

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
for Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

To: Westmont College

January 26–29, 2026

Team Roster

Barry H. Corey (Chair)
President
Biola University

Douglas Carlson (Assistant Chair)
Registrar & Assistant Vice Chancellor — Student Information
University of California, San Francisco

Stacey Bosick
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Education
Sonoma State University

Brian Harlan
Dean
Cornish College of the Arts

Deborah Wallace
Vice President, Administration and Finance
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Maureen Maloney (WSCUC Staff Liaison)
Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2023 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	1
A. Description of the Institution and Accreditation History.....	1
B. Team’s Review Process	1
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	3
SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS ON SELF- SELECTED THEMES	4
A. Institutional Context and Response to Previous Commission Actions (Component 1)	4
B. Institution-Specific Themes (Component 8).....	5
Theme 1: Justice and Reconciliation	8
Theme 2: Financial Health and Sustainability	11
C. Reflections: Synthesis of Insights as a Result of the Reaffirmation Process...	16
D. Compliance: 2023 WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements (Component 2)	17
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity	17
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success	21
Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures.....	24
Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement	29
SECTION III: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	37
APPENDIX A	
A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review	41
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	44
3. Student Complaints Review.....	46
4. Transfer Credit Review	48
B. Distance Education Review	49
C. Off-Campus Locations Review.....	59

I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Westmont College is located in Montecito, California. The college was founded in 1937 in Los Angeles and moved to Montecito in 1945. Westmont offers three undergraduate degrees in 29 majors. The college also offers 34 minors, coursework leading to a single- or multiple-subject teaching credential, and a postbaccalaureate certificate in theological leadership.

Westmont's mission statement defines five "planks" that describe Westmont: undergraduate, residential, Christian, liberal arts, and global. Two "rails" characterize a Westmont education: rigorous academics and a deep love for God.

In fall 2025, 1,311 students were registered at Westmont. This total includes 1,150 on campus in Montecito and 111 students at the college's off-campus location consisting of two buildings in downtown Santa Barbara. A conditional-use permit from Santa Barbara County limits on-campus enrollment to an average of 1,235 students. The six-year graduation rate was 70.3 percent, and the first-year retention rate was 85.2 percent.

Westmont employs approximately 216 staff and 104 full-time faculty. The student-to-faculty ratio is 10 to 1. Ninety-six percent of traditional undergraduate students live on campus. Approximately half of the full-time faculty live within walking distance of campus.

B. Team's Review Process

In recognition of its relatively stable outlook and high performance, Westmont was selected for a Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation Review (TPR). The report

focused on two themes: Initiatives related to justice and reconciliation, and strengthening financial health by launching new academic programs. Each team member independently read the institutional report and supporting documentation. The team decided upon writing assignments for each section of the report. The team members completed a worksheet to record observations about each section of the report, including strengths, challenges, questions, and possible lines of inquiry. The team reviewed this worksheet in a meeting on January 13, 2026. During that meeting, team members shared overall impressions of the report and planned potential lines of inquiry. Prior to the on-campus visit, the chair met with Westmont's president.

The chair and assistant chair visited the downtown location on January 26, 2026.

The team members met again on January 26, 2026, to discuss lines of inquiry and to assign team members to lead the discussions in the sessions held on campus on January 27 and 28, 2026. All team members attended the meetings in person. Approximately 10 members of the board of trustees met with the team, most in person and some by video conference. The team enjoyed Westmont's superb hospitality throughout the visit.

WSCUC established a confidential e-mail account for members of the Westmont community to communicate with the team. The team monitored this e-mail account through the last day of the team's visit.

Team members met on January 27 and 28, 2026, to review findings and to draft the commendations and recommendations. The chair met with the Westmont president on January 29, 2026, to report the findings, including the commendations and the recommendations. The chair on behalf of the team reported to the Westmont community the

commendations and recommendations in a public session on campus on January 29, 2026.

After the visit, the assistant chair compiled contributions to the report from the team members. The chair reviewed the draft and then circulated it to team members for final review.

The team appreciated the excellent organization and support from Westmont's accreditation liaison officer and all the staff, faculty, and students who facilitated Westmont's efforts in preparing the institutional report, answering questions from the review team, and, during our on-campus visit, devoting time to and respecting this important process. (CFR 1.8)

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The team was satisfied with the quality of the institutional report. The report addressed the required sections, explained the institution's actions and analyses clearly, and provided evidence and references to external sources, many attached as exhibits, to support the statements in the report. Several of the references included substantial additional information and context, providing insight into issues mentioned in the report and assisting the team in formulating its lines of inquiry.

The institutional report described numerous strengths and successes of Westmont, as well as the potential financial challenges that the college faces. During the visit, the review team confirmed these impressions and learned about the college's approach to addressing anticipated challenges.

The quality of the institutional report and supporting evidence allowed the team to prepare for an efficient and insightful visit to the campus.

Off-Campus Locations and Distance Education Programs

Westmont has an off-campus location in downtown Santa Barbara. Gifts from generous benefactors enabled the college to purchase two adjacent buildings in 2020 and 2021. A new accelerated Bachelor of Science in Nursing program enrolled 103 students in fall 2025, and a distance-education certificate of theological leadership enrolled eight students. Two members of the team toured the off-campus location during the site visit and met with nursing faculty and students.

II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS ON SELF-SELECTED THEMES

A. Institutional Context and Response to Previous Commission Actions

The Commission reaffirmed Westmont's accreditation in July 2016. The Commission's action letter identified four recommendations. Westmont submitted an interim report in 2021, and WSCUC found no issues with continued compliance with the WSCUC Standards.

In the first recommendation, the Commission advised Westmont systematically to address the requirements and expectations for the Global Awareness institutional learning objective to ensure that it is an outcome for students graduating with a Westmont degree. Westmont assessed this learning objective in 2023–24 and provided the assessment as an exhibit to the institutional report.

Second, the Commission encouraged Westmont to enhance the competencies of faculty and staff in working with students of different races, cultures, beliefs, classes, and political perspectives. Westmont has implemented multiple strategies to enhance inclusion, belonging, and cultural awareness and intelligence. Westmont also administered the

ModernThink Great Colleges to Work For Survey and developed initiatives resulting from the findings.

Third, the Commission encouraged Westmont to continue implementation of the General Education assessment program. Westmont has implemented changes to the General Education program after evaluating student feedback, but the college has not yet completed a comprehensive assessment.

Fourth, the Commission urged an aggressive exploration of the ramifications involved in remaining true to mission while charting a course for a sustainable future. With a gradual decrease in traditional residential enrollment on its main campus, Westmont has been actively planning to address future financial challenges by opening a location in downtown Santa Barbara and creating new programs to increase enrollments. In addition, Westmont understands the need to ensure alignment between these initiatives and the college's five-planked mission, and Westmont is addressing this challenge.

B. Institution-Specific Themes

Westmont College, with its strong accreditation history, chose the TPR option the Commission provided to high-functioning institutions to expediate the process and give the college more agency in framing its review. Westmont elected to focus on two themes that aligned closely with the college's institutional priorities and the WSCUC Standards. Those themes were:

1. Advance collegewide initiatives related to justice, reconciliation, and diversity.
2. Advance financial health and sustainability through implementing strategies that bolster enrollment, including the development of new programs and further establishment of recently initiated programs.

These two themes emerged through campus-wide feedback and were developed through an inclusive process. Westmont introduced and explained the TPR framework to faculty, staff, and students through multiple venues, including campus e-mails and meetings. Westmont invited members of the community to provide input through surveys and open discussions, which helped to shape and articulate the themes that ultimately guided the self-study.

The leading factor influencing Westmont's decision to select its first theme was related to the Christian conscience of the college. Advancement of collegewide initiatives related to justice, reconciliation, and diversity was at the core of this faith-based college because of its commitment to the Christian principles of understanding that every human being is made in the image of God. As a result, the religious convictions of the college are such that all students—regardless of their backgrounds—will be welcomed to the campus and will be supported in their sense of belonging and thriving as Westmont students.

A secondary factor was that in the prior WSCUC evaluation in 2016, an interim report was required that focused on matters of how students from different backgrounds are welcomed, acclimated, and noticed with a sense of belonging and evidence of flourishing. It seemed obvious that, given these emphases from the 2016 reaffirmation review and the expectations of the mid-cycle review in 2021, Westmont would perceive matters of diversity as important because they were important to the Commission.

Suffice it to say that these two realities were the principal factors influencing the college's selection of its first TPR theme. The WSCUC team has taken the approach to pursue Theme One by exploring what Westmont is doing to live into its values by

increasing the enrollment of Westmont with students from a variety of backgrounds, welcoming all students in a way that assures that they flourish and enabling them to graduate aware of how to live lives of justice and reconciliation while also prepared to engage with global literacy.

The second TPR theme focused on financial sustainability. This theme emerged out of the stress colleges face with limited endowments and a declining traditional enrollment, especially those like Westmont with a county-mandated enrollment cap. This theme explored ways in which the college might mitigate a shrinking pool of traditional students interested in a college that focuses on the five missional planks of residential, undergraduate, liberal arts, Christian, and globally immersive. Posing this theme required the college to ask new questions about these five planks, each of which is written into the 31-word mission statement of Westmont College: *Westmont College is an undergraduate, residential, Christian, liberal arts community serving God's kingdom by cultivating thoughtful scholars, grateful servants and faithful leaders for global engagement with the academy, church and world.*

During the visit, the review team found that the first theme permeated conversations across constituencies. Although students were less familiar with the technical aspects of accreditation or the TPR process itself, when team members described the theme, students affirmed that the themes resonated with their lived experience. Students were readily able to provide concrete examples of how these themes are expressed in their academic and co-curricular lives. The same was true for faculty and staff in that they could articulate ways in which justice, diversity, and reconciliation were being integrated into the curricular and co-curricular programs of the college.

The second theme to “advance financial health and sustainability through implementing strategies that bolster enrollment, including the development of new programs and further establishment of recently initiated programs” was less well known by students, other than those students who were enrolled in the handful of newly launched programs. Faculty, on the other hand, were well aware of the administration and board’s initiatives to introduce new programs intended to be a hedge against enrollment decline. A recurring theme among some of the more vocal voices in the faculty regarding new program development questioned whether these new programs passed the five-plank test of being residential, Christian, undergraduate, liberal arts, and globally immersive. This discussion about the mission of the college—a statement dating back to the 1980s—and the founding vision of the college, which was established in 1937, became a contextual point of whether or not these new programs were consistent with Westmont’s reason for being.

Theme 1: Justice and Reconciliation

The team observed that the theme of justice and reconciliation clearly resonates across campus, though it is articulated and operationalized in various ways depending on context. Importantly, the institution defined and framed this theme in a manner that was consistent with its identity as a Christian college. The self-study emphasized that Westmont’s initiatives in justice and reconciliation were grounded in Christian understandings of these concepts and were aligned with its mission. (CFR 1.1) The community shared a foundational belief that all persons are created in the image of God and therefore deserve care, dignity, and respect.

This shared theological grounding provided a common basis for dialogue and learning. It also allowed the institution to address potential tensions thoughtfully. For example, as explained to the review team, students may initially perceive certain social justice movements and religious commitments as being in conflict. Faculty, staff, and administrators reported that they are able to engage such concerns by returning to the institution's foundational commitments and mission-centered understanding of justice and reconciliation.

Westmont considers justice and reconciliation as long embedded in the ethos of the institution. The team's conversations across campus supported this understanding. The hiring of a chief diversity officer (CDO) further formalized and strengthened this commitment. There was widespread understanding that students must be prepared to work effectively with people from a variety of backgrounds and perspectives and that part of Westmont's responsibility is to equip students to do so in ways that integrate Christian values with respect for differences.

One of the most tangible expressions of this theme was its integration into the curriculum. Westmont revised its General Education program to include a set of courses focused on justice and reconciliation. The board of trustees approved this revision, and the college launched these courses in fall 2024. Although formal assessment of student learning outcomes has not yet occurred, the institution conducted an initial self-assessment that, from its perspective, indicated positive reception among students and faculty. Students reported stronger understandings of race and justice issues through biblically grounded frameworks. Westmont, however, has not yet completed a comprehensive assessment of General Education as an integrated program, and so there remains

to be seen evidence that the learning outcomes of the newly established set of courses that focus on justice and reconciliation demonstrate formation.

The institution also advanced this theme through its faculty recruitment and retention practices. Faculty positions were posted broadly to encourage a wide applicant pool. Faculty were provided professional development orchestrated by the CDO to ensure their readiness to address the theme of justice and reconciliation in their work with students. (CFR 3.3) The student population has grown slightly in overall size with the introduction of new majors, including nursing, and the opening of a downtown campus, and based on conversations with students—though not based on verifiable evidence—the themes of justice and reconciliation are permeating all of the degree and non-degree programs.

As Westmont expands its programs, it is actively working to ensure that students at the downtown campus experience a similar sense of community and belonging as those at the main campus. Beyond the curriculum, Westmont has implemented several student support initiatives designed to foster belonging and student success. (CFR 2.13) A Wake Forest Well Being Assessment conducted in fall 2023 informed a series of changes. The counseling center has been restructured to provide both in-person and telehealth services. The early alert system has been strengthened, with outcomes now disaggregated by various student characteristics to enable more targeted follow-up and intervention (2.14).

The college has launched student groups for first-generation students and is in the process of implementing a cohort-based first-year seminar. Furthermore, Westmont added an Academic Affairs Day to new student orientation, and survey data indicate that this addition helped reduce student stress around academic preparedness, especially those

who were first generation students. These efforts were intended to ensure that all students experience belonging and are supported toward retention and success. (CFR 1.2)

In response to growth in the number of students seeking accommodations, Westmont has increased staffing in the Accessibility Resources Office. The institution also reports efforts to cultivate a community culture in which all members are treated with dignity and respect.

Finally, Westmont has initiated faculty exit interviews to understand better the reasons for departure and to identify areas that may require attention. (CFR 1.5)

The team commended Westmont for its progress on its goals to educate students on justice, reconciliation, belonging, cultural competencies, and the ability to discuss differences—progress that Westmont has achieved through curricular and co-curricular programming rooted in the Christian faith and jointly adopted by the administration and the faculty.

Theme 2: Financial Health and Sustainability

Westmont focused on advancing financial health and sustainability by bolstering enrollment, including developing new programs and expanding programs at the downtown campus. Westmont highlighted the risks to its future if the institution fails to plan and invest. (CFR 3.4, 3.5) In this sense, Westmont's expansion into new programs—some of which are not traditional to the college's culture—was meant to live into the founding vision of the college more than to square with the more recently developed mission statement of the college. Some within the faculty argued that the mission statement is the standard by which all new programs should be vetted. The administration and the board, on the other hand, argued that the founder's intent and the college's first prin-

ciples are the standards by which all new programs should be vetted. Clearly, the intent of the founder was to provide a Christian education to rising generations of students, and her establishing intent was an education that focused on just one of the five planks: Christian.

That said, in the decade since the last accreditation review the college has launched new degree programs in engineering, data sciences, environmental sciences, and nursing, and, in certificate form, a program in theological leadership. Of these, the engineering degree to a lesser extent and the nursing degree (off-campus and offered as an advanced baccalaureate degree) to a greater extent, have proven to be positive financial moves for Westmont. The new engineering degree has averaged 50 to 70 students in the program, and the advanced baccalaureate nursing degree has provided approximately \$2 million in revenue to the college.

During the team's visit, the team observed that developing sustainable programs was a consistent focus of the board of trustees. Westmont's strategy to implement innovative programming at the downtown location has produced favorable results, including higher enrollment and greater community visibility. This program was conceived over a conversation between the Westmont president and the Cottage Hospital (Santa Barbara) CEO, imagining the good that would come from Westmont students taking on nursing professions within the local area. Now this program is a respected part of the community as stated by civic leaders during the President's Annual Leadership Lecture Series and has continued to attract major donors and to garner reputational support. (CFR 3.4)

According to Westmont's leadership, investing in the ownership and renovation of two buildings in downtown Santa Barbara secured the downtown campus as an incu-

bator for the institution's growth programs. Though more ideas are on the horizon, and although the Center for Applied Technology uses the downtown facilities during the summer, to date only the nursing program is a substantial degree initiative at the downtown campus. While the Montecito campus reflects Westmont's longstanding identity, expanding into a cohort-based model downtown for non-residential students has helped fortify the college's economic posture. The cohort model is designed for groups of 20 or so students enrolled each year for the advanced Bachelor of Science Degree in Nursing. These students have previously earned an undergraduate degree. They complete their coursework and practicum in the span of one and a half years, qualifying them to enter into careers as registered nurses. Not only is this program meeting a mutual need for students and medical centers, but it is also providing new revenue streams for the college to offset a shrinking undergraduate student body on the Montecito campus, thus supporting and enhancing financial sustainability.

The enrollment cap at the Montecito campus had always been a limiting factor in how Westmont could accommodate its students. Previously, a robust semester-long set of study abroad opportunities enabled Westmont to "overflow" its undergraduates into other settings. By doing so, the tuition revenues included more students than just those on the "capped enrollment" Montecito campus. When enrollment began to decline among residential students, the leadership decided to direct students toward summer rather than semester-long study abroad opportunities. In so doing, the Montecito campus remained close to its cap while the "overflow" students diminished. This trend led the leadership to consider new degree programs, some that stretched outside the five planks of the mission statement. The intent of the administration and the board was clear: while the college was

still in a place of relative financial strength (i.e., 41 years without ending in the red), growth would need to occur outside the Montecito campus. Westmont considers the new nursing program to be residential (students are learning in community though living off-campus), undergraduate (though it is their second degree), global (in the curricular emphasis on global healthcare issues and encouragement toward service abroad), Christian (in the faculty commitments and the faith integration of courses), and liberal arts (in the courses in theology, philosophy, and sociology required for the advanced nursing degree). (CFR 1.1)

Westmont's programming is becoming more innovative as a hedge against demographic-caused student decline. Of these programs, only the nursing advanced bachelor's degree is showing significant revenues to the campus, totaling about \$2 million per year. Other programs' effect on revenue are still to be determined (e.g., environmental science and data sciences) or were established as donor-initiated (e.g., the certificate in theological leadership). With the launch of these programs, the institution is demonstrating a desire to diversify offerings so that new types of students will be attracted to Westmont, and these would be students other than traditional high school graduates looking for a rigorous liberal arts college where faith is infused and where "being there" matters.

Though not plummeting, since 2020 Westmont has experienced gradual drop in its on-campus enrollment. For example, the average on-campus enrollment declined by about three students per year over a 20-year period. With the county-mandated residential cap of 1,235 on its Montecito campus enrollment, Westmont historically had, for decades, kept close to that cap through channeling students to the above-mentioned

semester-long study abroad programs and building a San Francisco site. These “overflow” options became increasingly “drains” on the main campus enrollment, an enrollment that was necessary for Westmont’s financial well-being. As such, the San Francisco campus was closed, and students in the semester-long programs were encouraged to go abroad instead in the summer.

In addition to the start of new programs to expand the Westmont mission and to produce new revenues, especially nursing, the college has been focusing on student retention. The team observed that Westmont has developed programs and systems to make sure those students who enroll at Westmont graduate from Westmont. As a result of this intentionality with early alert programs, student engagement, well-being sessions, advanced student advising, welcoming and belonging initiatives, and faculty awareness training, retention rates have been increasing.

With the focus on stabilizing enrollment on the Montecito residential campus and the focus on expanding non-traditional programs at the new downtown campus—even considering for the first time graduate programs in healthcare—the college is positioning itself for a sustained model of economic and missional viability. These initiatives, new since the 2016 WSCUC review, are being undertaken with an eye to protect the college from the disequilibrium of the non-traditional programs overshadowing the residential liberal arts undergraduate programs. Evidence will need to be provided that the administration has developed a clear, data-driven plan to recruit and retain students to the Montecito campus, as the administration has made clear that the longstanding model of residential, community-based, liberal arts undergraduate education for approximately 1,200 students will be the main enterprise of Westmont College. Furthermore, evidence

will be needed to demonstrate that the more entrepreneurial programs launched to both meet a professional need and to diversify the college's revenue align with the mission statement of the college, as these growing curricular offerings seem to be outside of some of the current mission's five planks.

The team recommended that, in the context of modestly declining enrollment on the main campus and to avoid the risk of institutional disequilibrium, Westmont develop a clear, data-driven plan to recruit and retain students. The team further recommends that the board of trustees under the leadership of the president consider the college's current mission statement in light of these new educational offerings and in light of the college's founding principles.

C. Reflections: Synthesis of Insights as a Result of the Reaffirmation Process

Westmont College decided on a TPR for its decennial accreditation review. The purpose of the visiting team's review was to assess Westmont College's success with its two themes and its compliance with the four Standards established by the WASC Senior College and University Commission.

Westmont reflected on its self-study by appropriately celebrating numerous achievements. A new General Education program focused on justice and reconciliation, the creation of new academic programs, and the implementation of a new downtown center are a few of the major accomplishments. In addition, Westmont identified challenges facing the institution relating to enrollment and finances. The Westmont president and board of trustees were looking ahead to make adaptations well in advance of looming enrollment threats without diminishing the principles set out by its forebears.

The team observed that Westmont took its reaffirmation process seriously and did so with a healthy sense of engagement. Westmont's reflections on the self-study process were candid and open, and the team observed that Westmont benefited from the TPR process.

Westmont's reason for being in the broader landscape of higher education and the narrower sector of faith-based colleges and universities is to provide a Christian liberal education to undergraduate students, preparing them intellectually and morally for a life that embodies the abiding Christian virtues and a love for God and others. The team members approached this assignment respectful of this campus culture. At the same time, all but one member of the team did not have professional experience in that kind of faith-based community, resulting in the team's permission to seek clarity and to ask questions without any fear of saying the wrong thing. Acknowledging the majority of the team's lack of professional experience in faith-based higher was expressed to one another, to the WSCUC accreditation liaison officer, and in the opening session with the president. This posture seemed to have been respected by the Westmont groups with whom the team met.

D. Compliance: 2023 WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity

The team observed that Westmont operated under a clear mission that most stakeholders understood and respected. The college was committed to providing a Christian liberal-arts education that prepared undergraduate students intellectually, morally, and spiritually. Westmont consistently affirmed this mission during the review,

and the mission was deeply embedded in its academic, co-curricular, and governance structures. (CFR 1.1)

At the same time, economic pressures provoking the expansion to a downtown campus, where Westmont launched a non-residential professional program, and discussions of pursuing graduate programs prompted a need to assess the alignment of programmatic changes with mission. The team found that Westmont's board of trustees and president were fully aware of this need for alignment. The team further observed that those leaders had ideas on how to revise the institution's mission statement while staying true to the college's vision, and they plan to engage the campus in this process. Westmont's challenge will be to discuss and amend the mission statement without disrupting the model of a residential undergraduate liberal arts community on its Montecito campus. (CFR 1.1)

The team recommended that Westmont define a compelling mission-based vision for Westmont's future that encompasses all educational offerings and extends beyond economic risks to the college. (CFR 1.1, 3.4, 3.5)

Westmont was consistent in setting goals, policies, and practices that advanced student learning and success in ways that are directly aligned with its mission. The team observed robust processes for program assessment and for the regular review of student learning outcomes. The use of evidence to inform continuous improvement was reflected in Westmont's institutional commitment to educational effectiveness. Collegewide initiatives related to justice and reconciliation—rooted in Christian convictions and jointly adopted by faculty and administration—further demonstrated Westmont's efforts to remove barriers to student success and promote flourishing for all students. (CFR 1.2)

Westmont operated with integrity and transparency in governance, academic decision-making, and fiscal stewardship. Based on interviews during the accreditation visit, the administration and board of trustees demonstrated a forward-looking approach that anticipated external challenges while remaining faithful to the college's founding vision and Articles of Incorporation. Longstanding practices of fiscal prudence, balanced budgets, responsible debt management, and sustained philanthropic support, as evidenced by the institution's last 10-year reaffirmation, further reflect transparent and ethical institutional operations. (CFR 1.3)

The college adhered to clearly articulated policies governing academic freedom, faculty roles, due process, and grievance procedures, and it applied these policies across the institution. While the review identified opportunities to strengthen language and communication around mission-driven change, the team observed that Westmont had taken steps to clarify policy, process, and governance when the need had arisen. (CFR 1.6)

Members of the faculty who weighed in with comments—spoken or provided through the confidential email—expressed a range of perspectives on the leadership of Westmont, from concerns that the college was straying missionally from its core distinctives (i.e., some of the five planks of the official mission statement) as a residential and liberal arts undergraduate institution, to support for the hard decisions made in expanding the scope of academic programs. The visiting team did not discover any breach of policy-guided processes regarding curricular or academic personnel decisions. Nevertheless, the team did note that improved communication between the administration and the faculty would offset some of the concerns expressed by some professors. There

will remain, however, a lingering debate over the missional direction of Westmont, as some faculty remain committed to the mission statement established four decades ago while the administration builds its case for change on the founding vision of Ruth Kerr in 1937. Hers was a vision that did not limit Westmont to the language in its current mission statement, now under review by the board of trustees.

Amid the college's challenging context, the team commended Westmont for a commitment by the administration, board of trustees, faculty, staff, and students to the mission of Westmont College and to ensuring it remains a viable and thriving faith-based liberal arts college.

The team recommended that Westmont improve communication between faculty and the administration concerning potential impediments to the college's long-term sustainability and create opportunities for mitigation. (CFR 1.7)

Westmont's governing body agreed on the comprehensive mission of the college while also recognizing that changes were necessary to provide a wider terrain of educational offerings that anticipated potential enrollment challenges on the main campus. The team noted that the board was singularly minded on its governance model and philosophy, on defining and maintaining a healthy, mission-centered board culture, on committing to a deep understanding of the college and the vocational needs for its graduates, on keeping the long view in mind, and on how developing a three-year plan within a 10-year vision will position the college to reach its desired position meeting the future needs of society for Westmont-educated alumni.

Finally, Westmont approached the accreditation process with seriousness, candor, and a genuine spirit of inquiry. Westmont engaged with the team in an honest and con-

structive manner. The college acted with integrity and transparency and aligned institutional values, governance, and educational practices. (CFR 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success

Westmont demonstrated educational effectiveness and success for its students. The college works to ensure both the breadth and depth of its academic programs and maintains a faculty able to uphold appropriate academic standards. Westmont monitors student outcomes and performance in its programs and provides effective student support services.

Admission standards are clearly articulated, and the college communicates its mission and programs to prospective students. (CFR 2.1) Students with whom the team met expressed concern, however, that Westmont appears to be reducing its emphasis on global education. They noted limitations in the number of semester-length study abroad programs and described increased encouragement to participate in May term travel courses instead. The institutional report also suggests a reduced capacity to support global education initiatives. College leadership acknowledged that de-emphasizing semester-long study abroad experiences and emphasizing summer study-abroad experiences was due in large part to a goal of keeping students on campus for financial reasons.

Westmont has experienced an increase in the proportion of students with mental health concerns and learning accessibility needs. The college has responded by restructuring and expanding its student support services to better meet these demands. The

Counseling Center now offers telehealth services in addition to in-person appointments, increasing access and flexibility for students. Westmont also has expanded its Accessibility Resources Office to accommodate the growing number of students requiring academic accommodations, demonstrating responsiveness to changing student needs.

The college engages in multiple forms of direct and indirect assessment of its academic and co-curricular programs. Westmont has defined Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), General Education learning outcomes, and program-level learning outcomes. (CFR 2.3) The team observed that faculty demonstrate effective leadership in assessment practices and in classroom instruction. (CFR 2.6, 2.7) The institution regularly administers student surveys to assess belonging, satisfaction, and engagement. These data allow the college to evaluate which clubs, athletics, and campus activities contribute to students' sense of belonging and to disaggregate results by key student characteristics to assess inclusivity and the breadth of programming. (CFR 2.13, 2.14)

Program review for academic programs occurs on a seven-year cycle. The process is well established and clearly articulated, supporting continuous curricular improvement. (CFR 2.4) The college provided examples of how reflection through program review informs new program development. For example, the biology program identified student demand for environmental science and subsequently developed new curricular offerings in that area. In some conversations, however, faculty expressed concern about their level of influence over broader decisions related to new program development and the overall program portfolio. Greater clarity is needed regarding the role of faculty in exercising effective input and leadership over curricular direction and the program portfolio of the college.

In its 2023 Interim Report Action Summary letter, the Commission asked Westmont to clarify when and how the entire General Education program undergoes review. Westmont's self-study and team discussions clarified that the General Education program does not currently undergo holistic program review. The goals for each of the general educational courses were clear and defensible. Each of those goals is unpacked in the general education listing of course outcome assessments. The General Education program aimed to help students develop contextual background, foundational concepts, disciplinary vocabulary, and strategies of inquiry to support their majors and their lives outside of the college. The team found that each General Education requirement is independently assessed. General Education, however, is not assessed as an integrated, coherent program, and it remains unclear how the individual requirements collectively achieve the program's stated aims. As a result, the team was uncertain as to how assessment evidence is used to identify what may be missing from the GE curriculum or to guide program-level improvements.

The team commended Westmont for clear and well-established processes for the assessment and review of disciplinary programs, including the use of annual reports and regular reflection on student learning evidence to inform continuous curricular and programmatic improvement. As cited in the college's Interim Report Action Summary, however, Westmont should regularly assess the General Education program to evaluate its coherency and effectiveness.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures

a. Faculty and Staff

Westmont provided evidence demonstrating how it enhanced educational effectiveness and student success by investing in faculty, staff, and administrators. (CFR 3.1, 3.2) Driven by a commitment to student success, donor intent, and interest, Westmont adjusted the budget to strategically address enrollment shortfalls and to implement innovative programs that serve the community and support growth.

Westmont provided data dashboards, exhibits, links, and other supporting documentation to identify enrollment and financial trends, student-to-faculty ratios, and revenues from tuition, fees, and gifts. Westmont's leadership team noted that the use of technology had created an opportunity to optimize staffing levels.

Despite a slight enrollment decline and its impact on revenue, Westmont made every effort to maintain its current staff count by encouraging each vice president to propose ways to reduce costs without compromising program effectiveness. This was as much a typical belt-tightening measure common to colleges and universities as it was a stewarding of the future financial health of the institution. In other words, these measures were meant to reduce costs proactively knowing that fiscal prudence would need to become more habit-forming for the college. Where possible, the institution tried to address budget shortages with one-time funding. A task force was reviewing staffing levels. Recent data showed that Westmont staffing had remained within a reasonable range, and Westmont had maintained consistent staffing over the past 15 years. (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

The staff evaluation process involved a formal annual review and a self-evaluation, which were then finalized. The vice president reviewed the reports, and ongoing engagement and discussion occurred throughout the year regarding workload. (CFR 3.3)

Westmont also offered professional development opportunities and a faculty wayfinding program, both of which align with the mission and strategic plan. There were monthly voluntary faculty forums, hosting external scholars on campus, and faculty retreats. The faculty development committee had multiple touchpoints for faculty to engage and connect. (CRF 3.3)

During the visit, the team learned that Westmont presented the Modern College Survey, which is designed to evaluate workplace culture, at faculty and staff forums for review. Leadership participated in the forums to discuss wellness and belonging with staff. During the staff forum, employees actively engaged to share positives, challenges, and concerns about affordability. Staff expressed appreciation for Westmont's leadership for sharing the information. They noted that, despite budget cuts across departments, the workplace environment remained positive, though improvements were needed to address communication gaps. (CFR 3.2, 3.3)

Westmont strove to support its employees by offering programs to help with housing costs and the high cost of living in Santa Barbara. The college owns 41 homes and 13 condominiums through the city's affordable housing program. Employees can buy those properties at discounted prices, subject to selling them back when they leave the college. The prices are determined by income levels—moderate, middle, and upper—that guide purchase costs. Those levels were designed to promote affordability. Each year, the

prices increased proportionally with average salary raises. For instance, with a three-percent salary increase, the property price increased by three percent as well. Property taxes were calculated based on a \$300,000 property value. (CFR 3.2)

To evaluate staff compensation, a consultant conducted a study that found some lower pay grades were below the benchmark for peer institutions, prompting the campus to implement substantial raises. Westmont provided health insurance, with two HMOs available to faculty and staff. Individuals can buy into a PPO, though it is not covered under the college's plan. For retirement, the college contributed seven percent, with an additional three percent contribution possible. (CFR 3.2)

b. Fiscal, Physical, and Information Technology Resources

Westmont provided ample evidence to support its claim of maintaining a balanced budget for 41 years and consistently receiving an unmodified opinion on its annual audited financial statements. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

During the visit, the team learned that the current chief financial officer joined in 2007 and that the institution used a 30 percent discount rate. To address the recession, the institution had to increase discounts and rely more on financial aid. The global pandemic also forced the institution to rethink its diversification of the revenue portfolio, focusing on donor support, retention, and addressing the anticipated enrollment cliff and low birth rates. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

The nursing program significantly contributed to the revenue portfolio. Overall, the net bottom line was expected to be around \$2 million next year. The engineering program was also a measurable help, increasing on-campus enrollment by more than 50 to 70 students. As noted in Westmont's institutional report, the internal question remains:

what are the future student demands for programs? Leadership was working with the board of trustees to identify potential new programs, consider lower-cost sports programs, and involve and cultivate donors. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

Inflation significantly impacted the budget, and fire insurance costs increased by \$1 million, given the location of the campus, the fires of 2008 that destroyed some of the Westmont buildings, and the 2017 fire and ensuing mudslides in 2018 that were catastrophic for Montecito. Other expenses, such as compensation and recruitment, remain ongoing challenges, although personnel costs had stabilized. The net tuition per student was about \$37,000, and Westmont weathered the COVID storm thanks to several large, unexpected gifts. The leadership emphasized that the institution must address current challenges while also planning for ongoing three-year budget cycles. While there is a \$250 million pipeline of potential gifts, realization of those gifts remains to be seen. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

The budget development process involved communication with faculty and staff. The Westmont leadership team provided an annual report, and through the faculty council the provost also shared information. Communication was strengthened by the Budget and Salary Committee, which was responsible for distributing information. The budget development process existed to allocate additional resources when they became available, in line with the institution's three-year strategic plan. There was broad representation in strategic planning, and meetings were held twice a year to discuss additional plans and outcomes. Goals become the division's plan each year. The board of trustees had the final responsibility for approving the \$102 million budget, which must be balanced before approval. (CFR 3.6)

c. Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Process

During the visit, the team observed that the board of trustees was dedicated to the Westmont mission and was deeply invested in the institution, its success, and students' futures. Board members can serve up to eight terms, and the current trustees have an average of nine years of service on the board. The team assessed that the board members possessed the knowledge, skills, and ability to oversee the institution effectively. (CFR 3.8) The board had been engaged in ongoing discussions about the mission and continued to address issues related to the undergraduate and residential aspects. Those questions include the downtown program, graduate degree offerings, and a review of housing.

The college's leadership team highlighted to the review team Westmont's value proposition, emphasizing its strong commitment to the five planks (Christian, undergraduate, liberal arts, residential, global) and mission alignment as outlined in the institutional report. The leadership team noted that innovative programs provided the way forward. The board asked the president to develop a three-year plan to expand programming. The president had outlined a 10-year plan, and a board retreat to discuss this plan and to review the mission statement was upcoming after the visit. (CFR 3.9)

The review team observed ample evidence to conclude that the president's cabinet was a long-standing, highly skilled, mission-driven body. Faculty and staff noted that institutional goals are regularly disseminated, and budget information is shared in multiple forums. (CFR 3.10)

While the board of trustees had broad governing authority and oversight, the institution's organizational structure was designed to help ensure that educational effectiveness efforts were met. (CFR 3.11)

The team commended Westmont for the commitment by its administration, board of trustees, faculty, staff, and students to the mission of Westmont College and to ensure that it remained a viable and thriving faith-based liberal arts college. The team also commended Westmont for realizing \$325 million in philanthropic commitments over the past 10 years toward new construction, capital renewal, operational funds, Augustinian Scholars, Martin Institute, Center for Student Success, athletic facilities, and endowment support for scholarships and professorships, among other initiatives. The team recommended that Westmont, in the context of declining enrollment on the main campus and to avoid the risk of institutional disequilibrium, develop a clear, data-driven plan to recruit and retain students.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that Westmont has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 3.

Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement

Westmont demonstrated a robust commitment to quality assurance and improvement in its institutional report as well as throughout the interviews during the site visit. Westmont consistently ensured educational effectiveness, high-quality experiences for its students, and the achievement of the educational and spiritual elements of its mission. As discussed earlier in this report, the team heard important feedback from faculty about the process of academic and strategic planning. While this issue led to a recommendation to define effective academic leadership in the context of program offerings, those concerns also reflected the faculty's concern about quality. (CFR 4.1)

The college had a solid infrastructure for institutional research, with impressive expertise among the personnel. Data sources were distributed yet well-coordinated by the

associate vice president for research, planning, and implementation. The associate vice president oversaw federally mandated data reports and other core institutional research functions, such as national surveys, data analysis for enrollment management, marketing, communications, student services, and student affairs, as well as course evaluations, board evaluations, and ad hoc decision support for administrative and academic offices across the college. (CFR 4.4)

Faculty researchers were also sometimes asked to contribute to the institution's knowledge and awareness about the student experience. For example, a faculty-led undergraduate research team conducted a qualitative study on student experiences of inclusion on campus. Westmont triangulated those results with quantitative data from two instances of the Wake Forest Well-Being Assessment. (CFR 4.3)

Westmont addressed faculty and staff development around data literacies and competencies through a dedicated "Day of Data" retreat. That event began in 2023. During the site visit, faculty expressed an appetite to see more data from the administration, particularly on the health of existing programs and the viability of proposed programs. The team encouraged the college to continue bringing the community together collectively to review, interpret, and determine next steps based on institutional and external data.

Westmont's efforts to study the characteristics of its student composition and the student experience of community climate and well-being provided examples of the college's sophistication around data collection, analysis, and use of results. Alongside national, published surveys, the college conducted local surveys to monitor student life, residence life, athletics, and sense of belonging for first-generation students. Westmont

also fielded a cultural competency survey to staff, faculty, administrators, and the board of trustees. The results of those surveys led Westmont to increase training on micro-inclusion, inclusive hiring, difficult conversations, and implicit bias. Survey results also informed the need to establish an accessibility advisory board to support neurodivergent and differently abled students, as well as a Resilience-Informed Skills Education (RISE) curriculum focused on individual, interpersonal, and academic formation. (CFR 4.1, 4.3)

Westmont closely monitored, analyzed, and interpreted student success by demographic categories and made this information public on the college's website. Four- and six-year graduation rates have reportedly been tracked at the college for over 30 years. During this time, rates have improved on average, considerably so in the early 1990s, and then again in the early 2000s. Rates then held fairly steady for approximately the next 20 years until declining during the global COVID pandemic in 2020. Westmont had identified COVID and natural disasters, such as fires and mudslides in the area, as contributing to this decline. Westmont also identified a broadening of access for underserved populations as another potential factor. Such access is mission centric, yet the team heard during the visit that the rapid, near doubling of students of color over the last 10 years without a commensurate doubling of faculty of color might not have adequately prepared the college to ensure a sense of belonging for all cohorts. That fact also was noted in the college's Faculty, Staff, and Students of Color Report, which showed that between 1995 and 2025, there had been a 10 percent increase in faculty of color and a five percent increase in staff of color while the percentage of students of color increased by 30 percent over the same period. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

The last four years of available data on graduation rates showed signs of an upward trend. Compared to peer institutions and the national average, student success at the college was robust overall. In addition, student debt among graduates was lower than Westmont's peer group and on par with the national average, which is somewhat unusual for a small, private, liberal arts college. Graduate earnings are above peers and the national average, yet as the college stated in its institutional report as well as in meetings during the site visit, earnings after graduation represent only a partial measure of a graduate's success. Among others, the Westmont president clarified with the team that the college understood student success to include how graduates live Westmont's mission in their lives after college. (CFR 4.2, 4.3)

In the institutional report and its appendices, the college presented multiple examples of modifications of current practice and new initiatives based on internal research findings. The team followed up on many of those examples during the visit and found the staff and faculty both knowledgeable and insightful about the efforts. One example was the Center for Student Success, which Westmont established in 2020 from a \$2 million gift to provide a team of coaches and other academic support for students. Westmont also conducted a wellness study in 2020, and another in 2023, with notable improvements in areas such as academic engagement, positive coping, meaning, purpose, general happiness, and reduced anxiety. The report showed differences among specific populations of students. Westmont took several actions in response, including restructuring the offices for counseling and psychological services, an enhanced early alert system, additional orientation programming, establishing a new tradition to celebrate first-generation status, providing additional funding for intercultural clubs, and develop-

ing a new first-year seminar to smooth the transition for incoming students to life in college. (CFR 4.2, 4.3)

Another example of institutional inquiry leading to improvement was the development of a new degree in environmental studies. The need for that program was noted during a biology program review through senior exit surveys and an alumni survey. Westmont initially developed a new minor. Yet continuous assessment of the minor and student interests showed that students were pursuing interdisciplinary workarounds in order to further their specialization in this area. Biology faculty then developed a full major in environmental studies that has become a new signature program for the college. (CFR 4.6)

Faculty continuously monitored not only curricular needs but also the effectiveness of their teaching. Clear processes for program review and evaluation, including the use of annual reports and regular reflection on evidence to inform improvement, were well established at the college. The provost's office made an extensive number of assessment reports available on the Student Achievement page of its public website. Resources for assessment and program review processes, policies, rubrics, and other tools were also offered for faculty and to other interested parties on the site. Westmont conducted outcomes-based program review in both academic and co-curricular programs on a regular basis, and findings were put to good use. The appendices of the institutional report provided several examples of effective program reviews, direct and indirect learning assessments, and syllabi audits. (CFR 4.6)

The General Education Committee assessed the General Education program on an annual basis. The team learned that the multilayered aspect of the program, which

included the pillars of Christian context and worldview, methodological inquiry, and core intellectual competencies (communication, quantitative reasoning, modern languages) alongside disciplinary approaches, were somewhat complex to assess. Direct assessments were conducted for general education program learning outcomes. Those assessments overlapped with assessments within disciplinary degree programs and at the institutional learning outcomes level. (CFR 4.5, 4.6)

Westmont recently changed the General Education program to remove the Compassionate Action requirement, which included serving society, enacting justice, and communicating across cultures. Westmont made the change based on student feedback from a survey that included questions about which components students recommended adding or removing from the program. Although the results of such surveys clearly engendered faculty discussion within and outside the committee, the method might not have yielded robust evidence based on survey sample representation. Small changes in numbers could represent large changes in percentages. Also, results might not account for all demographics or majors or for transfer status. If the survey results did reflect the general opinion of the student population, however, 11 percent of the students stated that the program did not support them with skills needed for their major, and 24 percent were unsure whether it did or did not. In addition, seven percent recommended that courses related to Christian historical perspectives be removed from general education, and eight percent responded that biblical and theological canons should also be removed. Certainly, most of the student opinions were positive, and the team observed that consensus, but the team questioned whether the survey was an appropriate means to shape the program

given the important role of general education for structuring the educational experience that the college aimed to provide, as discussed earlier in this report. (CFR 4.3)

During the visit, the team encountered consternation from some faculty around the process, oversight, and recently increased pace of new program development. Although some faculty representatives noted their support for the administration, particularly its consistent reaffirmation of the value of the liberal arts model of education, others expressed uncertainty about the college's liberal arts identity in the administration's pursuit of increased enrollment and that their voice as a faculty had little impact on the direction in which the college was moving. The areas of concern encompassed professional education, online programs, and graduate degrees, as some faculty saw those areas as antithetical to a college that has historically remained undergraduate and residential. One faculty member recognized that the administration might find the faculty cautious toward substantive changes to the college's offerings, and therefore the faculty needed more time to process and critically evaluate such changes, but the faculty member pointed out that a respectful process of information sharing and collaboration takes time. (CFR 4.8)

Encountering those sentiments early in the visit, the team addressed them with the executive team and the board of trustees. All levels of administration reiterated a commitment to engaging the community in the college's long-term planning processes. An appendix to the institutional report included a document outlining the college's approach to strategic effectiveness, stakeholder engagement, and response to the rapidly changing higher education environment. In addition, the current three-year strategic map emphasized tracks of work expressly aimed at strengthening "trust building and communication

across the college” (track seven) and establishing “best practices for implementing new programs” (track four).

Westmont engaged in clear and well-established processes for the assessment and review of disciplinary programs, including the use of annual reports and regular reflection on student learning evidence to inform continuous curricular and programmatic improvement.

The team recommended that Westmont assess the General Education program to evaluate whether it was accomplishing its goal to support success in the students’ disciplinary programs. The team recommended that Westmont clarify what it means for Westmont faculty to exercise effective academic leadership in the context of program offerings.

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that Westmont has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 4.

III. FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations

The team commends Westmont for:

1. Clear and well-established processes for the assessment and review of disciplinary programs, including the use of annual reports and regular reflection on student learning evidence to inform continuous curricular and programmatic improvement.
2. A commitment by the administration, board of trustees, faculty, staff, and students to the mission of Westmont College and to ensuring it remains a viable and thriving faith-based liberal arts college.
3. Progress on Westmont's goals to educate students on justice, reconciliation, belonging, cultural competencies, and the ability to discuss differences, through curricular and co-curricular programming rooted in the Christian faith and jointly adopted by the administration and the faculty.
4. Realizing \$325 million in philanthropic commitments over the past 10 years toward new construction, capital renewal, operational funds, Augustinian Scholars, Martin Institute, Center for Student Success, athletic facilities, and endowment support for scholarships and professorships, among other initiatives.

Recommendations

The team recommends that Westmont:

1. Improve communication between faculty and the administration concerning potential impediments to the college's long-term sustainability and create opportunities for mitigation.

2. Define a compelling mission-based vision for Westmont's future that encompasses all educational offerings and extends beyond economic risks to the college.
3. In the context of declining enrollment on the main campus and to avoid the risk of institutional disequilibrium, develop a clear, data-driven plan to recruit and retain students.
4. Assess the General Education program to evaluate whether it is accomplishing its goal to support success in the students' disciplinary programs.
5. Clarify what it means for Westmont faculty to exercise effective academic leadership in the context of program offerings.

APPENDIX A

Federal Compliance Forms

- 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review**
- 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review**
- 3. Student Complaints Review**
- 4. Transfer Credit Review**

Distance Education Review

Off-Campus Locations Review

Federal Compliance Forms

Overview

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
3. Student Complaints Form
4. Transfer Credit Policy Form

As part of the institutional report preparation, the institution completes these forms and submits them with the institutional report. During the visit, teams validate the information on the four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

1. The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
 - i. It reviews the institution's-
 - A. Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - B. The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
 - ii. Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
2. In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

1. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

2. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where is the policy located? The policy is available in various places including: • The website Unit Definition webpage: FC Exhibit 01 – Unit Definition webpage • Elsewhere? Yes: FC Exhibit 02 – College Catalog 2025-26 Credit Hour p25 • Note: The Academic Senate approved a slight change to the credit hour policy in November 2025. The website has been updated to reflect the change (as reflected in the FC Exhibit 01 PDF). The change will be integrated into the 2026-27 College Catalog. Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ☐ NO Comments: Schedule of on-ground courses: • Schedule of fall 2025 courses: FC Exhibit 03 – Westmont Fall Course Offering Master 2025 • Schedule of spring 2026 courses: FC Exhibit 04 – Westmont Spring Course Offering Master 2026

Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 05 – Theological Principles of Leadership syllabus - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 06 – World Christianity syllabus - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 07 – An Introduction to the Old Testament syllabus
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Hybrid
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Religious Studies
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ☐ NO
Comments: - Westmont has one post baccalaureate certificate program that is a WSCUC accredited distance education program (Certificate of Theological Leadership). The program has an in-person component—at the start of each semester students meet on the Westmont campus for a few days of intensive instruction and engagement. Students return home and courses are completed from a distance. So, most courses in the program have a “hybrid” component. - While the program is post baccalaureate, it is undergraduate (as approved by Westmont’s accreditor WSCUC). - The program is offered through the college’s Religious Studies department.	

Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 08 – Cell Biology Lab syllabus 2025 - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 09 – General Physics I Lab syllabus 2025 - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 10 – Introduction to Christine Doctrine syllabus 2025 - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 11 – Painting I syllabus 2025 - Syllabus: FC Exhibit 12 – United States History to 1877 syllabus 2025 - Note: Course syllabi are made available publicly to students and others through the Westmont website. To access the webpage, please use the following link: https://www.westmont.edu/class-syllabi
	What kinds of courses? Syllabi from two lab courses were provided as well as three syllabi from various courses.
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Art, Biology, History, Physics, and Religious Studies
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? - Program: FC Exhibit 13 – Biology Program - Program: FC Exhibit 14 – History Program - Program: FC Exhibit 15 – Mathematics Program - Programs are described in brief on Westmont’s website (see FC Exhibit 16 – Majors & Degrees) and detailed in more depth in Westmont’s College Catalog (see FC Exhibit 17 – College Catalog Degree Programs)
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Bachelor degree programs
	What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Biology, History, and Mathematics
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Brian Harlan

Date: January 29, 2026

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ☒ YES ☐ NO Comments: All employees working in the admissions office are paid based on either a salary or hourly basis. Outcomes from recruitment do not impact compensation. If desired, a generic copy of Westmont's compensation agreement with admission counselors can be made available for review. This is a standard inclusion in the offer letter and includes a one-page addendum that spells out hourly wage, over time rate, and other compensation details.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ☒ YES ☐ NO Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ☒ YES ☐ NO Comments: Westmont provides students, families, and the general public several resources related to degree completion and costs. These include: • Graduation Rate: FC Exhibit 18 - College Catalog Graduation Rate page 13 • Tuition and Fees: FC Exhibit 19 - Tuition & Fees webpage • Charges beyond Tuition and Fees: FC Exhibit 20 - College Catalog Charges page 297 • Various reports related to a variety of outcomes including graduation and retention are available on Westmont's Student Demographics webpage including: 1. Retention & Graduation rates: FC Exhibit 21 – Retention & Graduation rates fall 2025 2. Gender and Ethnicity: FC Exhibit 22 – Gender and Ethnicity fall 2025
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments: Westmont makes this type of information available to the general public in several ways: • The Outcomes page of the website reports employment data based on results from the First Destination Survey and includes a list of "top employers" and "top graduate schools" • Westmont annually submits graduate employment data to US News & World Reports & other similar outlets who, in turn, make these available to the general public • The Career Resource Center webpage is a great resource for students who are preparing to enter the workforce • The annual First Destination Survey and subsequent report provide data on post-graduation employment: FC Exhibit 23 – First Destination Survey Report Class of 2024

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Deborah Wallace

Date: March 10, 2026

3. Student Complaints Review Form

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Westmont's College Catalog provides contact information for WSCUC and the Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education (page 12). The catalog says, "The Student Handbook and the College Catalog describe several processes that students are encouraged to use whenever appropriate for registering complaints or grievances." FC Exhibit 24 – College Catalog Complaints p 12 The Student Life Handbook, available via Westmont's website, contains the Student Concerns and Complaints Policy that describes the formal procedure designed to address student complaints. FC Exhibit 25 – Student Concerns and Complaints Policy
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly:
	Westmont's Student Concerns and Complaints Policy can be found in Westmont's Student Handbook which is made available via the website. The policy identifies the office to which a concern or complaint should be filed based on the nature of the issue and describes a general process that will be followed to resolve the issue. The College will work to resolve the complaint within 10 business days. The student will be notified of the resolution and is given three days to appeal a decision, should that be desired. All complaints are addressed by the Vice President for Student Life, who works in conjunction with other appropriate administrative leaders should the complaint fall outside of the Student Life division. Records of complaints and resolutions are kept by the Vice President for Student Life. These are reviewed annually to identify any "trends or ongoing concerns that need to be addressed." In addition to or in lieu of utilizing this process, a student may choose to file a complaint against Westmont with either WSCUC or the BPPE. Contact information for both organizations is provided.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? As stated in Westmont's policy, records of student complaints are kept by the Vice President for Student Life.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: As stated in Westmont's policy, student complaints are reviewed annually by the Vice President for Student Life who works to identify and address any trends that may be present in the complaints, working to address these as needed.
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Stacey Bosick

Date: January 29, 2026

4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? Westmont's transfer credit policies are made available to the general public via Westmont's website. FC Exhibit 26 – Transfer Credit Policies The Transfer Students section of the College Catalog contains a description of how transfer credits are evaluated and awarded. FC Exhibit 27 – College Catalog Transfer Students p 286-288
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

1. Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
2. Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Barry Corey

Date: January 29, 2026

Distance Education Review Form

Overview

Institutions must have WSCUC approval to utilize distance education in the delivery of any of its programs in any amount, and are required to seek WSCUC approval for programs where 50% or more of the program can be completed through distance education. The institution's use of distance education in the delivery of its programs is reviewed as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the institution including an Accreditation Visit or a Seeking Accreditation Visit.

Distance Education is defined as:

Education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor or instructors and to support **regular and substantive interaction** between the students and the instructor or instructors, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies that may be used to offer distance education include:

- The internet;
- One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband, fiber optic, satellite, or wireless communication devices;
- Audioconference;
- Other media used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in this definition

In keeping with federal expectations, WSCUC requires institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs to demonstrate "Faculty-Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction" and "Academic Engagement" as defined by the federal regulations (see Code of Federal Regulations §600.2).

Regular and Substantive Interaction is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes at least two of the following:

- (i) Providing direct instruction;
- (ii) Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework;
- (iii) Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency;
- (iv) Facilitating a group discussion regarding the content of a course or competency; or
- (v) Other instructional activities approved by the institution's or program's accrediting agency.

An institution ensures regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors by, prior to the student's completion of a course or competency -

- (i) Providing the opportunity for substantive interactions with the student on a predictable and scheduled basis commensurate with the length of time and the amount of content in the course or competency; and

- (ii) Monitoring the student's academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.

Academic Engagement requires active participation by a student in an instructional activity related to the student's course of study that –

(1) Is defined by the institution in accordance with any applicable requirements of its State or accrediting agency;

(2) Includes, but is not limited to –

- (i) Attending a synchronous class, lecture, recitation, or field or laboratory activity, physically or online, where there is an opportunity for interaction between the instructor and students;
- (ii) Submitting an academic assignment;
- (iii) Taking an assessment or an exam;
- (iv) Participating in an interactive tutorial, webinar, or other interactive computer-assisted instruction;
- (v) Participating in a study group, group project, or an online discussion that is assigned by the institution; or
- (vi) Interacting with an instructor about academic matters

Student Identity Verification – In keeping with federal policy, WSCUC requires institutions that offer distance education to have processes in place through which the institution establishes that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. To meet this requirement, the institution must employ, at its option, methods to verify the student who participates, such as:

- A secure login and pass code
- Proctored examinations
- New or other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

In so doing, the institution must make clear in writing at the time of enrollment or registration that it uses processes that protect student privacy and notifies students of any projected additional charges associated with the verification of student identity.

Institution instructions:

The institution includes this form with background information and links to evidence when submitting their self-study report. Institutions will fill in:

Section A if the institution offers distance education programs approved by WSCUC (one or more programs will have distance education modality indicated in the WSCUC web site directory) or are 100% distance education institutions;

OR

Section B if the institution utilizes distance education in the delivery of programs that do not rise to the level of a WSCUC approved distance education program.

Review team instructions:

Teams evaluate the evidence provided to begin their investigation, then use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Review teams append a completed copy of this form to the team report for all reaffirmation visits and for other visits as applicable. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Recommendations section of the team report.

SECTION A: For institutions with approved distance education programs:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Programs and courses to be reviewed (please list)
 - a. Certificate of Theological Leadership (CTL) approved by WSCUC in January 2023.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)
 - a. Westmont College has but one academic program offered in remote learning mode with a four-day in-person, on-campus experience at the beginning of each semester. This CTL is the first and only distance education program, and it is in its infancy with no parallel program offered for in-person students.

3. Nature of the review (material to be examined and persons/committees to be interviewed)

Lines of Inquiry	Institution responds to questions and provides links to evidence (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review Team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?		This program is consistent with the mission of Westmont College to provide spiritual resources to students grounded in biblical theology. But this program is not undergraduate or residential. This program is donor-supported, tuition-enhanced, and operated under the Provost's Office. As connected to the Martin Institute for Christianity and Culture and the Dallas Willard Center for Christian Spiritual Formation at Westmont College, this program fits snugly within the college's commitment to cultivate wisdom in Christian leaders.
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?		To create a sense of community, the first four days of each semester are done in residence. After that, connections are through the regularly scheduled class meetings with Westmont's full-time faculty in the Religious Studies Department. No recommendations added.
<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?		The CLT program is connected to the Martin Institute and the Willard Center, and it is taught by faculty who are in the Religious Studies program. The administration of the small program is under the control of the Provost's Office.

<i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?		As a post-baccalaureate Certificate in Theological Leadership, it is designed for ministry professionals and laypeople desiring to grow spiritually. Other students include recent college graduates considering seminary. These students are not in a degree but rather a certificate program, so the resources they need are accessible online facilitated by the faculty. Provost's office survey results indicate 4.2/5.0 on support. No recommendations added.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?		The Theological Leadership courses at Westmont College are led by faculty from within the college who have status and who are in residence. Based on their profiles, these faculty offer subject knowledge, real world ministry experience, and a commitment to forming spiritually-grounded leaders. These faculty teach as part of their load and work with the Provost's office to receive support. No recommendations added.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)		Content after the first four days in person and on campus is delivered in an asynchronous format with some regularly scheduled class meeting times. No recommendations added.
<i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for "faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction"? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction?"		This certificate program is monitored out of the Provost's Office. The first cohort of this certificate program, a group of eight students, has just completed. It is still early to assess learning outcomes. Early responses to survey prompts indicate averages of 4.7 out of 5.0 on interaction and engagement. No recommendations added.

<i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?		Three prompts on the CTL survey assess the degree to which the program has met the federal definition of regular and substantive interaction and academic engagement. The majority of scores agree or strongly agree. The faculty are embedded in the college. No recommendations added.
<i>State Licensure Requirements.</i> Describe, as appropriate, the institution’s process for disclosing to students how state licensure requirements are met by distance education programs, whether licensure requirements are not met by programs, or whether the institution has not determined where licensure requirements are met by the programs.		N/A as these degrees are not necessary for licensure.
<i>Student Identification Verification and Privacy.</i> What is the institution’s process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification? What precautions are taken by the institution to protect technology from cyber security intrusions on its or outsourced systems? Are additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity disclosed at the time of registration or enrollment?		No recommendations added.
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?		Retention is strong, and graduation rates are based only on the completion of one eight-person cohort. No recommendations added.

<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?		As this is the first experience Westmont has had with distance education, as the cohorts are small, and as the college is not planning any immediate additions to online or hybrid programs, student learning in the CTL is still being monitored. Furthermore, there are no on-ground comparisons of similar certificate programs. No recommendations added.
<i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Agreements with Unaccredited Entities</i>?		N/A
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?		As stated above, this is the first experience Westmont has had with distance education, so more time is needed to assess quality. The program is still in its infancy.

Name of reviewer/s: Barry H. Corey, Chair of the WSCUC Review Team

Date/s of review: January 27-29, 2026

SECTION B: For institutions without approved distance education programs:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1. Courses to be reviewed (as appropriate; please list)

- 2. Nature of review (material to be examined and persons/committees to be interviewed)

Lines of Inquiry	Institution responds to questions and provides links to evidence (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review Team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
<i>Nature of Online Learning Courses.</i> How do faculty use distance learning options in face to face courses, e.g., blended learning, hybrid learning, hybrid flexible (hyflex), flipped classroom, or other instructional strategies that allow student/instructor separation? How extensive is distance learning in the curriculum?		
<i>Faculty and Student Preparation for Distance Education.</i> What training is offered to faculty who incorporate distance learning in their courses? Can students request a distance learning option for onsite courses? How is their placement in the option determined? What orientation to distance education do students receive?		

<i>Quality of the Distance Education Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?		
<i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?		
<i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?		
<i>Student Identification Verification and Privacy.</i> What is the institution’s process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification? What precautions are taken by the institution to protect technology from cyber security intrusions on its or outsourced systems? Are additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity disclosed at the time of registration or enrollment?		
<i>Quality Assurance.</i> What processes are in place to collect data from courses that use some type of remote learning? How are the findings used to improve instruction?		

Name of reviewer/s:

Date/s of review:

Revised April 2023; October 2025

Off-Campus Locations Review Form

2023 Handbook of Accreditation

Overview

WSCUC uses this form to address institutional compliance with federal regulations regarding two types of off-campus sites: additional locations and branch campuses. This applies to locations within the United States or abroad.

The institution submits one of these forms for each site to be visited with background information (section A below) and links to evidence (section B below) when submitting their self-study report. The number and identity of sites to be visited will be determined by the WSCUC liaison in communication with the institution prior to submission of the self-study report. See [Off-Campus Locations Review Guide](#) for information about whether and how many sites will be visited.

Prior to or during the visit (either Seeking Accreditation Visit or Accreditation Visit), teams evaluate the evidence provided and visit the site(s). A completed copy of this form is then appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Recommendations section of the team report.

A. Information to be provided by the institution:

1. Site Name and Address

26 and 29 West Anapamu St, Santa Barbara, CA 93101

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus or additional location by WSCUC)

Westmont Downtown is an extension of Westmont College in Santa Barbara, and it offers semester-long programs in entrepreneurship and leadership, integrating academic coursework with 20-hour-per-week internships at local businesses. In 2022, Westmont expanded its presence with the Grotenhuis Nursing Campus, launching a 16-month Accelerated Bachelor of Science in Nursing (ABSN) program. The expansion was supported by a \$7.25 million donation from Celeste and Dr. Robert White in 2021 to acquire the four-story

building at 29 Anapamu. In 2025, Westmont received \$3 million from a legal settlement to renovate the nursing campus, further strengthening its role in community engagement and workforce development.

3. Nature of the Review (material to be examined and persons/committees to be interviewed)

Two members of the WSCUC accreditation review team visited the Westmont Downtown Campus in advance of the onsite review to meet with faculty, staff, and students and to tour the campus in light of its programs and potential programs.

B. Evidence to be provided by the institution. Findings and recommendations to be entered by the review team.

Lines of Inquiry	Institution provides links to evidence (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?		The site has been approved through its programs' substantive review process with WSCUC. No recommendations needed.
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.1, 3.1, 3.6, 4.1)		This is "in process" as many of its aspects fit with the mission, but as the mission statement is being reviewed by the board of trustees, some rewording will make this fit more aligned. No recommendations needed other than waiting for the board's mission review and edits.
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.5, 2.10, 4.3)		The geographical proximity to the main campus with the unified faculty, shared policy and support services, and financial model keep it well integrated. No recommendations needed.

<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 2.5, 3.1, 3.6)		Donations supported Westmont's purchase of the facilities, making the financial model of this off-campus site less subject to costs of rent or loan repayment, thus strengthening the financial model of this site. The buildings were in good condition, with ample space for teaching and laboratory work. As a professional nursing site, its rooms, equipment, supplies, simulation beds, and location made for a strong learning site for these students in the ABSN program. Furthermore, its proximity to Cottage Hospital and the collaborative relationship on internships and job placement make this site effective in fulfilling its educational purposes. No recommendations needed.
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.6, 3.10, 4.1, 4.3)		The students feel a sense of community in a different way than on the main campus. For the most part, they are older and have already completed an undergraduate degree. Some live outside of Santa Barbara, causing for a commute. Some are married with children. Nevertheless, they sense the Christian integration in their classes (though unlike the main campus students they are not yet required to attend chapel), they feel supported by the Westmont community, they have access to the main campus and its facilities, and they appreciate the accelerated program that enables them to

		receive a degree in 16 months and enter the workforce. None of the students we met with expressed any concerns about securing a job after graduation. The feel supported and communicated with. About one-quarter of the ABSN students are Westmont graduates, and the representation of these graduates within the program spoke highly of how community is a priority and reality as non-residential students. No recommendations needed.
<i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.6)		The meeting with the faculty and staff surfaced no concerns. They felt supported in information technology, human resources and finances from the main campus. The Westmont Downtown faculty understand that were they on the main campus they would have a better sense of involvement in academic matters, but they understood the reality that a space distance causes and were happy with their ability to serve these nursing students in ways that meet student needs. They are eligible as remote site faculty to be represented in the Academic Senate and Faculty Council, and they receive clear communication as faculty, not feeling like second class citizens. No recommendations needed.

<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 4.2)		Program design, approval, and evaluation are conducted in similar fashion through the Provost's Office and in congruency with personnel and educational policies. No recommendations needed.
<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)		As this is a new program, from the early classes retention and graduation rates are strong, rates are considered to be market comparable, and students seem to appreciate the 16-month timeframe start to finish. No recommendations needed.
<i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)		The student assessment of learning is the same process as happens on the main campus. No recommendations needed.

<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)		Again, as a new program, Westmont is committed to assess through its normal processes on the main campus what is occurring with the ABSN at its Downtown campus. So far, this is the only degree program offered in its entirety at the Downtown campus (not including the practicum at Cottage Hospital and local healthcare facilities). No other degree programs are offered at this site, though some courses and entrepreneurial student programs are provided here to supplement courses at the main campus. No recommendations needed.
--	--	--

Review Completed By: Barry H. Corey, Chair of WSCUC Reaffirmation Team
Date: February 5, 2026

Revised, August 2023, October 2025