

Westmont College Institutional Proposal to the Western Association of Schools & Colleges (WASC) January 2003

Section 1: Institutional Context

The WASC re-accreditation review comes at a propitious moment in Westmont's history. Westmont has completed its expansion in terms of enrollment, having reached the level of 1200 on-campus students that the community and the college agree should be a ceiling for the college. The college is approaching the end of an era of enrollment averaging in which the presence of a number of on-campus students above the 1200 ceiling has for several years helped to fund capital improvements. Although the college has just completed a capital campaign that exceeded all goals and precedents by generating \$56 million in new gifts, the college also faces unprecedented challenges in gaining approval for a revision of its master plan, completing its campus, and securing the financial resources required by the operating budget to support the work of the college as all the buildings called for in the revised master plan come on line during the next 10-30 years.

Educationally, the college also stands poised between unprecedented accomplishments and unprecedented challenges. Relying on grants totalling more than \$500,000 from the Irvine Foundation, the college has completed an extensive review process during the past seven years that led to faculty adoption of six standards for student learning outcomes (see attachment #1) in the following areas:

- ❖ Christian orientation
- ❖ diversity
- ❖ critical-interdisciplinary thinking
- ❖ written and oral communication
- ❖ active societal and intellectual engagement
- ❖ research and technology.

In adopting these six standards (as opposed to the 11 program standards previously proposed), the college was implementing the 1995 WASC recommendation "to reduce the number of standards and evidences to manageable proportions" (p. 52). Each of the academic departments of the college has now completed its own self-study based on those six standards for student learning outcomes. Although each department has identified how its program offers inputs toward fulfilling the six standards, we are still in the process of identifying appropriate evidence for student learning outcomes, some of which are clearly more measurable by traditional means than others.

During the past three years, the faculty have invited in outside consultants to help us in this process. In addition there have been three distinct stages in our efforts to embed dialogue about student learning among the faculty. After the initial stage of departmental self-studies, the departments interacted with colleagues on the Assessment Advisory Committee about their self-studies. At the end of this initial round of dialogue, a task force evaluated this process to determine how the dialogue at the department level could be most effective in transforming student learning. Since the WASC four-year review, the six standards for student learning outcomes have been refined and formally adopted by the faculty.

During the past three years, the college has completed a thorough reassessment of general education (as recommended by WASC) and, for the first time in 35 years, has adopted a new general education framework (see attachment #2). Still before us is the detailed description of a number of specific courses in the new general education structure and the implementation of that structure in fall 2004.

We also stand on the cusp of a new era of leadership within the college. Although Westmont has a new president and a new provost (after the stability of 25 years of presidential leadership), we also enjoy considerable continuity in our new leadership. The provost who called for a reassessment of general education is now our president; the vice provost who oversaw the adoption of the standards for learning outcomes and who chaired the review of general education is now our provost. Under this leadership the distinctive context for a Westmont education continues to be that of an undergraduate, residential, Christian, liberal arts college with a global vision. Who we are is in part indicated by identities we have rejected. We have made informed decisions *not* to expand into a university, *not* to offer graduate programs, *not* to engage in distance learning programs or degree completion programs (i.e., adult education). Westmont *is* expanding off-campus study programs in ways that are congruent with our distinctives as an undergraduate, residential, Christian, liberal arts college. We are also continuing to increase our selectivity. In 1992, following the last WASC re-accreditation, the college admitted 89% of approximately 918 first-year applicants. In 2002, the number of applicants topped 1531, while the percentage admitted dropped to 64%.

The last WASC re-accreditation team identified a number of issues facing the college. The need for tighter connections within our academic planning has, in part, been realized by the way the faculty-wide process for adopting student learning outcomes has, a) informed our academic departments' self-studies, and, b) provided criteria for the revision of the general education curriculum. The need to secure financial resources commensurate with our mission has, in part, been addressed by the very gratifying results of our recent capital campaign even as we acknowledge the fiscal challenges before us. In the area of faculty evaluation and contracts, we have standardized multi-year contracts for faculty and taken positive steps toward ensuring accountability for senior faculty. Although we can point to some successes, we continue to face challenges as we seek to diversify the people and programs of the college in terms of racial diversity, gender diversity and socio-economic diversity. The priority we attach to these goals is reflected in our obtaining a \$400,000 grant from the Irvine Foundation to increase the diversity of our student body and to achieve the college's program standard of diversity. All curricular projects funded by this grant will be for projects that specify in advance the particular student learning outcomes to be achieved and the evidence by which such student learning outcomes will be assessed.

In addition to our progress in those areas, the new challenges before us include:

- ❖ developing structures for assessing the six learning outcomes adopted by the college as standards that apply to general education, to all academic majors, and to our campus-wide educational program.
- ❖ implementing the new general education program.
- ❖ securing county approval for the revision of our campus master plan.
- ❖ establishing priorities for future fund-raising campaigns as we secure the financial resources to complete the buildings called for in our campus master plan while maintaining and enhancing a flourishing academic program.
- ❖ working within a cap of 1200 on-campus students without a margin for additional income as a result of enrollment averaging.

Our goals and objectives for the WASC review emerge from an effort to recognize the particular moment we are in and to prepare to meet the challenges we face.

Section 2: Description of Expected Outcomes

As a result of the re-accreditation process, we hope to:

- ❖ Clarify our processes for expanding our financial resources and allocating those resources among competing priorities. We need to ensure that we have adequate structures and processes in place to:

- receive input from the college community regarding program needs
 - determine priorities for fund-raising campaigns (and for other means of enlarging our resources)
 - communicate decisions regarding the raising and allocation of resources.
- ❖ Improve undergraduate education at Westmont by focusing on two specific goals:
 - 1) achieving student learning outcomes in general education and 2) achieving student learning outcomes in departmental programs. In doing so, we will focus campus attention on developing suitable tools and strategies for assessing student learning outcomes. We need to sustain faculty and student life conversations about the six standards for learning outcomes so that all pertinent constituencies will be aware of and facilitate student growth toward the six goals. As these six standards are to be taken into account in the program review process, we need to develop tools that are appropriate for meaningful review of the work of each academic department and student life program. In doing so, we will clarify our current procedures for the collection of data and the ways in which we use that assessment data to engage in a continuing process of program modification.
 - ❖ Strengthen our on-going program review process to ensure that all academic departments and student life programs continue to develop and use appropriate procedures for reviewing goals, curriculum and student learning outcomes. During 1999-2002 the college participated in a pilot project to shift our program review process to focus on student learning outcomes. During that project, funded by grants from the Irvine Foundation, every educational department engaged in a self-study, assessing their syllabi and departmental practices in light of the six standards for student learning outcomes. Acting on the success of that pilot project, the faculty in April 2002 established a permanent cycle of program review based on the six standards of student learning that were formally adopted. Beginning in 2002-2003 each department will engage in a self-study every five years as part of an ongoing review cycle of planning, goal setting, implementation, assessment, and program modification.

Section 3: Description of How Constituencies Were Involved

In Spring 2002 the provost convened a WASC planning group which met during the spring, summer and early fall of 2002 to plan for the institutional proposal. This planning group consisted of representatives from each of the academic divisions of the faculty, student life, the president's office, and the offices for finance, institutional research, and college advancement.

Section 4: Description of How the Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews Will Be Staged

We plan to complete the self-study for the Preparatory Review by the fall of 2004, in preparation for a spring 2005 site visit. The self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review will be completed by the fall of 2005, in preparation for a spring 2006 site visit.

Section 5: Preparatory Review

For the Preparatory Review, we will organize the institutional data display according to the four Commission standards. As part of the development of the institutional proposal, the planning group has already developed a basic descriptive data profile. Work is underway to assemble relevant data, policies and procedures as evidence in support of the standards and related criteria and questions. Reflective essays will place the institutional portfolio in the context of both the preparatory and educational effectiveness reviews.

As a part of the Preparatory Review, we expect to:

- ❖ Survey members of the Westmont community to determine the extent to which respondents indicate they feel that they have:
 - had appropriate opportunities for input regarding program needs and the establishment of goals for fund-raising campaigns
 - received timely and clear communication of decisions determining the priorities for fund-raising campaigns
 - received timely and clear communication of decisions regarding the allocation of resources as part of the ongoing budgetary process.
- ❖ Review our existing structures and processes for determining fund-raising goals and allocating financial resources, making any improvements necessary or desirable in light of the above survey results. Such a review will involve the president and provost working with the President's Advisory Council, the Faculty Council, and, possibly, the Board of Trustees. We will communicate any changes in structures or procedures to all members of the college community.
- ❖ Determine what data we find valuable for purposes of ongoing institutional review and the assessment of our educational effectiveness. Such a determination will involve the director of institutional research in conjunction with the Academic Senate, the Program Review Committee, the General Education Committee, and the WASC planning group. As part of this process we will identify what data we will collect and what information will be available for which constituencies.
- ❖ Provide a more systematic dissemination of information particularly as it is linked to our goals for educational effectiveness.
- ❖ Prepare a College Fact Book to be issued annually by the institutional research office.
- ❖ Establish a web-based data portfolio.

The college already has available the following data sources:

- ❖ Common Data Set: The Common Data Set is an initiative to promote peer institutions providing consistent answers to a standard set of survey questions. The Common Data Set provides information on the following categories: A) general information, B) enrollment and persistence, C) freshmen admission, D) transfer admission, E) academic offerings, F) student life, G) annual expenses, H) financial aid, I) faculty and class size, and J) degrees conferred. Westmont has information available from 1997 to the present.
- ❖ Comparative data with our peer groups. We use the following comparison groups for various purposes:
 1. selected national liberal arts colleges in California (i.e., Pomona, Claremont-McKenna, Scripps, Occidental, Pitzer, Whittier, Mills)
 2. Christian College Consortium national liberal arts colleges (i.e., Wheaton, Gordon, Houghton)
 3. Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) members.
- ❖ Reporting to the financial community for the bond rating of the college.

Student information in the above data sources include annual reports on student enrollment, retention, ethnicity; the graduation rates of all students, the graduation rates of athletes and ethnic groups, student demographics including home state and denominational preference, majors by class level, majors of graduates, and GPA studies. Faculty information in the above data sources include annual reports on faculty by rank, tenure, gender, and ethnicity; faculty salaries; and department load. General information in the data sources include tuition, room and board charge comparisons.

Section 6: Educational Effectiveness Review

Our broad vision for a Westmont education is that graduates will be versatile thinkers and effective communicators who are informed about the Christian faith, respectful of human diversity, skillful in using appropriate technology, and on a trajectory toward a lifetime of active learning. Toward that end, the Westmont faculty have adopted standards for student learning outcomes in the areas of: 1) Christian orientation, 2) diversity, 3) critical-interdisciplinary thinking, 4) written and oral communication, 5) active societal and intellectual engagement, and 6) research and technology. Initiating an ongoing institutional conversation regarding our effectiveness in achieving those student learning outcomes, Westmont implemented a pilot project—as part of a Futures Project funded by grants from the Irvine Foundation—to refocus our program review process on student learning outcomes. Those six standards for learning outcomes also informed the three-year dialogue—between the General Education Task Force and the faculty as a whole—that resulted in the recent adoption of a new general education structure. Now as we move to put into effect the new general education program and to institutionalize a program review process focused on student learning outcomes, we are ready to take the next steps in embedding the six standards into the educational program of the college. The seriousness with which we take that task—and the goal of educational effectiveness—is reflected in the following two specific topics for review.

Topic #1 Achieving Student Learning Outcomes in General Education

Although the six standards for learning outcomes apply to the whole program of the college, we expect such standards to be achieved, in part, through each student's work in general education. Our concern for student learning permeates the recently adopted general education structure. Indeed, one of the impelling incentives for initiating the lengthy and sometimes difficult review of general education was our desire to present students with a rationale for general education that would itself be educative. Throughout the history of the college the "General Education Requirements" section of the college catalog has just consisted of a list of required courses. Whatever rationale existed for these particular requirements has not been communicated in any effective way to students. Indeed, it has been decades since we articulated the rationale for particular general education requirements to ourselves. Over long years of habituation, it has become all too easy for faculty and departments to think of themselves as owning a section of turf on the general education landscape, rather than seeing themselves as stewards serving the larger interest of the growth and development of students. Over the past three years, we have engaged in the sometimes painful process of resurveying the entire terrain that serves as our commons, sometimes having to remove fences that have been erected over what should be regarded as open paths. In reviewing the general education program of the college, our first concern has been to devise a rationale so that students may see for themselves, in advance, where the paths of general education will lead them. Rather than allowing students to suppose that general education consists of a dozen classes that they need to "get out of the way," we want students to realize, in advance, how their journey through general education will develop their skills, nourish their faith, enhance their understanding, expand their capacity for inquiry, and lead them toward a lifetime of competent and compassionate action.

Beyond offering an educative rationale for general education, we have also realigned the general education requirements themselves so that the pathways open to students will more clearly lead them toward the student learning outcomes that serve as our goals:

1. **Christian Orientation Standard.** Our goal that students will be grounded in knowledge of the Christian faith is reflected in the general education expectation that all students will complete substantial coursework in the categories of "Biblical and Theological Canons," "Literary Traditions in Christian Perspective," and "Christian Perspectives on Civilization."

Our goal that students will incarnate their Christian orientation in appropriate practices, affections and virtues is reflected in the general education expectation that all students will—by the end of their college career—demonstrate the capacity for “Competent and Compassionate Action.” This general education criterion requires students to move beyond knowledge to action: engaging in projects or production; serving society, enacting justice, or communicating cross-culturally.

2. **Written and Oral Communication Standard.** Our goal that students will be effective communicators, both as speakers and writers, is reflected in a new college-wide emphasis on writing-intensive and speech-intensive courses as part of the “Common Skills” section of the general education program. The expectation that all students will take such courses both within their major and outside of their major is designed to ensure that students develop their abilities to communicate effectively to a wide range of audiences, developing their abilities to articulate information, ideas, and convictions both in written and oral discourse.
3. **Diversity Standard.** Our goal that students have the understanding and skills to engage people unlike themselves is reflected in a variety of ways that permeate the new general education structure. All students will participate in a course that equips them for “Thinking Globally,” toward the end that they will become informed agents of redemption and justice in the world. Students will explore both Western and non-Western literary works and will encounter a geographically comprehensive approach to world history. Further, by the end of their college career, all students will
 - ❖ participate in a course or an internship (under the rubric of “Serving Society; Enacting Justice”) that raises their awareness of issues of justice grounded in social class, gender, ethnicity or human disability; or
 - ❖ participate in an off-campus program or an on-campus course that involves significant encounters with people from other cultures in a context designed to facilitate mutual understanding and appreciation (“Communicating Cross-Culturally”).

In addition, our goal that students deepen their appreciation of other cultures is reflected in strengthening the language requirement in the new general education structure. All students will now be required to take college-level coursework in language or demonstrate language proficiency appropriate to the completion of three semesters of college language study.

4. **Critical-Interdisciplinary Thinking Standard.** Our goal that students develop their capacity for critical thinking and their capacity to think abstractly is reflected in the new general education requirement that all students complete coursework that engages them in “Philosophical Reflections on Truth and Value,” and “Reasoning Abstractly.” Our goal that students become versatile thinkers who demonstrate the ability to frame appropriate questions, and use the tools provided by different disciplinary methodologies is reflected in the general education requirement that students complete “Common Inquiries” courses that expose them to a variety of disciplinary approaches. Our goal that students engage in interdisciplinary thinking is reflected in the new general education requirement that all students take coursework that involves them in “Thinking Globally,” an expectation that is explicitly interdisciplinary.
5. **Research and Technology Standard.** Our goal that students have the skills and critical understanding necessary to make use of appropriate technologies is reflected in a variety of ways in the new general education structure. We considered but rejected the idea of instituting a new course requirement in technology per se. Instead, students completing the “Common Skills” coursework of the new general education structure will be expected to

demonstrate competence in a wide range of contemporary information technology processes. In addition, as they complete the “Understanding Society” requirement, students will reflect on the applications of contemporary technology and its impact on research methodologies, the inquiry process, and the accumulation of new knowledge.

6. **Active Societal and Intellectual Engagement Standard.** In order to realize our broad vision for Westmont’s graduates, we intend that active societal and intellectual engagement will not just be a goal to be attained in some far-off future but will also be a characteristic of a student’s experience of education while on the Westmont campus. Rather than just being a goal to be attained in the student’s major or in a specific course requirements in the general education structure, we intend that active and collaborative learning will be characteristic of students’ experience from their first semester. First-year students taking their first college courses are not just learning a body of material; they are also learning what it means to engage in education at Westmont. Recognizing the crucial role of first-year classes not just to educate but to socialize entering students, we intend that active intellectual engagement will not just be a goal to be attained in the junior or senior year but will be a characteristic of students’ experience of education from their first semester on campus including all of their general education coursework.

After adopting the new general education structure in April 2002, Westmont faculty in September 2002 elected a new General Education Committee to effect the new structure. During fall 2002 the committee began work on implementing the new general education structure, soliciting course proposals and syllabi from faculty for all of the gen. ed. components. The intention of the faculty was to institute the new requirements for students entering in fall 2003. However, since registration materials for fall 2003 go to press during the first week of February 2003, it became apparent in January 2003 that more extensive dialogue was needed to mediate between the mandate of the faculty as a whole, as entrusted to the General Education Committee, and the individual departments involved in teaching specific courses. At present the General Education Committee is reviewing syllabi and carrying out that dialogue with a firm commitment to have the new general education program in place for students entering in the fall of 2004.

As part of Westmont’s self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review to be completed by the fall of 2005 (in preparation for a spring 2006 site visit), the college will compile and make available to the WASC visitation team:

- ❖ Syllabi and course proposals submitted to the General Education Committee for fulfillment of each of the components of the new general education structure
- ❖ A record of the dialogue between the General Education Committee and departments or individual faculty regarding the extent to which course proposals fulfill the faculty mandates
 - for components of the new general education structure, and
 - for the six standards for student learning outcomes
- ❖ Re-submitted syllabi in cases where the rationale for inclusion in a particular section of the framework needs to be more compelling or where syllabi need to reflect more clearly to students how a particular class fits within the overall general education framework or fulfills the six standards for student learning outcomes
- ❖ Syllabi as distributed to students for Fall 2004, Spring 2005 and Fall 2005 for courses fulfilling each of the components of the new general education structure.

After students are completing coursework within the new framework, the General Education Committee will continue to monitor the general education program of the college to ensure that general education is contributing appropriately to the student learning outcomes of the college. In doing so the General Education Committee will make use of data from the National Survey of

Student Engagement and from the Senior Survey in an ongoing dialogue with faculty who offer coursework within the general education framework.

Topic #2 Achieving Student Learning Outcomes in Departmental Programs

Each academic department and student life program at Westmont has already completed a self-study as part of a pilot project in program review funded by grants from the Irvine Foundation. As part of that pilot project, which involved every faculty member and every member of the student life staff, each department reviewed its syllabi and practice to assess its student learning outcomes in light of the six standards for student learning outcomes adopted by the faculty. During 19XX to 20XX, the Program Review Task Force gave leadership in structuring helpful conversations between individual departments and the faculty as a whole, as reflected in the six standards for student learning outcomes. As a result of the success of the pilot project of program review, the Westmont faculty in September 2002 established a standing Program Review Committee to oversee the ongoing process of program review.

Beginning in 2002-2003, the Program Review Committee will work with each department on a five-year cycle, overseeing three to four departmental self-studies each year. The Program Review Committee will

- ❖ provide a forum for professional enrichment and encouragement in areas of course and program development and pedagogy, a place to share effective practices and a safe place to receive constructive criticism
- ❖ provide suitable strategies and tools—such as the systematic use of student portfolios—for departments to review curriculum and goals, identify strengths, and discuss means of addressing identified program weaknesses
- ❖ help develop departmental priorities and rationales for requesting college funds intended to strengthen a weak program or make a good program better
- ❖ encourage educators to ask themselves regularly how they can improve teaching practices and departmental efforts to enhance student learning
- ❖ take the lead in continuing a campus conversation about ways to become more intentional in designing an educational program that strives toward meeting the objectives of the college mission statement and the standards for student learning outcomes

With the assistance of the Program Review Committee, each department will assess student learning outcomes appropriate to its area, collecting a body of evidence that is useful to both the department and the institution. While no one department will satisfy all aspects of the college mission statement or demonstrate all six standards of student learning, each department will collect evidence that students are learning. The evidence gathered by each department will demonstrate student learning outcomes as appropriate to the program of the department. Each department will make use of this evidence in an ongoing review cycle of planning, goal setting, implementation, assessment, and program modification. Once every five years, departments will write—and submit to the Program Review Committee—a summary report that includes:

- ❖ a description of their program review activity
- ❖ a summary of their results, and
- ❖ a summary as to how the department has benefited from their program review.

The Program Review Committee will also enter into a dialogue with departments in order to explore ways of systematically mapping connections between course syllabi and the six learning outcomes. Our intention is to be more deliberate about the relationship between individual courses and the larger outcomes of the college. In particular, the program review process will ensure that departments become more explicit in communicating how individual courses reflect and pursue the

goals of the college. In doing so we will seek to help students see the relationships between the immediate focus of their study and the longer range student learning outcomes that they will achieve.

In addition to the program review process, the college will continue to take advantage of existing means on campus for discussion of pedagogical issues and student learning outcomes. The weekly Faculty Forums and monthly Faculty Exchange gatherings have already provided numerous occasions for discussion of pedagogical issues.

As part of Westmont's self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review, the college will compile and make available to the WASC visitation team:

- ❖ the self-study prepared by each department during 1999-2001 under the supervision of the Program Review Task Force
- ❖ the self-study of eleven departments prepared during 2002-2005 under the supervision of the Program Review Committee
- ❖ the body of evidence collected by each of the eleven departments that have engaged in self-studies during 2002-2005.

Proposed Implementation and Outcome Assessment for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The college already has available a number of means providing clear evidence of student learning. Among these are:

- ❖ the student research symposium each spring in which students from a variety of disciplines display their research
- ❖ portfolios compiled by students in the teacher preparation track of several majors
- ❖ portfolios required by various departments of some or all of their students
- ❖ talks by students regarding how their major honors projects contributed to their education
- ❖ the major honors projects themselves
- ❖ student work in senior seminars and other capstone experiences
- ❖ the annual "Passion and Civility Intramural Debate Tournament" involving over 10% of the student body
- ❖ senior shows, recitals, and performances by students in art, music, and theatre
- ❖ student learning outcomes specified for each project funded as part of the \$400,000 Diversity Grant the college has received from the Irvine Foundation

As part of Westmont's self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review, the college will compile and make available to the WASC visitation team a record of the above evidences of student learning. We will also provide a record of how the Program Review Committee and the educational departments of the college use such evidences of student learning to assess our program and engage in an ongoing process of program modification.

In addition to the data-gathering explicitly identified above as part of these two topics, we will be relying on existing data gathered by several campus-wide assessment projects, including:

- ❖ the National Survey of Student Engagement
- ❖ a survey of Westmont seniors conducted every other year by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) of UCLA supplemented by our questions
- ❖ the First-Year Student Survey of entering Westmont students conducted by HERI
- ❖ the Faculty Survey of Westmont professors conducted by HERI
- ❖ the Alumni Survey.

We will link particular items in those instruments to the six standards for learning outcomes as a means of assessing our performance in achieving each of the six standards. As an example of the linkages between such campus-wide tools of assessment and our specific student learning outcomes,

please see attachment #3 (“Data Regarding the Westmont College Program Standard of Diversity”) showing data available to establish a baseline for the college’s program standard of diversity.

In addition, the college will initiate in spring 2004 a program in which each faculty member conducts a one-hour interview with a graduating senior regarding the six learning outcomes of the college. Such interviews will complement results from the ongoing senior survey and become part of the ongoing campus-wide dialogue that will be formative for the institution as it continues to modify its program in order to more fully achieve student learning outcomes. Faculty who have conducted such interviews will be available to meet with members of the WASC visitation team.

The Program Review Committee and the General Education Committee will work with each department to ensure that data gathered from the campus-wide tools of assessment and from the systematic interviews with graduating seniors serves as a basis for an ongoing dialogue regarding student learning and provides a means of assessing our performance. The provost and the Academic Senate, in consultation with the director of institutional research, will ensure that such dialogue and program assessment contributes to an ongoing process of program modification in order to achieve more fully the student learning outcomes established by our six standards.

Section 7: Basic Descriptive Data

See attached Basic Descriptive Data Profile.

Section 8: Off-site Programs

None.

Section 9: Institutional Stipulation Statement

- ❖ Westmont College is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments; we will engage in the process with seriousness, and data presented will be accurate and will fairly present the institution.
- ❖ Westmont College has published and publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission for this purpose in Appendix 1 of the WASC Handbook. Such policies will be available on request through the period of accreditation.
- ❖ Westmont College will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education procedural requirements (USDE) as outlined in Section VI of the WASC Handbook.
- ❖ Westmont College will submit all regularly required data, and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of Accreditation.

Stan D. Gaede
President

Basic Descriptive Data Profile Attachments

- ❖ Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall Term)
- ❖ Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall Term)
- ❖ Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level (Academic Year)
- ❖ Faculty by Employment Status
- ❖ Key Financial Ratios
- ❖ Mission Statement
- ❖ Organizational Chart
- ❖ List of Academic Programs Currently Offered
- ❖ Financial Audits for the Last Two Years
- ❖ Catalog