REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM
SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 2

For Institutions Seeking Candidacy and Initial Accreditation

Southern California Institute of Technology (SCIT)

March 25-27, 2026

Team Roster

Team Chair

Ariane Schauer, Higher Education Consultant

Team Assistant Chair

Patty Mullen, Associate Provost, Alliant University (retired)

Team Members

Elisa Anders, Associate Provost, University of the Pacific

Peter Michell, Board of Trustees, Kaiser Permanente School of Allied Health Sciences and Westminster University

WSCUC Staff Liaison

Susan Opp, WSCUC Vice President

The team evaluated the institution under the 2023 WSCUC Standards of Accreditation Revised and prepared this report containing its collective judgment for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission. 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. Once an institution achieves either candidacy or initial accreditation, the team report and Commission Action Letter associated with the review that resulted in the granting of either candidacy or initial accreditation and the team reports and Commission Action Letters of any subsequent reviews will be made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

Table of Contents

Section I – Overview and Context 2

A. Description of Institution and Visit 2

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report 3

C. Response to Issues Raised in Past Commission Letters 4

Section II – Evaluation of Institutional Compliance with WSCUC Standards 4

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity 4

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success 8

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures 15

Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement 26

Section III – Commendations and Recommendations 32

A. Commendations 32

B. Recommendations 32

Appendices 34

A. Credit Hour Federal Compliance Form 34

B. Distance Education Review Form 39

Section I – Overview and Context

A. Description of Institution and Visit

Southern California Institute of Technology (SCIT) is a private, for-profit institution located in Anaheim, California. Its focus is applied, hands-on education for career readiness in engineering and technology fields. SCIT offers four bachelor of science degree programs (Biomedical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Electronic Engineering, Information Systems), two associate of science degree programs (Biomedical Engineering Technology, which is a new degree since the last visit and is currently offered; and Industrial Automation and Robotics Technology, a program that is being renamed and revised and currently has no enrollments) and four certificate/diploma programs (Biomedical Technology, Computer Networking and Cybersecurity, General Electrician, Industrial Automation Technology). SCIT is accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC), and the institution participates in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

As of January 5, 2026, SCIT reported 131 students in the bachelor's degree programs, 27 students in an associate's degree program, 318 students in certificate/diploma programs. About 14% of the students are enrolled in distance learning programs. The institution operates with 24 full-time staff and administrators and 37 faculty, 11 of whom are full-time and 26 of whom are part time.

SCIT was granted WSCUC Eligibility by Commission Action on July 1, 2021. The first Seeking Accreditation on-site visit (SAV1) occurred in October 2024. The resulting WSCUC Commission Action Letter of February 27, 2025, commended SCIT for: its pervasive commitment to hands-on education and career preparation; significant investments in facilities and innovative equipment to support hands-on learning; prioritizing academic quality over enrollment growth while maintaining healthy finances; and seriousness of intent in learning from WSCUC standards and processes to strengthen the institution.

The February 27, 2025, Commission Action Letter (CAL) indicated that the Commission found that SCIT had demonstrated evidence of compliance at a level sufficient for Candidacy under Standards 1 and 2 but not for Standards 3 and 4. The Action Letter identified Areas for Development under all four WSCUC Standards and called for a follow-up SAV2 Visit in Spring 2026.

The Spring 2026 SAV2 Team reviewed the SCIT January 2026 institutional report and accompanying materials and held a virtual meeting to discuss their impressions and plan the visit scheduled for March 25-27, 2026. A set of additional documents was requested by the team and provided by the institution. During the visit, the team met with the founder/corporate parent CEO, the president, the CFO, the president's cabinet, members of the board of trustees, the independent firm that audits SCIT, program directors/chairs ("leads"), the Governance Advisory Council (GAC), senior staff, institutional research staff, and the lab operations manager. Open meetings were held with full-time and part-time faculty, "non-senior" staff, and both distance education and on campus students. In addition, the team monitored the WSCUC confidential email account.

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

SCIT presented a well-organized institutional report that addressed the issues raised in the February 2025 Commission Action Letter. The institution recognizes that many efforts are in early stages but shows understanding of next steps. The report also identifies the extended nature of hiring, developing and integrating new staff into leadership roles to achieve accountability and stewardship. The team found that SCIT was open, candid and serious about utilizing the WSCUC review process to strengthen the institution.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Past Commission Letters

This is addressed in Section II.

Section II – Evaluation of Institutional Compliance with WSCUC Standards

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity

The February 27, 2025, Commission Action Letter (CAL) found that SCIT had demonstrated compliance with Standard 1 at a level sufficient for Candidacy.

The Commission asked that SCIT strengthen systematic assessment, regular communication, and institutional processes to keep constituencies informed about important institutional issues and to help identify and address the needs of its community. The letter references CFRs 1.2, 1.4 and 1.7.

CFR 1.2: *Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution defines and sets goals, policies, and practices; evaluates student outcomes; removes barriers to student success; and allocates resources across academic, student support, and co-curricular programs and services to advance success for all students.*

Through a review of the institutional report, additional requested documents, and on-site interviews, the team found that administration, faculty and staff share a deep commitment to student success and understand the need for policies and procedures that support student success and thoughtful and regular assessment to demonstrate and improve student outcomes. Since the SAV1 visit, SCIT has developed or improved or refined several practices that support student success.

<u>Policies and Procedures</u>

SCIT developed and adopted a new decision-making framework to guide decisions at the institutional level and in areas such as academics, budget development, and enrollment and student affairs. It reviewed its policies and procedures and identified the status of each, ranging from approved or written-but-not-yet-approved to *ad hoc* or not-yet-existing. Development and modification of the policies

and procedures is underway, with three (student drop procedure, make up exam policy, and student conduct and discipline procedures) approved with input from the GAC. The timeline for completion of the work is 2030, and the team recommends that the work be expedited to ensure the institution is operating with a collectively understood and well-functioning set of policies and procedures.

Two iterations of a new annual Program Performance Report (PPR) process were completed for 2024 and 2025 calendar years. This process, supported by institutional research staff, incorporates data on completion, employment, and the limited available assessment data. The chief academic officer (CAO), who is also the president, has been working with all academic programs to build out the assessment infrastructure including encouraging the reworking of assignments to ensure alignment with the program learning outcomes (PLOs). Programs further along with implementation of assessment processes are using more comprehensive assessments: the BS in Engineering programs, for example, use the senior level capstone project to evaluate all PLOs. The rather slow pace of embedding academic assessment across the institution is described as due to “gaps in SCIT's current academic leadership structure” (SAV2 Institutional Report, p.15), ascribed in part to difficulty in recruitment.

Annual performance report data are discussed in faculty meetings and improvement steps are identified, some of which require additional resources. The computer networking and cybersecurity diploma program conducted a full program review since the SAV1 visit. Two pilot program reviews had previously been completed, and an additional pilot review was provided for a bachelor’s degree program.

The faculty have been working across departments and programs to develop course briefs for all courses to improve course alignment and complete a broader, collaborative and thorough review of course materials. While in initial stages, faculty are committed to completing this work for all syllabi to improve the curricula and the experience for students when a substitute faculty must step in to teach the course.

Co-curricular assessment efforts to date have focused on support for employability. For example, assessments are taking place in the Career Readiness course in which students are prepared for resume writing and interviewing. Data were analyzed in two areas of career services support and changes were made, as one example, in how student interview skills were rated by staff in order to strengthen student understanding of employer expectations of candidates during interviews.

Some programs have not completed learning outcome assessment plans and monitor only basic data on completion rates incorporating transfer-in and transfer-out data, and employment rates required by ACCSC. Administrators and faculty identified other important directions for gathering and using data to improve student success that are planned but not yet underway. At the time of the visit, resources had not yet been allocated for improvements recommended as the result of periodic program review or annual program performance reports. See Standards 2 and 4 for more information.

Overall, the team found that modest gains had occurred while gaps in systematizing assessment and improvement processes remain at the program level and institutional level. The team recommends that SCIT faculty and administrators work expeditiously to fill gaps in academic leadership and ensure all components of assessment are in place and operational for academic programs. The team also recommends that co-curricular assessment efforts be expanded to other student support departments and activities. (CFR 1.2)

CFR 1.4: *The institution maintains appropriate operating policies and business procedures, including timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances.*

SCIT stated that it is "transitioning from a centrally managed operation to a more mature institution with stronger systems, shared responsibility, and less dependence on individuals" (SAV2 Institutional Report, p.10). As noted in CFR 1.2 above, as part of that process, the institution compiled and evaluated a set of policies and procedures and has a plan to review or create those needing attention before 2030. The president's cabinet is responsible for monitoring and ensuring the review and

completion of the policies, and three policies and procedures have already been updated, including the Make Up Exam policy and the Student Conduct and Discipline procedures. The Governance Advisory Council (GAC), a faculty committee focused on bringing the faculty voice to the administration, has been recommending policies for review and working with the administration to provide input on these policies.

During the visit, the team learned that while there is a Student Complaint and Incident Report form to collect student complaints, currently the institution does not have a clearly defined process for tracking or maintaining student complaints. The team recommends that SCIT review its policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the WSCUC Complaints and Third-Party Comments Policy for both students and institutional personnel. (CFR 1.4)

CFR 1.7: *The institution communicates about important issues with its constituents.*

SCIT administrators and groups have worked to improve communication across the institution to replace the unidirectional flow of information from the president to the campus community with a more open sharing of information among departments and constituencies. Since the SAV1 visit, the president initiated faculty and staff meetings, now held on a quarterly schedule, to cover key issues across the institution and to offer two-way communication opportunities. These meetings cover key institutional issues including key performance indicators (KPIs) (such as enrollment counts, retention rates and placement rates), upcoming events, the strategic plan, professional development, and policies. A senior staff group meeting was convened, then reconfigured to become a president's cabinet that meets every two weeks to advise the president and strengthen the lines of communication across departments. This group appeared to still be in the process of determining its direction and goals. Divisional meetings provide opportunities for further communication and discussion of strategic goals.

The Governance Advisory Council (GAC), which was active during the SAV1 visit, advises the president and has enhanced communication with faculty. The GAC populates an intranet page with GAC meeting archives, materials and information for faculty. It also produces and distributes quarterly

newsletters for faculty and seeks faculty feedback via surveys, plus the GAC chair meets with the board of trustees Academic Affairs Committee to share information on faculty and academic-related issues, plans, and activities with the board.

Progress has been made, but a formal evaluation of communication efforts has not yet occurred, and changes in organizational structure, personnel, and policies and procedures are ongoing. The team recommends continuing attention to engaging all campus constituents in two-way communication about the key strategic, effectiveness, organizational and operational issues; policies and procedures; and job performance expectations as appropriate. See also Standard 3 section on CFR 3.3 for more detailed information. (CFR 1.7)

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success

The February 27, 2025, Commission Action Letter found that SCIT had demonstrated compliance with Standard 2 at a level sufficient for Candidacy.

The Commission asked that SCIT develop the faculty to deepen their capacity and engagement in assessment, program review, and academic governance, congruent with the institution's mission and strategic direction.

CFR 2.3: *The institution clearly identifies and effectively implements student learning outcomes and expectations for achievement. These outcomes and expectations are reflected in and supported by the framework for academic advising, student support programs and services, and information and technology resources.*

SCIT currently offers four diploma programs, one operating associate of science program, and four bachelor of science programs. In 2025 SCIT evaluated the maturity of its program assessment practices indicating and determined:

- All programs have codified program learning outcomes;

- Curriculum maps are completed for the diploma and associate programs and are sporadic/in development for bachelor's programs;
- Artifact identification and ongoing data collection regarding student learning assessment do not exist for general education, are complete for one diploma program (Computer Networking and Cybersecurity, or CNC), and are in development/sporadic status for the remaining diploma, associate, and bachelor's programs; and
- Continuous improvement processes are non-existent for biomedical programs, complete for one diploma program (CNC), and in development/sporadic or non-existent for the remaining diploma and bachelor's programs.

The CNC program is the most mature program having also completed a full iteration of program review. Two other programs had undergone pilot program review, and a third pilot self-study was written.

The team requested additional assessment materials for the bachelor's programs and was provided with the PLOs/ILOs, curriculum maps, assessment artifacts, and some limited summative assessment data from the BIO490/EE490 Senior Design Project courses, which are the capstone courses for the biomedical, electrical, and electronic engineering bachelor's programs.

SCIT identified advancement of program assessment maturity as a key area of focus for both the office of institutional research and effectiveness and the new annual Program Performance Review process (SAV2 Institutional Report, p.15).

SCIT has systematized an annual program performance report that incorporates a range of key metrics: DFWI grades, graduation, average wages and employment, student evaluations of teaching, and a snapshot assessment of student learning; these were shared with the team. SCIT is in the preliminary phase of using the reports in an established review cycle. Programs meet to identify changes based on the data, but the resourcing and monitoring of changes is not yet complete.

Since the SAV1 visit, SCIT designated a faculty member as a course designer to create course briefs and training workshops with an emphasis on course design and delivery. At the time of the visit, approximately 10% of courses had been reviewed and briefs documented; SCIT plans to complete the review of all courses by 2030 (SAV2 Institutional Report, p. 15). On-site discussions with faculty across programs indicated commitment and enthusiasm for sustaining this effort. Faculty listed the benefits of having established course briefs as cross-training and back-up coverage as well as gaining clarity on alignment of content across individual courses and program curricula (diploma, associate, and bachelor levels). Expanding brief content to focus on student learning outcomes, formative and summative assessment, and encouraging disaggregation of data (e.g., by modality) is an area of opportunity to leverage faculty momentum to strengthen systematic assessment practices.

The office of student services monitors student attendance, GPA, and degree progress. SCIT has recognized the "substantially higher" attrition rates in bachelor's programs over diploma programs. During discussion with the team, cabinet members shared how student success data are discussed currently, demonstrating the institution's efforts to engage in strategic reflection and periodic sharing of progress on established KPIs. While a full understanding of the factors contributing to student attrition has not yet been determined through analysis of additional data, the cabinet conveyed a commitment to continued inquiry and reflection. The student support services team is working to strengthen student services using best practices and professional standards guided by student development theory and future use of smaller (micro) assessment practices. An emphasis on the student experience across all support services, in addition to KPIs and ACCSC outcomes (such as placement rates), provides the institution with an opportunity to strengthen assessment practices and quality assurance. (CFR 2.3)

CFR 2.4: *The institution conducts periodic reviews of its degree programs. The program review process includes analysis of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes.*

Since the SAV1 visit, SCIT has established a program review framework. Each program review committee is comprised of full-time faculty and the part-time faculty by invitation of the program lead or director in consultation with the president/CAO. The program review template includes reflections on capacity, resources, and funding in support of program effectiveness.

SCIT's program review schedule indicated completion of two pilot reviews of certificate programs, General Electrician in 2023 and Biomedical Technology in 2024. An additional pilot program review self-study for 2023 for the Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering was provided as part of a request for information by the team. In 2025, SCIT conducted a full program review of its Computer Networking and Cybersecurity diploma program using a more comprehensive process that included input from an industry advisory board as the external review component. The review culminated in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) documenting review action items. Remaining SCIT programs are scheduled for full reviews on a timeline ending in 2030.

The team recommends that SCIT expedite the schedule of program reviews to complete the initial cycle of reviews earlier. As SCIT continues to learn from the program review process, the team recommends attention to standardization of review templates for the self-study and external review, similar to its MOU, which will strengthen consistency and allow comparisons across programs. SCIT should also consider a more robust external review component beyond an industry advisory board such as an external peer review team with program-specific expertise. (CFR 2.4)

CFR 2.5: *The institution has faculty with the capacity and scale to design and deliver the curriculum to evaluate, improve, and promote student learning and success.*

Based on data and information provided in the SAV2 institutional report and from discussions with faculty and administrators, the team learned that SCIT maintains adequate faculty to deliver curriculum by leveraging part-time faculty. The institution expressed a goal to increase the number of full-time faculty, particularly those who could support bachelor's level programs. While overall one third

of SCIT faculty are full-time and the rest part-time, only two of the 12 engineering faculty dedicated to bachelor's programs in biomedical, electrical, and electronics engineering are full-time, and one of the four faculty for the information systems/cybersecurity programs area (serving one certificate and the fourth bachelor's program) is full-time.

Faculty develop their courses and syllabi and have begun engaging in the collaborative development of course briefs to promote course alignment and curricular integrity as described in the section on CFR 2.3. One barrier to more fully embedding assessment practices has been that "only half of the academic departments have department chairs, and SCIT's president is currently serving as the school's "acting chief academic officer" (SAV2 Institutional Report, p.15) as well as the chair of general education role that was vacant at the time of the visit.

SCIT leadership is generally aligned on the importance of investing in faculty development. Budgets reflect increased allocation of resources for professional development. Governance Advisory Council (GAC) faculty leaders described new processes for their responsibility for the review of individual professional development proposals and respective recommendations to the president for funding. Faculty-led workshops on instructional technology and designing student learning outcome assessments were held to support faculty learning.

Leadership roles in academic programs, which are currently filled at the level of associate chair, and key academic officer roles, such as dean of education or chief academic officer, are essential to building and supporting faculty-driven curriculum and assessment practices. The team recommends continuing focus on filling key positions to support ongoing faculty development and further the attention of faculty on student academic success. (CFR 2.5)

CFR 2.6: *The faculty exercise effective academic leadership and act consistently to ensure that the quality of academic programs and the institution's educational purposes are sustained.*

At the program level, assessment and program review remain led largely administratively rather than by faculty. SCIT quality assurance efforts engage faculty primarily through the annual PPR process (SAV2 Institutional Report, p. 14). The PPR process includes an annual meeting in December. Participation is required of full-time faculty and optional for part-time faculty, although given small numbers of full-time faculty in some programs, including all part-time faculty might be a consideration. Part-time faculty have been compensated for participation in the PPR process, and faculty shared during the visit that the compensation for part-time faculty has been essential to achieving specific program milestones, such as completion of the Computer Networking and Cybersecurity periodic program review. PPR meeting minutes from the Computer Networking and Cybersecurity certificate identified that assessment data from one course indicated that students were having difficulty with content for one PLO, which was being addressed by the instructor. The minutes also identified faculty development needs such as stipends for certifications and premium tools; these could be proposed through the new 2026 professional development application process facilitated by the GAC.

On-site discussions indicated that SCIT is in the developmental stage of faculty understanding and ownership of the PPR process and role of annual meetings. To increase faculty attendance, the president/CAO began joining the first cycle of PPR meetings to reinforce the importance of the evaluation activities.

The GAC, a faculty leadership body with a self-defined mission, engages with the president regularly and with the chair of the board of trustees Academic Affairs Committee periodically. Members of the GAC, some of whom are elected by the faculty and some of whom are appointed by the president through an application process, reflect a diversity of faculty ranks, programs, full-time and part-time appointments, and years of service at SCIT. In its first year (2024-2025), the GAC submitted 13 proposals to administration to influence policy revisions spanning make-up exams, student conduct, and course evaluation consistency across programs. Over the past year, the GAC reviewed and provided

feedback on the institution's strategic plan. One of the GAC's current year agenda items is to promote discussion about the process to review rank-based qualifications and promotion and clarify terminology and the advancement process in the Faculty Handbook.

The GAC assessed faculty engagement in Spring 2025 finding that 66.7% of faculty rarely participated in their forums and "only 33.3% of faculty felt well-informed". Since the assessment, the GAC has sought ways to incentivize faculty participation in its open forums including by changing GAC forum days to when more faculty are on campus and/or available to join.

The GAC maintains an anonymous feedback form to collect faculty input. The feedback form is advertised in communications and through proactive placement of QR codes in areas where faculty congregate. Recent successes shared during the on-site visit included increased engagement of online faculty using the feedback form, and more faculty sharing feedback in-person through informal discussions with GAC members. The GAC reports outcomes of the feedback in its periodic newsletters to close the loop. The GAC is also leveraging its Google platform so faculty can more easily navigate all GAC documents including past and current meeting agendas, minutes, and newsletters, to optimize use of faculty time, provide easy access to information, and foster engagement.

Similar to 2.5, ongoing faculty development and full development of faculty leadership is key to progress in quality assurance and continuing to strengthen the academic culture. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7)

CFR 2.9: *The institution demonstrates that graduates consistently achieve stated learning outcomes and standards of performance. Faculty evaluate student work in terms of stated learning outcomes.*

SCIT monitors and reports on graduation and employment rates as standards of performance for ACCSC accreditation purposes, BPPE compliance, and institutional quality assurance. Including the assessment of student learning outcomes as a measure of student success is an area for continuing growth and development for SCIT as noted in CFR 2.3 above. During on-site meetings, faculty conveyed their

commitment to student skill and competency development, which they understand as essential to excellent graduate and workforce outcomes. Faculty articulated an understanding of the role of assessment in demonstrating program learning, even where current assessment practices are not yet in place to fully demonstrate standards of achievement. Faculty leads for bachelors engineering programs indicated a goal to align at least one assessment artifact for every program learning outcome by the end of the 2026 calendar year; that goal also advances alignment of the programs with ABET accreditation standards, a stated aim of the institution.

Most recently, SCIT created an engineering senior project capstone assessment across all the engineering bachelor's programs and completed two cycles of faculty review of results in June 2025 and January 2026. Institutional research staff indicated that additional infrastructure capacity for data collection and use was required to collect, store, extract, and analyze assessment results, and that proactive design of data collection for subsequent disaggregation (e.g., by modality) was also needed.

Overall, SCIT has made progress establishing foundational assessment frameworks for cyclical implementation that are not yet systematized and are led more administratively than by faculty. As noted in Standard 1, the team recommends that SCIT faculty and administrators work expeditiously to ensure essential components of assessment and program review are in place and operational for all programs, particularly for degree programs. Success will need to be demonstrated through sustained annual implementation of assessment and quality assurance activities. (CFR 2.9)

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures

The February 27, 2025, Commission Action Letter found that SCIT had not demonstrated compliance with Standard 3 at a level sufficient for Candidacy. The CAL identified specific Areas for Development.

CFR 3.3: *Foster a culture of open communication and regular professional development for faculty and staff.*

Communication

SCIT's SAV2 institutional report and on-site discussions demonstrated efforts to foster a culture of open communication with faculty and staff. The team reviewed a 2025 schedule of meetings, presentations, and minutes held for all faculty, all staff, senior staff, joint faculty/staff, cabinet, Governance Advisory Council (GAC), and board of trustees Academic Affairs Committee. Materials also included an evaluation by faculty of the effectiveness of the GAC, a screenshot example of dashboards for faculty and staff that show institutional data in real-time, and the 2026-2029 Strategic Plan incorporating an objective to increase transparent communication that incorporates a goal measurable through annual climate surveys. Additional evidence requested by the team prior to the visit included the results from a winter 2026 climate survey of SCIT faculty and staff.

Meeting materials demonstrated sharing of information in the areas of enrollment, operations, priorities, and planning, primarily delivered by the president. As noted in Standard 2, while the spring 2025 evaluation of the effectiveness of the GAC indicated that only 33.3% of faculty felt well-informed and 66.7% rarely participated in the GAC, in the winter 2026 employee climate survey (completed by only one third of the employees), 77.3% of faculty and staff had positive responses to two questions regarding communication with 18.2% having neutral responses and 4.5% negative responses. The president and members of the board of trustees, cabinet, and senior staff confirmed a strong commitment to open communications in discussions with the team. Board members reported that the opportunity to interact with a faculty representative at Academic Affairs Committee meetings was informative.

In on-site discussions, GAC members noted their successes in improving communication channels. They highlighted a newsletter for faculty produced every five-week term, an online faculty feedback form, in addition to their interaction with the board. The addition of a staff representative to the

GAC did not occur as originally anticipated. Faculty confirmed that communication had improved, citing GAC's initiatives and open meetings with the president.

Members of SCIT's cabinet and senior staff cited the quarterly meetings with the president and expanded information-sharing within their own departments and divisions as improvements in communication. Interviews with staff, however, revealed divided perceptions and experiences regarding an improved culture of open communication. Providing open avenues for staff voice, participation, and contributions represents an important opportunity to build institutional resilience and maturation.

Professional Development

SCIT's SAV2 institutional report and on-site interviews provided evidence of efforts to regularize professional development opportunities. The 2026-2029 Strategic Plan incorporates a commitment to professional development opportunities and leadership pathways measurable through annual employee performance evaluations and ratings of a "high" level of contribution to the institution. The recent winter 2026 climate survey of SCIT faculty and staff indicated that 63.6% of faculty and staff had positive responses to a question regarding professional development opportunities at SCIT with 27.3% having neutral responses and 9.1% negative responses. Five professional development workshops were offered for faculty and/or staff during FY 2025; attendance at each workshop ranged from two to nine participants. To address low rates of participation in professional development workshops, a new professional development policy effective on January 1, 2026, provides 12 hours of paid professional development time in the current year for faculty and staff after approval.

The president, members of the board of trustees, cabinet, and senior staff stated a strong commitment to offering expanded professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. Draft financial statements for FY 2025 showed total spending on employee professional development for the year was $904. Budget projections for FY 2026 through FY 2029 showed much higher amounts for professional development: $15,000 in FY 2026 increasing to $37,150 in FY 2029. Annual funding for

professional development was one of the few strategic objectives with resource allocations in the multi-year budget projections.

Cabinet members and senior staff described examples of improved professional development opportunities. Faculty members reported that development opportunities had improved, citing examples of workshops they had participated in, and acknowledged the work of the GAC on their behalf. GAC members described their advocacy and involvement with professional development for faculty: they review and recommend proposed professional development submissions for individual faculty members and can propose and offer in-house workshops. For FY 2026, they have plans to clarify processes for faculty rank advancement.

Some non-senior staff experienced workload pressures and related barriers to participation in development opportunities, such as turnover in non-senior and supervisorial staff positions. Suggestions for improvement included more support for staff-identified professional development options, and more assistance with office coverage during training and workshops to facilitate participation.

Data provided by SCIT indicated that there were over 20 staff and faculty positions that had turned over from FY 2023 through FY 2025 with most, but not all, positions replaced at the time of the team's visit. The faculty and staff hiring plan includes the addition of 11 academic and staff administrative positions through FY 2029. There have been extended vacancies in the academic leader infrastructure at the program and institutional levels. The team observed that cabinet level positions, except for the CFO, are at the associate director level with several cabinet members including the president having responsibility to provide coverage for vacant or planned additional positions, particularly in key academic areas and those that may carry more risk when unfilled by employees with specialized training and expertise.

In summary, the team finds that SCIT has established and implemented practices and policies to build a culture of open communication with faculty and staff and to expand professional development

opportunities. SCIT has made strategic plan commitments that incorporate goals to address these two areas, has identified metrics to assess progress, and planned higher levels of funding for professional development opportunities in its budget projections through FY 2029.

The team also finds that efforts to improve communications with faculty and staff and expand their professional development opportunities are recent, not uniformly successful, and require ongoing effort and evaluation. The team recommends that SCIT continue to work with all constituents to strengthen communication and professional development opportunities, especially for constituents without an established mechanism for input such as non-senior staff, and clarify the professional development funding process to align with job responsibilities, departmental objectives, and institutional priorities. The team recommends that the institution review the climate survey instrument and assessment process to ensure that data gathered is both meaningful and useable, as well as to assure anonymity. Finally, the team recommends that SCIT review its staffing and hiring plans and the qualifications and sufficiency of administrators, faculty, and staff; their workloads; their professional development needs; and ensure an institutional culture supportive of all members. (CFRs 3.1–3.3, 3.9, and 3.11)

> CFR 3.4: *Develop, formalize, and implement a strategic plan to clarify and communicate the institution's direction and goals, and to align multi-year plant, equipment, and personnel investments with academic programs, enrollment strategies, and financial targets. Model multi-year financial scenarios that project both revenues and expenses consistent with the strategic plan.*

Strategic Planning

The SAV2 institutional report demonstrated the development of a four-year strategic plan for FY 2026 through FY 2029 that was adopted by the board of trustees on November 14, 2025. The plan incorporates the institutional mission, vision, values, and three major strategic goals that focus on student success, institutional continuity, and organizational viability. The plan also includes more detailed

strategic objectives, institutional level key performance indicators (KPIs), deliverables, and specific goal standards associated with each strategic objective. Materials foundational to the development of the plan included analyses of institutional data, climate survey results, a SWOT analysis, and documentation of collaboration with and feedback from key stakeholders including the board of trustees, the GAC, and faculty and staff through institutional meetings. The team reviewed a recently developed roadmap for implementing strategic plan objectives that identified responsible parties, cost estimates and implementation timelines; a template to be used to facilitate the implementation of strategic plan goals, objectives and resources at the departmental and board of trustees committee levels; and a set of goals, KPIs, and benchmarks established to date.

SCIT's institutional report identified as a weakness in institutional strategic planning practices that strategic planning objectives through FY 2029 have yet to be integrated into SCIT's budget projections through FY 2029. To address this, the report stated that members of the cabinet and senior staff have been tasked with developing strategic implementation plans in their areas of responsibility for inclusion in future budget projections using a template.

During the on-site visit, the president, CFO, members of the board of trustees, cabinet, and senior staff described their engagement with the formulation of the strategic plan and their collective intention to finalize details and monitor the plan. Leadership indicated they anticipated resourcing the strategic plan primarily through enrollment growth with the possibility of adding resources by reducing operating margins, if necessary.

GAC members indicated that they contributed feedback on the draft plan and, more recently, have been formulating their own KPIs. Faculty and senior staff indicated that they had opportunities to participate in the formulation of the strategic plan and were now focused on its implementation, including developing KPIs for their areas of responsibility.

Budgeting and Financial Modeling

SCIT has made efforts to develop and use multi-year financial modeling, including developing a revised chart of accounts to facilitate program-level financial analysis and creating three budget scenarios used to inform the adoption of the final FY 2026 budget. The review team requested and reviewed a three-year budget projection through FY 2029, a faculty and staff hiring plan through FY 2029, a facilities improvement plan projected through FY 2030, and a strategic enrollment plan. The institutional report identified a shortcoming in its multi-year financial modeling approach as a lack of input into budgeting processes from SCIT's community beyond the president, CFO, and board of trustees, and committed to greater collaboration in future budgeting processes although they did not provide a framework for doing so.

The team met with members of the board of trustees as well as with the president and CFO about their involvement in developing the FY 2026 operating budget and the multi-year financial models. All stated their commitment to integrate strategic plan objectives into the models as KPIs are further developed at operational levels of the institution.

The team found that SCIT has made progress in collaboratively developing and adopting a strategic plan that is reflective of its mission, vision and values. The strategic plan includes three major goal areas with associated institutional-level objectives, KPIs, and measurable goal standards. The team also found that SCIT has made progress in developing and utilizing budget scenarios and multi-year financial models based on reasonable assumptions. At the time of the SAV2 visit, however, the strategic plan had not been fully integrated with all institutional operations, nor had it been fully integrated into SCIT's multi-year budgeting models. The team was concerned that the lack of integration with key functions may prevent SCIT from gauging progress on the implementation and success of the plan or identifying necessary tactical adjustments to the plan. Strategic plan goals and objectives at the institutional level did not address academic programs including the planned growth of existing programs,

the planned creation of new programs, and the potential expansion of facilities necessary for growth and creation of academic programs. The multi-year budgeting models are basic: projections only include a few major variables. In addition, operating budgets and budgeting scenarios at SCIT are not currently formulated, shared, or monitored in a collaborative manner, and KPIs are still unidentified in some areas. It is not clear when or how a more collaborative approach to budgeting will occur. (CFRs 3.4, 3.10, 4.1-4.6, 4.8)

CFR 3.8: *Develop the Board of Trustees' composition and capacity to ensure appropriate leadership, succession planning, strategic direction and long-term effectiveness.*

The team found evidence of changes in the board of trustees' composition and an increased capacity since the SAV1 visit. The team reviewed board of trustees operating procedures, a board member skills matrix, and the resume of a newly appointed (August 21, 2025) board member with extensive higher education experience. Additional materials provided included the membership of the board of trustees, the SCIT corporate board of directors (corporate owner/parent of SCIT), and the ARISAM corporate board of directors (corporate owner of campus real estate); minutes of the board of trustees and its committees; and the corporate bylaws and conflict of interest policy adopted by the SCIT corporate board of directors to apply to the SCIT board of trustees.

The institutional report indicated that the board skills matrix is being used to identify gaps in the expertise of the current trustees and to prioritize the expertise of future trustee candidates to fill those gaps. Board operating procedures were modified to revise the leadership structure of the board including term limits (two years with the possibility of extension) for the board chair position and the addition of a board vice chair position. Excerpts from the board operating procedures focused on the annual evaluation of the president and a biennial board self-evaluation. SCIT appointed a board secretary to standardize and improve board and board committee operations.

Both board of trustees' members and the president reported that recent and planned board membership changes and changes to operating procedures had been effective in improving board operations. The board members indicated that the addition of a board secretary position had been especially impactful in facilitating the effectiveness of board work and the ability of the board to participate in in-depth discussions. Members described the process used to evaluate the president and the process under consideration for the board's self-evaluation. Board committees were maturing in their work and becoming both more active and effective in their responsibilities. Relations between the board of trustees and the SCIT corporate parent CEO and the corporate board of directors were described as positive and supportive.

The SCIT corporate parent CEO confirmed the positive and supportive working relationship between the board of trustees, himself, and the corporate parent board of directors. The CEO reported withdrawing from the operational functions of SCIT and from leadership roles on the SCIT board of trustees to assume more advisory and stewardship roles focusing on planning, program development, and strategic resources.

An interview with a representative of SCIT's independent auditing firm affirmed the past and projected future financial viability of the institution and its compliance with federal financial reporting and audit requirements. The auditor indicated that the audit engagement was with the SCIT corporate parent and interactions with SCIT were with the CFO, president, and corporate parent CEO; there had been no direct interactions with the SCIT board of trustees or its Audit Committee. This interview verified that SCIT has been using the bookkeeping and reporting services of a CPA firm owned by a non-independent member of the board of trustees who serves on the board's Audit Committee.

Overall, the team found that the SCIT board of trustees has made progress in assessing and improving the skill sets of its members. The board has a clear, shared direction for the skills it will be

seeking in future members. The board has updated its operating procedures with a focus on succession planning, and the board secretary supports and expedites its work.

The team identified areas for improvement in board of trustees' independence. The board is not retaining and meeting with the independent auditor directly. The team also identified a board conflict of interest concern because a non-independent board member owns a firm that is providing bookkeeping and reporting services for SCIT while serving on the Board's Audit Committee. A review of board and board Audit Committee meeting minutes do not show recusal of the conflicted board member from deliberations or votes accepting the audit reports as required by the SCIT bylaws. The team noted that SCIT bylaws and board operating procedures do not clarify whether the audit function is a reserved power of the corporate board of directors or a responsibility of the board of trustees. The team recommends that these issues be clarified and addressed. (CFRs 3.7, 3.8, and WSCUC Governing Board Policy)

CFR 3.9, 3.11: *Develop the leadership team and formalize decision-making structures to reduce dependence on individuals for better clarity, transparency, succession planning and long-term effectiveness.*

SCIT's SAV2 institutional report and related materials provided evidence that it focused on developing leadership and formalizing decision-making structures through leadership development, employee advancement, and a new decision-making framework. SCIT's leadership development process entails recruitment and appointment of staff and academic leaders into associate level positions with opportunities to advance into more senior level positions. The report described the formation of a five-member president's cabinet consisting primarily of associate director level positions, with all but one position filled. The dean of education/CAO position is an open position currently filled by the president. The report also indicated that succession planning is underway for the CFO position. The team reviewed

the institution's cabinet level job descriptions and qualification summaries, cabinet and senior staff meeting minutes, and an organizational chart.

Recently SCIT adopted a decision-making framework that identifies categories of major decisions, the decision maker, and involved parties. The institutional report described the development and use of KPIs by cabinet and senior staff members for their divisions that will guide decision-making, actions, and resources aligned with the 2026-2029 Strategic Plan.

During the visit, senior leaders further described the institution's leadership development approach, which entails hiring staff into associate level positions. Associate-level administrators would be mentored and developed to attain the skills and trust necessary to be promoted into senior level positions, including cabinet level or vice-president level positions. They acknowledged that this approach was time-consuming and several senior staff members are currently assigned additional responsibilities for vacant positions or to cover gaps in academic and administrative leadership. An additional stressor was the need to cover vacant or missing positions when operating under the time-constrained environment of the year-round five-week terms academic calendar. The team confirmed there are plans and funding in place to fill vacancies, add additional staff and faculty positions each year through FY 2029, and address the planned retirement of the CFO.

The team found that SCIT had made progress in developing its leadership structure as evidenced by the formation of a president's cabinet and formulating succession plans for the CFO position. Progress has also been made in the development and adoption of a decision-making framework and by the evolving development and use of KPIs aligned with the strategic plan.

The team had concerns, however, about the hiring and management development model for senior academic and administrative leadership at SCIT that includes extended time to hire, develop, and promote leadership (stated as one to three years), and the potential impact on SCIT operations of such

delays. The impact is manifested in the turnover in associate director positions, significant workload expectations caused by turnover, continuing reorganization, communication gaps, and discontinuation of key processes such as complaint tracking, as well as in gaps in strategic planning such as the lack of broader academic focus in the adopted plan, including academic programs and facilities. (CFRs 3.9 and 3.11)

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

The February 27, 2025, Commission Action Letter found that SCIT had not demonstrated compliance with Standard 4 at a level sufficient for Candidacy.

The Commission asked that SCIT implement and integrate data-based quality assurance and review processes across all academic programs and co-curricular services to inform decision-making and continuous improvement.

CFR 4.1: *The institution employs comprehensive quality assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas and uses the results to improve institutional operations.*

SCIT has established foundational frameworks for academic quality assurance processes. Cyclical program reviews self-study components reflect some student, alumni, and industry feedback. SCIT convenes industry advisory boards virtually for an annual 1.25-hour meeting to discuss curriculum, facilities and equipment, library/learning resources, distance learning, and student outcomes. In 2020, the advisory board was combined for all SCIT programs but from 2021 to the present, advisory boards have been separated by program discipline. Industry guidance includes topics such as course text relevancy, placement of internships within the curriculum, prioritized skills in particular for students engaged in distance education, and faculty staffing considerations.

During the on-site visit faculty, staff, and administrators communicated their understanding of the gap between the institution's current level of functioning and institutional maturity. Faculty articulated commitment to ownership and growth of academic assessment and student learning practices. Administrators acknowledged that this transition to full faculty responsibility has not yet occurred and will require personnel resources to support and sustain efforts.

In addition to cyclical continuous improvement practices, SCIT has conducted studies and evaluated data to be used for academic decision making. For example, SCIT conducted a study to evaluate learning management systems (LMSs) and elected to optimize use of its current Google Classroom system. Within this study, SCIT gathered valuable instructional feedback from students and identified faculty development opportunities to leverage additional LMS features.

SCIT provided evidence of some initial quality assurance efforts for non-academic areas. Current non-academic efforts typically focus on required external ACCSC and compliance reporting and monitoring (e.g., retention, completion, and placement). SCIT uses graduation and placement rates as a proxy for non-academic student-facing assessment and plans to implement and use a new Graduating Student Survey for feedback on support services. (CFR 4.1)

CFR 4.2: *The institution collects, analyzes and acts on disaggregated student outcomes data including retention and graduation rates.*

SCIT reports enrollment, graduation, and employment rates to maintain compliance with ACCSC and the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE). As noted in Standard 2 CFR 2.6, SCIT has developed Program Performance Reports incorporating a range of key metrics, specifically DFWI grades, graduation, average wages and employment, student evaluations of teaching, and snapshots of assessment of student learning where available. Expanding data collection, disaggregation and presentation in this reporting will strengthen SCIT's overall quality assurance processes. For example, SCIT course evaluations include questions specific to distance education student experience, and program compliance

reporting includes in-person versus distance education student outcomes, however, systematic use of data for comparison between in-person and distance education students across programs and services is not yet in place. During the visit, faculty and staff expressed enthusiasm for building this capacity and for more robust use of the data.

Faculty and staff expressed great pride in supporting advancement of SCIT students through their programs to reach graduation, in particular for bachelor's program recipients, many of whom first enrolled as diploma students and were not intending to earn a bachelor's degree. Interview participants noted time to degree for bachelor's students as an area for further inquiry and data analysis in the coming months.

SCIT has identified updating its database and technical capacity in support of academic and non-academic assessment data collection and use as an area of opportunity. Institutional research staff are developing a system to collect PLO assessment scoring outcomes in the student information system (SIS) through a test case using the engineering senior capstone project. Staff also noted the importance of building databases and reporting capacity to systemically monitor a variety of KPIs, including basic data indicators such as admissions yields and conversion rates as well as faculty-identified KPIs that support educational effectiveness. (CFR 4.2)

CFR 4.3: *The institution examines the extent to which its climate supports student success and acts on its findings. The institution regularly assesses the characteristics, experiences, and performance of its students and uses this evidence to improve student success.*

As described in Standard 3, in 2026, SCIT conducted an employee climate survey to solicit feedback "on communication and professional development opportunities" (Institutional Report, p.21). In on-site discussions, the cabinet provided examples of new ways employees are engaging in constructive feedback to leadership and expressed enthusiasm about strategies for continuing to improve employee communication. As noted earlier, the team recommends sustained use of climate surveys using a platform

that assures respondent confidentiality. Collaborative faculty, staff and administrator engagement in identifying proactive solutions to issues and taking effective actions in response to survey results are important to close the loop and demonstrate continuous improvement.

In past years (2022-March 2025) SCIT has administered a student climate survey, the results of which informed the SCIT 2026-2029 Strategic Plan and the design of a new Graduating Student Survey. Refining the student survey design, administration, data analysis and use of results is an opportunity for SCIT to maximize impact of this for students in SCIT's compressed five-week term programs, into which new students can enter in any term.

Since the SAV1 visit, SCIT has implemented three new student-level assessments. In March 2025, SCIT conducted an analysis of career services 2020-2025 caseload closure data, analyzing length of time to obtain placements or career advancements in the field. The study explored various factors including field of study. Future iterations could expand to additional student success indicators (e.g., student experience, student outcomes on PLO assessments). SCIT also developed assignments in the Career Readiness course to evaluate students' skills in resume-writing and interviewing and conducted a review of feedback given on students' interviewing skills. Ongoing engagement of faculty and staff in evaluating student services and academic support, supported by institutional research expertise, will provide many opportunities to demonstrate institutional improvement based upon the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation.

On-site discussions with faculty and evidence from 2025 Computer Networking and Cybersecurity certificate program review self-study analysis demonstrate institutional capacity to collect anecdotal data from alumni. However, beyond program review and the graduating student survey, alumni data do not appear to be gathered or used to evaluate or support student success. In discussions with the review team, faculty provided examples of deep relationships with alumni who remain in contact via informal personal updates, provide employment referrals and hiring, and serve in transitional roles such

as lab assistants at SCIT upon graduation. These important relationships with alumni offer an opportunity for SCIT to broaden engagement with its community for assessment and quality assurance purposes, as well as for alumni development, advancement, and support. (CFR 4.3)

CFR 4.5: *The institution demonstrates improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation.*

Evidence-based inquiry practices are foundational to fostering a culture of continuous improvement. As noted throughout Standards 1-4, many sources of data gathering are under revision, emerging from pilot phases, in final design status, or have been conducted one or two times to date. Sustained and consistent use and refinement of data instruments and taking actions based on the data are critical to engage constituents in reflection and promote educational effectiveness going forward. (CFR 4.5)

CFR 4.6: *The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in continuous inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the institution's standards of performance are being achieved.*

At the course level, SCIT has a systematic evaluation process. The survey distributed to students includes questions related to teaching and learning. The survey results are disseminated to instructors and program leads for analysis. Evaluations also include a specific question related to aspects of the online format of courses.

At the program level, SCIT has PLOs and matrices aligning institutional and program learning outcomes mapped to courses, as well as some outcomes data. These data, along with new program-level and the annual Program Performance Review reports inform PPR meetings, MOU action steps, and when applicable, cyclical 5-year program reviews. SCIT has demonstrated some capacity to guide programs though a full set of review processes. The Computer Networking and Cybersecurity (CNC) certificate program is the only program with an assessment portfolio with some standards of performance in

addition to results, annual program performance review report, annual program faculty meeting to review results, and an MOU with program-developed action steps. This certificate underwent cyclical 2020-2024 data gathering and a program review conducted in 2025 which resulted in a 2025-2029 MOU. This program review self-study illustrated mapping of PLOs, market analysis, an annual program advisory committee meeting, and alumni interviews; the program has one full-time faculty member who serves as associate chair and drafted the review documents. The program also noted assessment was in developmental phases and limited due to faculty turnover and inconsistent artifacts.

As discussed in Standard 2, SCIT's capacity to assure assessment plans, data collection, and analysis consistently across all programs is nascent as the institution continues to develop and grow its full-time faculty and academic leadership. (CFR 4.7)

CFR 4.8: *The institution periodically engages its stakeholders in reflection and planning processes based on the examination of evidence. Through these processes it assesses the institution's strategic position, articulates priorities, examines the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and defines the future direction of the institution.*

The 2026-29 Strategic Plan and planning frameworks were developed through a year-long process that included current university leadership (president, board trustees, cabinet, senior staff) and faculty engagement through the Governance Advisory Council (GAC). SCITs Strategic Priorities Roadmap and institutional and departmental KPIs reflect planning and evaluation measures to support continuous improvement. The team recommends that the institution seek formal and informal ways to gather input from all constituents, including students, alumni and employers, and ensure alignment of administrator, faculty and staff expertise, contributions, and needs for support. Sustained engagement of all constituents will be essential to achieving systematic practices and impact. This includes onboarding and transition/backfill support for new and current employees appointed while implementing the SCIT staff and faculty hiring plan. (CFR 4.8)

Section III – Commendations and Recommendations

The team reports the following commendations and recommendations for SCIT:

A. Commendations

The team commends SCIT for:

1. Demonstrating a strong shared sense of purpose with genuine and pervasive commitment to hands-on learning and career preparation and support.
2. A coherent vision for offering technical programs aligned with areas of current and anticipated industry demand.
3. Deep commitment of faculty and staff to student learning and success.
4. Providing a physical campus and labs designed to stimulate curiosity and support technical learning.
5. Establishment of the Governance Advisory Council (GAC), which serves as a voice for faculty on academic matters and provides leadership in the areas of faculty development and support.

B. Recommendations

The team recommends that SCIT:

1. Accelerate the formation and development of senior academic and administrative leadership to ensure academic quality, educational effectiveness, and achievement of strategic goals. (CFRs 3.1, 3.9)
2. Expedite the process of integrating the strategic plan into all the operations of the institution and into its multi-year financial models. (CFRs 3.4, 4.8)

3. Formulate and implement collaborative budget development and monitoring processes that include representation from academic and non-academic functional areas. (CFR 3.4)
4. Demonstrate faculty-driven assessment and program review across all academic programs including: a) well-developed curriculum maps, b) learning outcome assessment plans, c) regular and systematized data collection and analysis, and d) evidence of actions taken as a result of the evaluation of data. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9, 4.1, 4.5, 4.6)
5. Ensure assessment of the effectiveness of all co-curricular programs and services. (CFRs 1.2, 2.14, 4.1)
6. Continue to develop the board of trustees to ensure board integrity, independence and reasonable protection against conflict of interest, consistent with best practices. (CFR 3.7, and WSCUC Governing Board Policy)
7. Ensure that all courses contain sufficient direct instructional hours to comply with the institution's credit hour policy. (CFR 2.1, and WSCUC Credit Hour Policy)
8. Examine the extent to which campus climate supports faculty, staff, and administrators, and act on the findings. (CFR 3.2)
9. Enhance institutional research capacity to support quality assurance and decision-making, and demonstrate institutional improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. (CFRs 4.1-4.8, Standard 4)

Appendices

A. Credit Hour Federal Compliance Form

Credit Hour Review Form

Material Reviewed	Institution provides links to materials to be reviewed (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
Policy on credit hour	Link to institutional policy on credit hour: Please see **Exhibit CH.1 Credit Hour Policy**	Is this policy easily accessible? ___ YES X NO Comments: The credit hour policy was provided in the exhibits but does not appear with the same language in the catalog (2026 Catalog), although there is a definition of quarter units using clock hours (p.18). The team was informed the credit hour policy provided has always been the institution's policy. The team recommends the credit hour language in the policy and the quarter credit/clock hour language in the catalog be integrated into one clear policy that meets WSCUC, federal and institutional requirements and that this unified policy be included in the catalog.
Process(es) for periodic review of credit hour	Link to description of process for periodic review of credit hour: Please see **Exhibit CH.2 Periodic Review of Credit Hour Policy**	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)? X YES ___ NO Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ___ NO Comments: The Periodic Review of Credit Hour policy states that in addition to credit hour methodology and definitions being reviewed every five years, credit hour allocation are reviewed whenever new courses or programs are proposed, substantive course modification are made, delivery modalities are reviewed, and course reviews are conducted. Review of course syllabi was noted as taking place in one program review although the scope of the review was not specified. Current syllabus examples list quarter credit and instructional and out-of-class clock hours. Currently the institution is reviewing all courses as part of the development of a course brief for each course, including outcomes, assignments and assessments.

		Since clock hours are not usually referenced in credit hour programs, the team recommends that the language be clarified in the syllabi once the current policies and catalog language are integrated.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Link to recent schedule of on-ground courses: Please see **Exhibit CH.3 Course Schedules**	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES X NO Comments: Some do, and some do not based solely on the schedule. Courses take place over five weeks (although do not include the last weekend days of the fifth week). The course schedule shows the class meeting dates. Generally, didactic courses meet two or three hours one to four days per week. In some cases, the schedule shows the total number of instructional hours necessary for the credit awarded, but based on the syllabi provided, most courses combine in class time with "Required Video" time to meet the required instructional time. The syllabi clearly note the "Required Video" time in hours per week. The president/CAO noted that in some courses videos lectures were discussed in the classroom, and some had quizzes or exercises embedded in them that anchor them as direct instruction. Some videos were for review or detailed instructions about materials, and were stand-alone videos made specifically for the course(s) when courses were moved online at the time of COVID; while useful to the students, they may not incorporate sufficient faculty interaction with the material to be direct instruction. Slightly confusing language, occurs in the syllabi, indicating that "Pre-recorded videos may be posted to Google Classroom as necessary" and "Students may be required to view pre-recorded videos prior to class sessions which will be posted to Google Classroom and announced as appropriate." These statements potentially contradict the idea that all students are required to watch a certain number of hours of recorded video. Also, the courses indicate that students should anticipate "up to" the required

		number of hours of both instructional time and out-of-class hours. The team recommends that 1) A review of all courses without full classroom hours in the course schedule that use "Required Video" be undertaken to determine whether the video-based component is interactive instruction or is homework. 2) The language in the syllabi be reviewed to clarify for students when the video is required or optional, and how many hours are required of the student.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for on-ground and distance education courses	Link to at least 1-2 syllabi from each degree level and mode of delivery. Please see list of sample syllabi: **Exhibit CH.4 MT121 College Algebra 1 Syllabus** **Exhibit CH.5 MT235A Calculus 2A Syllabus** **Exhibit CH.6 ELE474 Power System Protection Syllabus**	How many syllabi were reviewed for each degree level and mode of delivery? One associate, five bachelor (two in-person, three distance), two non-degree certificate: • CH.4 MT121 College Algebra 1 (in-person or distance, associate and bachelor level) • CH.5 MT235A Calculus 2A (in-person or distance, bachelor level) • CH.6 ELE474 Power System Protection (hybrid-exam, distance with in-person exams, bachelor level) • Exhibit CH.7 NEC120-L National Electrical Code C (course portion) (in person or distance, non-degree certificate) • Exhibit CH.8 IS115-L Linux Server Administration and Lab Syllabus (course portion) hybrid or distance, bachelor and non-degree certificate) • Exhibit CH.9 EE311-L Circuit Analysis 2 (course portion) (in-person or distance, bachelor) What discipline(s) were the courses from? • Engineering – biomedical tech, industrial automation and robotics tech (associate) • Engineering – biomedical, electrical, electronic, information systems (bachelor) • Engineering – electrical and computer networking and cybersecurity (non-degree) Did the material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES X NO

		Comments: Most courses with more than 2 units had multiple meetings and assignments per week and cover a broad range material that is highly technical or challenging. For a five-week course, students in a four quarter unit course must complete 16 hours/week of homework. Not all syllabi had specified reading assignments. In addition, the material covered appeared comparable to similar courses found, when comparable courses could be found. See comments on instructional time vs. Homework time in the prior section for the didactic courses. Due to this issue, full instructional time could not be fully verified.
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).	Link to at least 1-2 syllabi from each degree level. Please see list of sample syllabi: **Exhibit CH.7 NEC120-L National Electrical Code C and Lab Syllabus** **Exhibit CH.8 IS115-L Linux Server Administration and Lab Syllabus** **Exhibit CH.9 EE311-L Circuit Analysis 2 and Lab Syllabus**	How many syllabi were reviewed for each degree level? Two non-degree certificate and two bachelor level with one overlapping syllabus used for both levels. What kinds of courses were reviewed? • CH.7 NEC120-L National Electrical Code C Lab (non-degree) • CH.8 IS115-L Linux Server Administration Lab (bachelor and non-degree) • CH.9 EE211-L Circuit Analysis 2 Lab (bachelor) What discipline(s) were the courses from? • General electrician • Engineering - electrical • Information systems, electrical, electronic Did the material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ___ NO Comments: The lab courses included 20 hours of instruction per unit plus 10 hours of out-of-class work per unit for a total of 30 hours. Lab courses are primarily hands-on work either on campus or using trainers sent to them with all required components for the lab. Faculty walk through all lab work with distance students synchronously so students receive real

		time laboratory instruction. There are several individual labs that take place in each course.

Review Completed By: Patty Mullen, Associate Provost, Institution Research, Retired, Alliant University

Date: March 25-27, 2026

Revised, May 2023, October 2025

B. Distance Education Review Form

Distance Education Review Form

SECTION A: For institutions with approved distance education programs:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Programs and courses to be reviewed (please list)

Institutional Response:

Programs (5 Total):

- Computer Networking and Cybersecurity – DE (Diploma Level)
- General Electrician – DE (Diploma Level)
- Electrical Engineering – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)
- Electronic Engineering – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)
- Information Systems – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)

Courses (9 Total):

- MT121 College Algebra 1
- MT235A Calculus 2A
- ELE474 Power Systems Protection
- NEC120 National Electrical Code C
- NEC120L National Electrical Code C Lab
- IS115 Linux Server Administration
- IS115L Linux Server Administration Lab
- EE311 Circuit Analysis 2
- EE311L Circuit Analysis 2 Lab

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)

Institutional Response

Following the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020, SCIT sought and received approval from its institutional accreditor, the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC), the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE), and the U.S. Department of Education to offer its programs through a distance education modality.

Subsequent to the SCIT's reaffirmation of accreditation with ACCSC in 2025, ACCSC formally approved the following five (5) programs to be delivered via 100% distance education, in addition to their existing residential offerings:

- Computer Networking and Cybersecurity – DE (Diploma Level)
    - 13 students enrolled as of February 2026
- General Electrician – DE (Diploma Level)
    - 28 students enrolled as of February 2026
- Electrical Engineering – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)
    - 16 students enrolled as of February 2026
- Electronic Engineering – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)
    - 2 students enrolled as of February 2026
- Information Systems – DE (Bachelor's Degree Level)
    - 10 students enrolled as of February 2026

As of February 2026, there are a total of 69 students enrolled in 100% online programs, approximately 14% of the institutions student population.

Starting with the initial application process to SCIT, students apply to attend via a specific modality (in-person or online), and must request to change modalities if they desire to do so after enrollment. SCIT does not separately offer standalone online courses. SCIT's courses in the above programs are offered in a "bimodal" format in which online students join live synchronous class sessions via videoconferencing technology alongside their in-person counterparts.

SCIT utilizes the Google ecosystem (e.g., Google Meet, Google Classroom, Gmail, and related tools) as the primary infrastructure for delivery of its online programs. SCIT conducted a formal review and comparative study of alternative learning management systems, including Canvas and Brightspace, to evaluate long-term scalability and functionality. After analysis, the institution elected to continue utilizing the Google ecosystem due to its ease of use, integration capabilities, and the continued rollout of advanced features that support instructional quality and operational efficiency comparable to other enterprise LMS platforms.

Instructional Delivery Method

Lecture-based courses are delivered primarily through synchronous, live instruction conducted via videoconferencing technology. Faculty-led sessions constitute the majority of instructional contact hours. Courses also incorporate a smaller asynchronous component, which typically includes faculty-developed pre-recorded instructional videos.

A commonly implemented instructional strategy is the flipped learning model. Under this approach, students are expected to review pre-recorded instructional content prior to attending live sessions. Synchronous class meetings are then utilized to reinforce concepts, facilitate problem-solving, and deepen application of the material.

Laboratory Delivery Model

Laboratory-based courses utilize either specialized software platforms or physical training equipment. For hardware-based courses, the institution deploys what it refers to as a "lab-in-a-box" model. Under this model, physical training devices are shipped to students in secured transport cases, enabling hands-on laboratory exercises in the home environment.

Faculty provide real-time instruction, supervision, and feedback through live teleconferencing sessions (e.g., Google Meet) as students perform laboratory exercises. These structured lab activities are designed to develop technical competencies directly aligned with course learning outcomes. Students submit deliverables in the form of completed lab assignments designed specifically for the online lab equipment. They receive direct formative and summative feedback to ensure proficiency in required skillsets consistent with course and program outcomes.

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

The team interviewed the following people and groups from SCIT to learn about the delivery of distance learning courses and programs:

President
Cabinet
Governance Advisory Council
Full-time and part-time faculty
Distance Learning students (6 students, electrical engineering and electronic engineering; some had begun in the GE program)
Student services staff (including associate director of student affairs, assistant director of student services, academic advisor, career advisors)
Institutional research staff (associate director of administration and academic operations coordinator)
Program leads/directors

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
Fit with Mission. 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?	SCIT's mission is centered on delivering hands-on instruction that prepares students for professional success in technical fields. Through its "Hands On-Line" model, SCIT extends this approach to distance education by enabling students to perform laboratory work at home using shipped training devices. Classes are offered in a "bimodal" format, allowing online students to benefit from the same live instruction as their in-person counterparts. This also minimizes costs and technology stack requirements necessary to support online learners. Over the past five years, SCIT has refined this delivery model and aligned its operational infrastructure, technology systems, and faculty training to support fully online learners, with minimal anticipated additional costs moving forward.	The online and ground programs and courses are integrated and focus on hands-on learning and professional skills and employment success post-graduation. Faculty, academic leadership and resources are the same for both modalities of each program. The syllabi represent both modalities. Both modalities have accreditation through ACCSC. Most classes are offered in the bi-modal format to allow students to choose the on-campus program or the distance program. Students in both modalities learn together in one class, and the faculty are responsible for ensuring the engagement of both online and ground students into the classes.

Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Distance education students enroll in the same programs and follow the same schedules as on-site students. They participate in synchronous, live lectures alongside residential faculty and peers. Online learners receive the same institutional services as on-site students, with regular monitoring from Student Services to check their engagement and support their success in the online environment. Further, online learners receive the same Career Services afforded to on-site students near the completion of their program, including resume preparation and career coaching.	Students remain connected to the institution primarily through emails, ongoing classroom discussion, and access to faculty. There is also an intranet with a listing of student information/materials, such as forms. Students receive trainer kits for the labs and class materials such as books, delivered to their home addresses. Students noted that many of them work and/or have families, and they primarily choose online because they don't have additional time to come to campus. Students reported satisfaction with and appreciation for the faculty who support them and provide multiple methods (office hours as well as other availability) to help the students who are stuck and need additional support.

Quality of the DE Infrastructure. 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?	Through the Google ecosystem, distance education students participate in live, synchronous lectures alongside faculty and on-site peers, where they can ask questions, engage in discussions, and take part in interactive activities such as polls and online forms. They are enrolled in the same Google Classroom courses and join live sessions through Google Meet, a widely adopted and reliable platform. All Google Classrooms are managed by the institution and archived after completion both on Google and on the institutions internal backup systems, allowing the institution to retrieve past materials if necessary. On-site support staff and a mobile audiovisual instructional cart are available in case of classroom technology failure.	Students found the Google Classroom easy to use and found the information needed (materials, assignments) posted online. They noted that the pdf documents and videos load quickly without lagging. After a review of other platforms and a decision to stick with the lower-cost Google LMS product, the institution is considering upgrading to a newer version that would have additional features (such as allowing students to upload videos of their work) to support additional assessment. They are exploring the use of VPNs that would strengthen student-to-student interaction as well as offer students the opportunity to gain expertise in the installation and use of this technology. Faculty felt well-trained and able to manage the bi-modal classrooms using GoogleMeet to facilitate dialog among students. In the labs, faculty walk students through the steps of the labs and equipment so the students receive synchronous lab instruction. After a review of other LMS platforms and a decision to stick with the cost-effective Google product, the institution is considering upgrading to a newer version that would have additional features (such as allowing students to upload videos of their work) to support additional assessment. They are exploring the use of VPNs that would strengthen student-to-student interaction as well as offer students the opportunity to gain expertise in the installation and use of this technology.

Student Support Services: 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?	Prior to admission, prospective online students are required to complete an Online Readiness Course (ORC) where students must demonstrate access to necessary technology, their ability to engage in and retain information from synchronous instruction, and their ability to complete guided, independent work involving both written and multimedia materials. See **Exhibit DE.1 ORC Syllabus** and **Exhibit DE.2 ORC Assessment Scorecard**. The Student Services Department regularly monitors distance education students through attendance and grade postings by faculty to assess participation and academic performance. When concerns arise, a Student Services Advisor conducts a virtual meeting to provide support. Library and technical resources are accessible through the Student Center Site, an internal platform offering tutorials and guidance on trainers, software, and academic tools, with guidance tailored to distance students. (See **Exhibit DE.3 Online Technology Support Site**, and **Exhibit**	Distance education students indicated that the student support services were sufficient. Student services and faculty work together to monitor student progress and reach out to distance education and on-campus students in cases where it appears students may need additional support (e.g., missing classes, not completing assignments on-time). Tutoring support is available and faculty are available to work individually with students who need academic help. Distance learning students indicated that they got what they needed from student services, and that if they needed support, it was incumbent upon the student to reach out. SCIT conducts a graduating student survey that incorporates questions on student services and interviews indicated that students are generally satisfied with the services. The online technology handbook and intranet site have basic technology/tech support information for students.

	DE.4 Online Technology Handbook). Completion rates for distance education students are comparable to on-site learners, and course evaluations have not identified significant concerns. See **DE.5 General Electrician Completion Rates DE vs RES** to view comparative completion rates data submitted to ACCSC. See **Exhibit DE.6 Course Evaluation Summary DE vs RES** for comparative student satisfaction data between online and on-site students.	

Faculty. 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?	Both full-time and part-time faculty teach distance education courses, and many instruct in both online and on-site modalities. Online courses follow the same course outcomes and lesson structures as their residential counterparts. To support effective online instruction, SCIT has developed an internal faculty orientation website outlining standards, expectations and guides for teaching within the Google ecosystem (See **Exhibit DE.7 Faculty Online Orientation Website**). In addition, a designated full-time faculty member serves as Online Instructional Support Lead, providing ongoing mentorship and guidance on best practices for synchronous delivery, engagement strategies, and instructional tools. New faculty complete an introductory training process with the Online Instructional Support Lead prior to teaching online. During their first course, they receive additional monitoring and support to ensure instructional quality and alignment with institutional standards. Faculty remain actively involved in curriculum development and	The team interviewed full- and part-time faculty who teach in the bi-modal course format for students in both on-campus and distance programs. Thus, most faculty are on campus plus teaching in a distance learning format. The faculty noted that they receive an orientation to online teaching as well as access to the SCIT Google Hub and individualized support on an as-needed basis. Faculty in each program develop the curriculum and syllabi. Currently faculty are involved in the development of course briefs, a project to review and develop in more detail course materials so substitute or new faculty have course roadmaps beyond the syllabi as needed. Faculty work together to develop PLOs, curriculum maps and assessment plans/processes, although these are not fully in place for all programs. One faculty member has been designed to work with faculty to support the development of course briefs and also holds workshops for faculty on assessment and instructional technology.

	assessment of student learning. For lecture-based courses, online delivery mirrors the on-site curriculum. For laboratory-based courses, faculty collaborate to design and refine instructional trainers and lab projects that replicate the hands-on competencies of residential courses, ensuring that distance education students achieve equivalent learning outcomes.	

Curriculum and Delivery. 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.)	Distance education programs follow the same approved curriculum as their on-site counterparts, including identical courses, credit allocations, and program learning outcomes. The primary distinction lies in the delivery of laboratory components, for which distance education students utilize instructional trainers at home in place of dedicated on-campus lab facilities. These trainers are designed to ensure students develop and demonstrate competencies equivalent to those achieved in the residential environment (See **Exhibit DE.8 Trainer Images**). Distance education courses are developed and continuously improved by faculty in collaboration with Program Chairs and academic leadership. Faculty play a central role in course design, refinement of instructional materials, assessment development, and alignment of laboratory activities with stated learning outcomes. Program-level improvements are addressed through ongoing faculty collaboration and the	The programs and syllabi are the same for distance education and on campus delivery. Syllabi refer to both modalities and may reference hybrid delivery when that is an option. Programs and courses are developed and approved by faculty and academic administrators. Faculty collaborate on the materials and programs work together to develop assessments. The decision-making framework provided by the institution describes that non substantive curricular changes (<50%) are determined solely by the faculty and program chair, and major curricular changes also require curriculum committee endorsement and final approval by the President. Employment data are collected by program, but do not appear to be disaggregated by modality. Assessment data is not collected by all programs, and the team recommends that the identification and collection of assessment data be expedited for all programs and that results be disaggregated by modality. Credit hour report is attached to the team report.

	institution's formal program review process. All new programs and substantive modifications undergo internal academic review prior to implementation, with final approval granted by the Board of Trustees. Faculty are responsible for ongoing evaluation of curriculum and student learning outcomes to ensure that distance education offerings remain comparable in content, rigor, and quality to on-ground programs.	

Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction. 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"?	SCIT ensures compliance with the federal requirement by structuring all distance education courses to include predictable, faculty-initiated instructional engagement throughout the academic term. Regular interaction is established through scheduled, synchronous live class sessions that occur weekly and are commensurate with the length and content of each course. During these sessions, faculty provide direct instruction, respond to student questions, facilitate discussion, conduct polls or interactive activities, and guide laboratory exercises. In laboratory-based courses, students work with instructional trainers under live faculty supervision and support, ensuring real-time instructional engagement. Substantive interaction is further achieved through the regular assessment of student coursework, which must be returned to students within 72 hours of submission. Students submit assignments and complete examinations on a scheduled basis, and faculty provide individualized feedback. In selected courses, faculty facilitate structured group	The majority of the instructional hours are synchronous (bi-modal) didactic class or lab hours and appear on the published class schedule. Courses and labs meet 2-4 times per week, generally. Course syllabi incorporate both classroom hours and usually also list required video hours. In interviews, it was noted that some of the required video hours, while useful, might not have the faculty interaction component necessary for instructional hours, and a review of the courses would be done to confirm instruction or add classroom hours. Course metrics are compiled at the end of each term including the course evaluation, which seeks feedback on faculty responsiveness to grading.

	discussions related to course content. SCIT monitors student academic engagement through attendance tracking, assignment submission records, and performance review. Faculty are responsible for proactively engaging students when participation declines or academic concerns arise, including direct outreach and additional instructional support. Students may also request meetings or clarification on academic matters, which faculty address promptly.	

Academic Engagement. How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for "Academic Engagement"? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?	Academic engagement occurs through attendance in scheduled synchronous live lectures and laboratory sessions where students interact with faculty; submission of academic assignments; completion of quizzes and examinations; participation in interactive instructional activities such as polls, guided problem-solving, and trainer-based lab exercises; and direct communication with faculty regarding academic matters. In laboratory-based courses, students engage with instructional trainers under live faculty supervision, further reinforcing active participation. Compliance is monitored through attendance records for synchronous sessions, tracking of assignment and assessment submissions, grading activity, and faculty oversight of student participation and performance. Attendance records are closely monitored by the Student Services Department to ensure students are attending class sessions. When faculty have a concern about a particular student's engagement, they submit a case to the Student Services	Courses and labs, generally meet 2-4 times per week in the bimodal format in the five-week term. There are usually several readings and assignments per week and/or several labs required per week, plus a mid-term and final exam. Some assignments may be contained within the GoogleClassroom LMS. Student attendance is taken for each class by faculty, and student services monitors both attendance overall and completion of assignments to ensure students are continuing to attend are making appropriate progress in the course.

	Department for intervention.	
State Licensure Requirements. 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.	SCIT is approved by the California Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) to offer its programs through distance education. Required state disclosures regarding program approval and delivery modality are published in the institutional catalog and enrollment agreement in accordance with California regulations. SCIT has undergone an announced BPPE compliance inspection in 2025 during which distance education disclosures and related requirements were reviewed and addressed as necessary. SCIT has not sought authorization in states outside of California and does not enroll students or advertise its distance education programs to residents of other states. Accordingly, state licensure determinations have been made solely within California, where the institution is authorized to operate.	This was confirmed in BPPE documents and an interview with the president during the visit.

Student Identification Verification and Privacy. 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?	SCIT utilizes multiple measures to verify student identity in distance education courses. All students, including online learners, are issued a Google account that requires secure login credentials. Access to course materials, live sessions, and online examinations is restricted to authenticated users through this account. Prior to enrollment, distance education students must complete an Online Readiness Course (ORC) that includes participation in a live, synchronous session. During this session, students are required to enable their camera for visual identification and submit a facial image. This image is used for the student ID card and for institutional identification purposes by faculty and administration. For examinations, students must log in using their institutional Google account and provide a live video feed of themselves before the assessment is released. This process allows faculty to verify the student's identity in real time prior to and during the examination process. To protect against cybersecurity threats, the institution relies on the	In addition to the items described by the institution, the GAC has been exploring how best to monitor and ensure fairness in exam conditions for online and on-campus students, including proctoring for online makeup exams.

	security infrastructure of the Google ecosystem, which includes account authentication controls, encryption, suspicious login activity alerts, and ongoing platform-level security monitoring. The institution monitors account activity and responds to flagged security concerns as necessary. There are no additional charges to students associated with identity verification processes.	

Retention and Graduation. 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?	SCIT closely monitors completion, placement, and retention data to ensure student success. The Strategic Enrollment Management Team meets regularly to address potential retention issues as they arise. The most recent analysis of SCIT's graduation rates for 2025 indicates that performance outcomes for distance education programs are comparable to residential offerings. For example, the General Electrician program reported an 88% completion rate for distance education students compared to 90% for on-site students, with placement rates for both modalities in the low 70% range (see **Exhibit DE.5 General Electrician Completion Rates DE vs RES**). Retention rates for the other distance education programs are consistent with, and in some cases higher than, the reported completion rates of their residential counterparts (see **Exhibit DE.9 DE Program Retention Rates**). At this time, no significant disparities or performance concerns have been identified between distance education and on-ground programs. Outcomes are monitored through SCIT's annual	Reports are generated for each course each term containing course metrics such as withdrawals, although student modality has not been included in the metrics. Retention and cohort graduation rates are in the annual program performance reports but not disaggregated by modality. Data are calculated for both distance education and ground programs. Transfer out students are excluded from the calculations, while transfer in students are added. Some of these data have been communicated widely in staff/faculty meetings (e.g., December 2025 All Staff Meeting). While in some cases the results are similar, the number of distance education students to date has been small in comparison to ground students. The team recommends that SCIT continue to review retention, graduation and transfer rates regularly by modality for all programs on a regular basis and use the data for improving student support and program improvement.

	program performance review and cyclical program review processes to ensure continued comparability and quality.	

Student Learning. 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?	SCIT assesses student learning in distance education programs using the same course-level and program-level assessment processes applied to on-ground offerings. Online courses utilize identical program learning outcomes and equivalent grading rubrics, laboratory projects, examinations, and evaluation standards as their residential counterparts. Student learning is measured through graded assignments, laboratory exercises (including trainer-based lab projects for online students), examinations, and other course-specific assessments. Faculty evaluate student performance and participate in ongoing program review processes to analyze learning outcomes and identify areas for improvement. Assessment results for distance education students are comparable to those of on-ground students. Overall grade averages and demonstrated competencies do not show significant differences between modalities.	The assessment are the same for ground and distance learning just as the program curricula and courses are the same. To date, complete and consistent assessment has been limited. This is an area for improvement for the institution. While all programs have defined PLOs, only some programs have PLO achievement data and may use rubrics for grading across the collection. Use of assessment data is still in the development stages. Data are not consistently disaggregated in standards reports, such as annual program performance reports, provided to the team. The team recommends that the collection of assessment data in all programs be expedited, and that all data be disaggregated by modality.

Contracts with Vendors. 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 *Agreements with Unaccredited Entities?*	SCIT does not maintain contractual arrangements with outside vendors for the development, delivery, or instruction of its courses. All curriculum, instructional materials, laboratory trainers, and course content are developed and delivered by the institution's faculty. SCIT does not have agreements with unaccredited entities related to academic instruction, and all instructional responsibilities remain fully under institutional control.	Not applicable.

Quality Assurance Processes: 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?	SCIT's quality assurance processes apply uniformly to both distance education and on-ground programs. Online students enroll in the same courses, follow the same approved curriculum, and are assessed using comparable assignments, examinations, laboratory projects, and learning outcome standards as their residential counterparts. Because course expectations and assessment instruments are consistent across modalities, student performance can be evaluated using the same academic review framework. Course evaluations include questions specifically tailored to the online learning experience to assess engagement, instructional effectiveness, and student satisfaction. Results are reviewed by faculty and academic leadership through the same evaluation process used for on-ground courses, and any identified concerns are addressed through instructional improvement planning. See **Exhibit DE.10 Sample Course Evaluations** for a sample of course evaluations completed by online students.	There are no differences in the quality assurance processes used for distance education vs. on campus programs. Standard reports are produced that provide direct and indirect metrics useful for evaluating course and programs effectiveness, such as student evaluation of teaching, and employment rates post-graduation. Student course evaluation ratings have different scales depending on program or question and are generally rated positively with low standard deviations. Data were presented that show similar satisfaction in the course evaluation questions for online students or ground students, although there were fewer "strongly agree" answers. Employment percentages are over 70% for the information available to the career services office. The institutional research department noted that the consideration of distance learning student issues needs more attention and disaggregation of data is not occurring consistently. The team recommends that quality assurance data be consistently reported and reviewed by modality.

Name of reviewer/s: Patty Mullen, Associate Provost, Institutional Research, Retired, Alliant University

Date/s of review: March 25-27, 2026