**Offsite Review (OSR) Summary of Lines of Inquiry**

**Directions**: This form is to be completed by the team at the conclusion of its daylong Offsite Review of the institutional report and supporting materials. The form will be sent to the institution within one week by the WSCUC liaison, and a response to section IV will be sent back from the institution eight weeks in advance of the Accreditation Visit. This form can be in a bulleted list, outline or narrative format. Please do not delete this first page, i.e., this cover page. Instead complete information as requested and submit it with the Lines of Inquiry.

OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR)

Institution under Review: California State University, San Marcos \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Offsite Review: November 18-19, 2015 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Team Chair: Al Karnig \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 **The Offsite Review team recommends the following actions be taken**:

\_X\_ Proceed with the Accreditation Visit scheduled in: March 15-18, 2015\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Reschedule the Accreditation Visit to: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The reason(s) the Team recommends rescheduling the visit is/are:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Due date for institutional response to Section IV (specify exact date):**

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_January 20, 2016\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Overview of the lines of inquiry. Please include the following language in this section:

This document identifies five (5) lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution’s report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR) that may be pursued during the visit. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section IV: “The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit.”

1. Commendations. The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:
* The presentation of a high-quality Institutional Report—succinct, clear, focused, and with useful data.
* Strong review processes and comprehensive approaches to recruitment, graduation and retention of historically underrepresented minorities, foster youth, and students from Indian Tribes.
* Well-articulated meaning of undergraduate and graduate degrees and emerging assurance of their quality and integrity.
* Allocation of resources to priorities in assessment and program reviews, as evidenced by developing efforts in core competencies, program review workshops, faculty incentives, and excellent work and resource infusion by the Division of Student Affairs.
1. Lines of inquiry. The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit:
* The university’s approach to strategic planning, including how CSUSM has undertaken since 2006 (a) holistic planning and budget management, (b) handling 24% recent student-enrollment growth, and (c) how the university anticipates financing planned enrollment growth.
* The effectiveness of assessment of student learning and its implementation across the institution, including but not limited to academic and student affairs programs, General Education, and student success programs.
* Evidence of the role of program review in student success, assessment of student learning, program improvement, and new program development.
* The university’s integrated, institutional approach to student success, including but not limited to the use of institutional data on retention and graduation, coordination of participating units’ efforts, and evaluation of different student success initiatives.
* How CSUSM creates and sustains a culture of teaching, learning and assessment among all instructional personnel, including tenure track, non-tenure track, and part-time faculty, including recent hires.
1. Request for additional documents and information. The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit:
* Examples of program review MOUs, specifically
	+ Two professional programs
	+ One Arts or Humanities program
	+ One Physical Science program
	+ One Social Science program
	+ Mathematics
* Examples (no more than 6) of responses to MOUS
* Examples of interim reports since 2012 implementation of new program review process
* List of the titles of the 30 + reports from RaDaR referenced in the IR (p. 56)
	+ Example of most/least requested reports
	+ Example of a report that is useful to student success efforts but is not frequently requested
* Lists of peer and aspirational institutions
* Overall organization chart
* Historical organization charts (pre- academic division reorganization)
* Assessment Organization Chart
* Faculty Center Description/Mission
* Schedule of faculty development activities sponsored by the Faculty Center for the last two years

The only written documents and information the team expects before the visit are listed in this section. The team does not expect or invite a written response to any of the questions posed or issues raised in other sections of this form.

1. Individuals and groups to meet during the visit. The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit.
* President Karen Haynes
* Each VP/Provost separately
	+ Provost Graham Oberem
	+ VP Linda Hawk (Finance & Administrative Services)
	+ VP Neal Hoss (University Advancement)
	+ VP Lorena Meza (Student Affairs)
	+ VP Patricia Prado-Olmos (Community Engagement)
	+ AVP Matt Ceppi (Institutional Planning & Analysis)
* Dean of Extended Learning (Mike Schroder)
* Academic deans as a group
* Academic Affairs Leadership Council (except for deans)
* Student Affairs Leadership Team
* Student success personnel
	+ Dean of Students (Dilcie Perez)
	+ Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Dawn Formo)
	+ Director of First Year Programs (Joanne Pedersen)
* Associated Students Incorporated leadership
* University Budget Committee
* Academic Senate Executive Committee
* Faculty from two programs whose MOUs we received
	+ One that has specialized accreditation
	+ One that does not have specialized accreditation
* Vice Provost, Planning and Academic Resources (Kamel Haddad)
* AVP Faculty (Michelle Hunt)
* Dean of Academic Programs and ALO (Regina Eisenbach)
* Director, Faculty Center (Elisa Grant-Vallone)
* General Education Committee
* Assessment Specialist (Melissa Simnitt)
* University Assessment Committee
* Temecula Site Team