidance to students in their use of educational resources. The Assurance Argument focuses on support for accessing and using information and research resources but does not specifically address how it provides guidance in how that information and research are used.

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

Rationale

Wright State lists a broad array of student organizations and programs. It would be helpful if the argument demonstrated how they are connected to the university's mission, in what sense they are innovative, and how they contribute to the educational experience of students.

The report links to December 2018 effectiveness studies for the Orientation/Transition and Transfer program, for Career Services, and for First Year Programs. These studies reflect a commitment to begin assessing co-curricular programs. The argument could be strengthened by explaining how these studies have been used. Over time, they may become useful in making changes to improve student enrollment, retention, and success. Studies of the effectiveness of student activities would also be helpful.

Evidence about the effectiveness of three student-oriented programs was provided in 3.E.1. The University is currently asking students to complete NSSE surveys, which might fruitfully provide some documentation of how students are engaged at the university. They could also be used for co-curricular assessment.

The 2016 HLC Assurance argument states, "WSU is taking steps to assess co-curricular efforts, like community service, by measuring the number of participants, service hours, and community impact of projects. Additionally, students may record out-of-classroom learning experiences on the Engage, Demonstrate, Graduate and Excel (EDGE) co-curricular transcript." If this information is available, it could support the Assurance Argument as evidence.

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.

Rationale

WSU is providing a quality education in its offerings. The university provides learning outcomes in some of its degree programs. More articulation and evidence in how the university differentiates these learning outcomes at the various degree levels could be demonstrated in the Assurance Argument. The university has a well established and robust General Education Program (GEP) appropriate to the degree levels and educational offerings of the institution which is tied to their mission statement. The GEP is grounded in the well established and broadly accepted framework of the American Association of Colleges and Universities as well as the Ohio Department of Higher Education's Six Principles of General Education. Wright State has established 7 Core Learning Objectives that are required of all degree programs which is being assessed for several of its programs.

The university provides extensive student support services, largely through its newly organized Division of Student Success. Of the six departments in this division, four (Academic Support, Academic Advising, Career Services, and Student Success Planning) are specifically devoted to offering direct services to its general student population. The NSSE could be a source of information that could be better utilized for the assessment of these programs.

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

Rationale

Wright State University maintains and utilizes a clearly established program review process. The most recent completed review cycle concluded in the 2019-2020 academic year. Reviews are guided by well developed program templates and rubrics. Following review, Colleges provide summary reports and recommendations to the Provost. Recognizing some limitations in the review process, WSU implemented its Assurance of Learning Committee to guide changes in the process. New templates were developed using more comprehensive financial and student success data. This format was applied during the most recent review cycle. The regular cycle of program review also applies to Administrative (non-academic) Programs. Again, the process and cycle of review are clear and regular. In both the Academic and Administrative review arguments, the institution comments that

the follow up discussions with faculty and staff regarding program improvements was a valuable part of the process. Few examples of actual implemented change and improvements are documented in the Assurance Argument materials for this component. In fact, while there is a link to the Administrative Review outcomes, access is restricted which does not allow accessibility to examine this evidence.

The institution has a well defined set of policies and procedures associated the evaluation of transfer credit. Prior Learning Assessment and Military Training and Experience are included in these policies and are clearly explained. Specific systems are used in the evaluation of general transfer credit including the Ohio Department of Higher Education guidelines and requirements and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network, as well as widely accepted software systems such as Transferology, Transfer Equivalency System, and College Credit Plus. Equivalencies are evaluated and approved by faculty at the department level.

Wright State University assures the quality of transferred credits utilizing the policies reference in 4A2 as well as the Ohio Department of Higher Education Transfer and Articulation policies. Again, faculty are responsible for the determination of transfer credit equivalencies along with specific criteria (including but not limited to restrictions on developmental courses and course grades). Graduate transfer credits are evaluated by the Graduate School, Departmental Program Coordinators and are guided by the Graduate Transfer Credit Criteria (policies determining the acceptability of course transfer credit). No indication of polices specific to the evaluation and acceptance of international transfer credit is offered.

Wright State University exercises authority over prerequisites, course rigor, and learning resources as described in other criteria and components. Learning outcomes, while evident for most courses as described in Criteria 3 components, are not presented as clearly and consistently to facilitate full review and evaluation. Assessment of student learning to determine effectiveness of learning and course rigor is present. There is a lack of evidence of regularity and consistency in the application of process. Faculty qualification policies are aligned with HLC and the ODHE. The Assurance Argument reports an internal review of Faculty Qualification in 2018 and a new process of review by Academic Affairs and Human Resources. Additional levels of review are employed at the Graduate level. No direct results of the 2018 review were included in evidence files. The Assurance Argument explains that Dual Credit Courses have the same outcomes as the same campus based courses and are taught by WSU faculty. No policy documents or examples comparing the similarity between specific College and Dual Enrollment courses were provided.

The Assurance Argument provides links to various reports of professional accreditation and all accredited programs are up to date and listed as reaffirmed or under review. The primary accreditation information link can be found from the University web site under the About tab. Some programs list their accreditation on their online program listing and/or on the program catalog listing. More consistency in program listings and greater visibility/access to the overall accreditation information would be helpful.

Wright State University measures and monitors the post graduate success of its graduating students. A number of key data and metrics are collected, measured, and analyzed through several credible sources Institutional Research, its own Career Development Office, the National Student Clearinghouse, the State of Ohio, and separate data collected by individual Colleges. The institution reports strong percentages of students either employed or pursuing graduate degree programs.

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

Rationale

The Ohio Department of Higher Education provides guidelines and procedures for Academic Program Review. Under Chapter 4, section K (Assessment), there are expectations regarding multiple assessments used to inform continuous improvement. In addition, assessments are to be used to inform students' progress in an academic program. Academic programs are reviewed during the Academic Program Review process which occurs every 5 years. An example of a completed review was not provided in the assurance argument. The reviewers were able to find examples on the WSU website. These 2013-2016 reports demonstrate student learning goals for academic programs.

Wright State University's program approval procedures provides information on who approves graduate and undergraduate curriculum. An example of a completed curriculum modification or program adjustment form was not provided. This would have provided evidence of how assessment is tied to this process. In addition, WSU program learning goals for programs are displayed in the Catalog. As noted in 3.A.2, the course catalog is inconsistent and does not articulate learning outcomes for every program.

The institution notes that all academic programs at the Dayton and Lake campuses submitted updated assessment plans in 2019. From the Academic Program Review page, there is indication that all plans are located in a SharePoint site (not accessible by the reviewers).

The argument states that administrative departments have goals and plans for assessing the learning goals. A Student Affairs example was provided indicating stated learning goals. The processes used to assess these learning goals was not included. The Administrative Program Effectiveness Review provided a list of Administrative reports. The reviewers were unable to view any of the administrative reports.

The general education program (Wright State Core) has seven learning outcomes.

There is an Assurance of Learning Committee (ALC) that provides assessment leadership and coordination.

Overall, there is limited evidence to demonstrate processes used to assess student learning goals. It is important to provide a narrative and additional examples of how assessment plans and methods align with expectations and good practices.

Curricular assessment of learning outcomes is achieved through individual unit assessment plans. An example assessment report from Middle Childhood was provided. This example reveals the presence of student learning outcomes, assessment activities using direct and indirect measures, and results.

The Wright State Core has processes for faculty review and evaluation of learning outcomes. An example report, including methods and results, would have provided additional evidence of how the Core is assessed. The evidence provided was an overview report for a faculty senate meeting.

Co-curricular and administration units adhere to the Administrative Program Effectiveness Review process. One example (Disability Services Review) demonstrated student learning outcomes, assessment activity, and results.

Without additional examples (accredited/non-accredited undergraduate, general education, graduate programs, and co-curricular programs), there is a lack of evidence indicating ongoing, systematic assessment processes. It is recommended that the institution build upon their commitment to assessment by demonstrating the various ways student achievement is assessed. It is also important to demonstrate the criteria or standards used in assessment processes.

Wright State University indicates the continuous improvement of student learning is used in several ways. Evidence provided indicates a survey and course evaluations were used to make curricular adjustments in the Organization Leadership program. The ABET self study for Computer Engineering and Undergraduate Psychology Assessment Report was also provided. These two examples demonstrate assessment results being used in to make improvements.

The Wright State Core results are also collected and shared. An example report was not provided in the assurance argument. It is not clear how these assessment results are used other than possibly removing a course.

A co-curricular example from the Office of Residence Life and Housing was provided. This example indicated a number of program changes that occurred based on assessment results.

There was no indication the institution uses standardized assessments, such as NSSE, to make student learning improvements.

It is recommended that the institution build upon their commitment to assessment by documenting evidence of continuous improvement based on results and that continuous improvement efforts involve stakeholders at all levels.

Wright State University has representation from all colleges as members of the Assurance of Learning Committee. The committee is working toward more centralized efforts of documenting the collection, reporting and implement change based on assessment results.

There is a lack of evidence demonstrating substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Regarding general education, the Core Oversight Committee meets to discuss results of assessment. Recommendations are provided to the Faculty Senate. If approved, recommendations are implemented.

Additional evidence is needed on professional development opportunities for faculty and staff to learn about assessment best practices.

It is unknown what guidance or expectations ensure that processes and methodologies are used to reflect good assessment practices.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

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

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

Rating

Met

Rationale

In 2013 Wright State University established a Campus Completion Committee to review student success data and to establish goals and monitor progress for student success, persistence, and completion. The Campus Completion Plan, which is reviewed and updated every two year (most recently in 2018) articulates specific, attainable, and ambitious goals. The Campus Completion Plan is directly tied to the institutional mission (establishing a foundation for student success), to Goal 2 (Student Access and Educational Attainment) of the institution's strategic plan, and to a broadly shared institutional commitment to "meeting students where they are."

The University collects, analyzes, and disseminates a broad and comprehensive range of data on student retention and completion both for the institution as a whole and for each of its programs. The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness provides broad and easily accessible tools to review data at multiple levels of degree, program, and curricula.

The institution reports two specific examples, largely resulting from its work with EAB, of using data collected from developmental Math and English programs to make curricular adjustments. Wright State University reports and documents (Start Strong to Finish report) that the co-requisite intervention initiated based on the data has had a positive impact on student persistence (retention).

The institution demonstrates good practice in collecting, analyzing, and disseminating student success data. Coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, data is obtained from multiple sources, including IPEDS, and additionally managed with the oversight of the Data Governance Committee established in 2017. The broad range of technology assisted tools for

gathering, analysis, and dissemination are both valid sources and suitable to the institution's programs and student populations.

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.

Rationale

WSU has an established program review process which is ongoing to assist with continuous improvement which includes both academic and administrative programs. Assessment of student learning to determine effectiveness of learning and course rigor is present. However, there is a lack of evidence of regularity and consistency in the application of process. Evidence from Academic Program Reviews located in SharePoint were not accessible in the Assurance Argument for review as evidence. Evidence such as examples of how assessment plans and methods align with expectations and good practices is needed on the assessment of the Wright State Core (general education program) for the process and outcomes. Without additional examples (accredited/non-accredited undergraduate, general education, graduate programs, and co-curricular programs), there is a lack of evidence indicating ongoing, systematic assessment processes. It is recommended that the institution build upon their commitment to assessment by demonstrating the various ways student achievement is assessed. It is also important to demonstrate the criteria or standards used in assessment processes. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational quality, with a regular process of program review. Assessment of educational programs, learning environments, and support services takes place, but the process is not consistently represented so as to demonstrate there is continuous improvement.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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

5.A - Core Component 5.A

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

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

Rating

Met

Rationale

Wright State University has provided evidence that its resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. There is evidence that -- despite significant financial challenges -- the institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered. This conclusion is based on a close inspection of the institution's resources conducted by the HLC approximately one year ago. Resources have been a challenge for Wright State University in recent years, resulting in WSU receiving a letter from the Higher Learning Commission dated 18 January 2019 that required an Interim Monitoring report on several issues including the institution's financial viability. That report resulted in an analysis issued on 24 June 2019 indicating that the HLC's concerns had been addressed and that no further monitoring was required. The HLC Financial Panel found WSU's enrollment plan to be acceptable. Furthermore, it found that: "Wright State University provided the current version of its Financial Sustainability Plan which contains numerous initiatives identified to increase enrollment. The University will focus on the major projects and assess the impact of the achieved successes. The enrollment projections and goals are employed to create a short-term financial model. The developed

model indicates that the net operating position is likely to decline until enrollment can be stabilized. The University will draw upon reserves to resolve any short-term deficit." Finally, the panel noted progress toward a 2.0 score on the Composite Financial Index (CFI), moving WSU outside of the danger zone and above the score that triggers HLC monitoring.

There is evidence that Wright State University has a resource allocation process that ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a super-ordinate entity. As documented by minutes of meetings, the governance structure is well-informed about resource allocation. University administration gives monthly reports to its Board of Trustees so the Board is informed and able to direct the university on its budget up to and including annual budget approval. These meetings are open to the public, and members of the university community frequently attend, including students. At these meetings, students and members of the faculty have the opportunity to emphasize to the Board the importance of the educational mission of WSU. Unrestricted operating expenses have been challenged due to roughly \$20,000,000 in budget cuts from FY2017 to FY2020 necessitated by declining enrollment. The university has responded by reductions in staff ranging from a nearly 25% reduction in administration and to an 8% reduction in faculty.

Wright State University has provided evidence that its goals are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities. Resources have become significantly limited as a result of enrollment declines of roughly 30% and concomitant reductions in WSU's allocation through Ohio's resource distribution model. Evidence was provided that WSU prioritizes teaching and learning in its budget, \$186,322,106 of its FY2020 budget dedicated to the Academic Affairs mission, which includes instruction, learning technology, libraries, and so on, and amounts to 76% of that year's total General Fund budget. Evidence was provided that the proportion of the budget dedicated to teaching and learning has increased since FY2016. Planning for the FY2021 budget has included considerable analysis and predictions of the effect of COVID-19 on revenue and expenses. Evidence was provided that WSU is realistically addressing the budgetary impact of the pandemic on revenue from tuition and campus housing and added expenses for technology, facilities, and so on. The university has also factored into its FY2021 planning a 3.8% reduction in its state allocation. WSU is predicting a deficit of \$11,500,000 as it enters FY2021. Evidence was provided that the university took immediate steps to address the deficit, including cuts in administrator salaries, hiring freezes, suspension of nonessential facilities projects, voluntary reduction in hours from members of the staff, and similar short-term actions. As of this writing, it is too soon to tell whether enrollment projections are realistic given the pandemic, but this is normative to all higher education at this time.

There is evidence that Wright State University's staff is appropriately qualified and trained for their respective positions. The university provided evidence of a credentialing policy for the faculty, which includes a verification of degrees. A similar credentialing process exists for staff positions. The university catalogue lists all professors and their degrees. A review of these materials revealed that 83% of the teaching faculty had terminal degrees in an appropriate discipline. Furthermore, Wright State University policy 2160 details the requirements for becoming a member of the Graduate Faculty and thereby the ability to teach graduate-level courses. The policy describes four categories of Graduate Faculty, each with its own requirements: Regular, Associate, Provisional, and Temporary. Evidence was also provided that WSU invests in professional development for its faculty and staff, including the Wright Leader Academy, which identifies and nurtures future leaders. New employees go through a mandatory on-boarding process that prepares them for employment at Wright State. This includes training modules on Sexual Violence and on Discrimination.

The evidence indicates that WSU has an appropriate process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses. Eight times per year, the university provides budget updates and information to the Finance Committee of WSU's Board of Trustees, and annually the full Board meets to approve the budget for the upcoming year. During the consultation process, budget forums are held on campus to inform the faculty, staff, and students and to receive feedback on the budget. PowerPoint slides from the forums were available and the information provided follows common university and HLC norms. University leadership receives monthly reports prepared by WSU's Division of Business and Finances in order to monitor income, expenses, and variances from the approved budget. The Division also ensures that internal and external financial reports accurately reflect WSU's financial position.

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

Rationale

The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees require its members to be knowledgeable about the institution, and the Board of Trustees has a committee structure designed to address financial and academic policies and practices and to meet its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. This committee structure was modified in 2016 to expand the Academic Affairs committee to include Enrollment Management, to expand the Finance Committee to include Auditing and Infrastructure, and to create two new committees, one on Governance and Compliance and one an ad hoc Special Committee on Medicine and Health.

State Open Meetings laws provide for public meetings and posted minutes for the Board of Trustees. Section 2C of the assurance argument includes the minutes for the last year of Board of Trustee meetings. These minutes provide evidence that the Board meets its legal and fiduciary obligations in overseeing campus operations.

The Wright State assurance argument demonstrates a culture of shared governance, providing evidence in Faculty Senate Minutes, President and Provost statements, and multiple exchanges between faculty, administration, students, and the Board of Trustees.

Following the 2018-2019 academic year that included a faculty strike and a vote of no confidence in the Board of Trustees, there have clearly been recent attempts to improve relations between the Board of Trustees and the faculty: the Faculty Senate President spoke twice at the Board of Trustee meetings, inviting Trustees to meet with Faculty Senate leaders on campus and to attend classes. There were several such meetings with individual Trustees, and one Trustee even attended the Senate President's class.

Enrollment drops have led to cost-cutting and a need to increase recruitment and retention. The new President and the Interim Provost, who took office in January 2020, have made an effort to

communicate regularly with faculty on these initiatives and to engage them in shared problem-solving. Their theme for the year was Retention, Recruitment, and Relationships.

WSU is in the midst of a college re-structuring process, and there is evidence of communication with faculty and of a commitment to getting their input. There is evidence that both faculty and students were engaged in shared discussions about how to handle the pandemic. For example, the Senate pass/unsatisfactory policy was developed with a group that included students.

The Faculty Senate minutes provide significant evidence that the institution has the structure and the commitment to establish appropriate academic policies and work on curricular design and approval. The minutes demonstrate a robust and active committee structure dealing with matters under the faculty purview, including curriculum design and academic policies. There is significant participation. Senate attendance is excellent.

There is a Student Government Association that posts their meetings. It would be helpful to have some evidence of student participation in policies and decision-making.

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 With Concerns

Rationale

Wright State University provided evidence that it allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities. WSU provided evidence that it prioritizes academics and the student experience in its budgeting and expenditures. Enrollment had been negatively impacted, losing 1,136 students from Fall 2017 to Fall 2018. The university assessed the challenge and responded with an enrollment plan. As part of an Interim Monitoring process in 2019, WSU developed an enrollment plan which included increasing enrollment in three areas: (1) direct enrollment from high school; (2) transfer students; and (3) Fall-to-Fall retention (from 64% to 68%). The plan also entailed introducing new academic programs and delivery models and an aggressive marketing plan to strengthen the University's identity.

There is evidence that Wright State University links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. WSU recognized it had a lower retention rate than the goal in its enrollment plan. Fall-to-Fall retention had been 64%, but the university set a goal of 68% retention. To that end, there is evidence that it has invested in five Academic Success Centers to encourage growth in student success and retention. These Centers include the Math Learning Center, the University Writing Center, Tutoring Services, the Student Retention Team, and an office for Supplemental Instruction. In addition, many academic departments provide Academic Help Rooms, and the university provides frequent "Research Toolkit Workshops" for students to hone their research skills.

Evidence that Wright State University engages in a planning process that encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups is incomplete. Evidence was provided in the self-study that WSU had been engaging in a broad-based strategic planning process until mid-October of 2018, this plan was never brought to completion. WSU's Strategic Planning website still has prospective language: "Wright State University's strategic

planning process WILL guide the university ..." [emphasis added], and the most recent posting to this website is dated 31 October 2018. Similarly, WSU's "Strategic Planning Documents and Resources" website has no entries more recent than a Draft Strategy Document dated 18 October 2018. There is ample evidence that up until that date, WSU's planning process was broad and inclusive of internal and external constituents. Given the lack of evidence that this process came to fruition, this level of shared governance and consultation unfortunately had no result. The institution states in its self-study that this delay was due to the change in leadership. The delay has lasted nearly two years and there is no evidence at this time of a plan to re-start the strategic planning process during Fall 2020.

Wright State provided evidence that it conducts its planning using the a sound understanding of its current capacity, anticipating the possible impact of fluctuations in its sources of revenue. WSU's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness ("IR") provides regular Enrollment Reports for the institution to monitor its capacity to serve students effectively. IR also tracks demographic data to provide long-term trend data. IR data are accessible to all WSU faculty, allowing tracking at the institutional, college, departmental, and course levels. Evidence is provided that IR staff members work with academic and non-academic units to enable future planning and academic program review based on the data. The State of Ohio's Department of Education has a funding model that informs how resources are distributed and how WSU should plan. As Wright State's enrollment has declined, its share of these resources has also declined.

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected planning and capacity at Wright State just as it has throughout higher education, including unpredicted effects on the FY20 and FY21 budgets. For example, the negative effect of COVID-19 on WSU's allocation of Ohio's FY2020 budget allocation was \$3,800,000. During the summer of 2020, the WSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee conducted a well-attended (300+ participants) meeting with the President and Provost to discuss the financial effects of COVID-19 on the FY21 budget. 400 faculty members completed a survey asking them about Fall 2020 planning. Evidence was provided that the Student Government Association ("SGA") was supportive of this initiative. In fact, SGA passed a resolution in support of the approach WSU has taken.

Wright State University's 2018 draft Strategic Plan has not been enacted. The draft demonstrates that the institution's planning processes anticipate emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization. For example, the 2018 draft of "Strategic Plan 2025" identified the following goals and objectives: In terms of "Collaborative Delivery of Services," the goals included: Redesign the transfer student experience; and Strengthen the system for proactively identifying students in need of assistance. In terms of "Research, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship," the goals included: Strengthen and elevate the research enterprise; and Establish a Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. In terms of "Strategic Relationships and Partnerships," the goals included: Establish an Office of Corporate and Community Engagement; and Institutionalize best practices for globalization and education abroad. In terms of "Student Life and Engagement," the goals included: Establish the President's Council on Diversity and Inclusion; and Allyship training. In terms of "Teaching, Learning, and Programming," the goals included: Expand online offerings; and Establish Wright State's experiential learning guarantee. Finally, in terms of "Strategic Foundations," the goals included: Create an integrated health-focused college; Implement the fiscal sustainability plan; and Update the campus master plan. These goals clearly demonstrate a desire to anticipate emerging factors related to technology, demography, and globalization, but unfortunately this strategic plan was never officially enacted, remaining in draft form on the institution's website since October 2018.

Evidence also demonstrates that enrollment planning is tied to local demographic changes through coordination with regional community colleges, such as through WSU's Community College Partnership Program website which provides specific pathways for students transferring from Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Clark State Community College, Edison State Community College, Sinclair College, and Southern State Community College.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team requests an interim monitoring report to be due August 31, 2021. Since WSU has been operating under a strategic plan that was to expire in 2018, and did not indicate any plan or commitment to completing or initiating a strategic planning process, a monitoring report is being requested by the end of August 31, 2021. Continuing into another calendar year without a strategic plan leaves the university in lack of clear priorities for the future where uncertainty is already high and challenges will continue. The report should provide evidence and analysis on three topics:

1. Evidence that a strategic planning process has been restarted, or that the draft strategic plan has been implemented;
2. Evidence and analysis of what Wright State University has been using to guide its decision making in the absence of a formal strategic plan; and
3. Evidence of a schedule for the completion of a strategic planning process moving forward.

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

Rationale

Wright State University provided documentation that it develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations. For example, WSU participates in the statewide Efficiency Advisory Committee, established by the Chancellor of the higher education system in Ohio. This process allows WSU to benchmark its efforts to capture efficiencies against other higher education institutions in Ohio. The annual report of the Efficiency Advisory Committee measures such dimensions of efficiency as Operational Efficiencies, Partnerships, Academic Practices, Time to Degree, and Policy Reform. The 2019 Report cites the efficiencies captured by Wright State's leadership of the Western Ohio Regional Compact. The 2018 Report mentions Wright State's participation in a multi-institution Master Services Agreement with Ellucian, that resulted in savings of \$4,200,000 over five years at the five universities. A State of Ohio reporting requirement called "Senate Bill 6" requires institutions of higher education to report their CFI scores on a quarterly basis. For now, GASB 68 accounting standards are excluded in the CFI calculations for all Ohio institutions.

There is evidence that WSU learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts. Wright State uses a variety of reports to ensure its effectiveness and sustainability, including an annual Affordability and Efficiency Report, monthly Finance Committee reports, and frequent enrollment and retention reports from its Office of Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness. Samples of these reports were readily available. Discussions about future financial sustainability from FY2021 into the future are broadly inclusive of the entire campus as evidenced by minutes of the Faculty Senate, Finance Committee, Student Government Association, and other shared governance structures. Future budget reductions will be substantial, variously modeled on the order of \$30,000,000 to \$50,000,000 due to the drops in enrollment and reductions in WSU's of the statewide allocation model. Among the budget reduction ideas are the restructuring of academic units and reductions in staffing and athletic programs. Specific examples were provided of budget reduction strategies including changes in its copier and printer vendor and a renegotiation of WSU's contract with its food service vendor (Chartwells).

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.

Rationale

WSU has the resources, structures, and processes that are sufficient to fulfill its mission. It has planned for the financial challenges for the future. It also appears to have the appropriate processes in place for budgeting and monitoring expenses. However, since October 2018, WSU is currently operating without a Strategic Plan. WSU indicates that this delay was due to the change in leadership. The delay has lasted nearly two years and there is no evidence at this time of a plan to re-start the strategic planning process during Fall 2020. Thus, the university is not adequately planning of the future.

Because WSU has been operating under a strategic plan that expired in 2018, and did not indicate any plan or commitment to completing or re-initiating a strategic planning process, a monitoring report is being requested by August 31, 2021.

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 With Concerns
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date

8/31/2021

Report Focus

The team requests an interim monitoring report to be due in by the end of August 2021. Because WSU has been operating without a strategic plan since October 2018, and did not indicate any plan or commitment to completing or re-initiating a strategic planning process, a monitoring report is being requested by August 31, 2021. Continuing into another academic year without a strategic planning process leaves the university in lack of clear priorities for the future where uncertainty is already high and challenges will continue. The report should provide evidence and analysis on three topics:

1. Evidence that a strategic planning process has been restarted, or that the draft strategic plan has been implemented;
 2. Evidence and analysis of what Wright State University has been using to guide its decision making in the absence of a formal strategic plan; and
 3. Evidence of a schedule for the completion of a strategic planning process moving forward.
-

Conclusion

Due to the recent change over of leadership and lack of an approved strategic plan for the institution, it is recommended that the institution remain on the Open Pathway. In several of the core components elements, reviewers provided useful guidance as the institution moves toward the 10 year comprehensive review. This feedback along with the re-initiation of a strategic planning process will build for a stronger Assurance Argument for the comprehensive review. Often the reviewers had to seek evidence to support the arguments presented, and sometimes, this evidence was either not found or not accessible.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met With Concerns

Sanctions Recommendation

No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Eligible to choose



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE: Wright State University, OH
TYPE OF REVIEW: Open Pathway Assurance Review
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:
DATES OF REVIEW: 6/29/2020 -

No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: no changes

Degrees Awarded: Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Specialist, Doctors

Recommended Change: no changes

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2015 - 2016

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2025 - 2026

Recommended Change: no changes

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

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

Recommended Change: no changes

Additional Location:

The institution has been approved for the Notification Program, allowing the institution to open new additional locations within the United States.

Recommended Change: no changes



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

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 changes

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway

Open Pathway

Recommended Change: no changes

Upcoming Events

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2025 - 2026

Recommended Change: no changes

Quality Initiative Report: 06/02/2025

Other

Recommended Change: no changes

Quality Initiative Proposal: 06/01/2023

Other

Recommended Change: no changes

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change:

Monitoring Report due August 31, 2021 to provide evidence and analysis on three topics, to include 1. Evidence that a strategic planning process has been restarted, or that the draft strategic plan has been implemented; 2. Evidence and analysis of what Wright State University has been using to guide its decision making in the absence of a formal strategic plan; and 3. Evidence of a schedule for the completion of a strategic planning process moving forward.



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Institutional Data

Educational Programs		Recommended Change: no changes
Undergraduate		
Certificate	64	_____
Associate Degrees	13	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	102	_____
Graduate		
Master's Degrees	65	_____
Specialist Degrees	1	_____
Doctoral Degrees	10	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

Lake Campus, 7600 State Route 703, Celina, OH, 45822

Recommended Change: no changes

Additional Locations

Miami University, 501 E High St, , Oxford, OH, 45056 - Active

The Duke E. Ellis Human Development Institute, 9 North Edwin C. Moses Boulevard, Dayton, OH, 45402-683 - Active

Recommended Change: no changes

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: no changes

Distance Delivery

13.0401 - Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Master, Master in Education - Teacher Leader

13.0404 - Educational, Instructional, and Curriculum Supervision, Master, M.Ed Educational Leadership-Principalship

13.0409 - Secondary School Administration/Principalship, Master, Educational Leadership - Principalship

13.0501 - Educational/Instructional Technology, Certificate, CERT Instructional Design of Online Learning



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

13.9999 - Education, Other, Specialist, Ed,S Curriculum & Instruction - Professional Development
 13.9999 - Education, Other, Specialist, Ed.S Curriculum & Instruction Professional Development (CIPD)
 13.9999 - Education, Other, Specialist, Ed.S Educational Leadership - Superintendent
 13.9999 - Education, Other, Specialist, Ed.S. Educational Leadership-Superintendent
 14.0901 - Computer Engineering, General, Certificate, CERT Cyber Security Analytics
 14.0901 - Computer Engineering, General, Master, MS Cyber Security
 14.1301 - Engineering Science, Master, M.S. in Human Factors Engineering
 40.0601 - Geology/Earth Science, General, Master, MST Earth Science
 42.2803 - Counseling Psychology, Master, Master of Rehabilitation Counseling
 51.3801 - Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse, Bachelor, RN-BSN Degree Completion
 51.3805 - Family Practice Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, CERT Primary Care PNP
 51.3805 - Family Practice Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Cert- Primary Care PNP
 51.3805 - Family Practice Nurse/Nursing, Master, MSN Family Nurse Practitioner
 51.3808 - Nursing Science, Doctor, Doctor of Nursing Practice
 51.3809 - Pediatric Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Acute care PNP
 51.3809 - Pediatric Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, Cert-Pediatric CNS
 51.3809 - Pediatric Nurse/Nursing, Certificate, School Nurse
 51.3817 - Nursing Education, Certificate, Nursing Education
 52.0101 - Business/Commerce, General, Master, MBA
 52.0203 - Logistics, Materials, and Supply Chain Management, Master, M.S. in Logistics and Supply Chain Management
 52.1201 - Management Information Systems, General, Master, Master of Information Systems

Contractual Arrangements

14.01 Engineering, General - Master - Master - 14.01 Engineering, General (Master of Science in Engineering)
 - Chung Yuan Christian University (CYCU)

None

Recommended Change: no changes

Consortial Arrangements

14.01 - Engineering, General - Doctor - Doctor - 14.01 Engineering, General (PhD in Engineering) - Dayton Area Graduate Study Institute

14.01 - Engineering, General - Master - Master - 14.01 Engineering, General (Master's in Engineering) - Dayton Area Graduate Studies Institute

52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General - Bachelor - Business - Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education

Recommended Change: no changes
