



Program Name & Location

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
 Long Beach, CA

Dates of the Site Visit

April 20-22, 2016

Accreditation: 3 year CAHME Accreditation, effective 2016 through 2019

Accreditation History

Season	Year	Action
	1999	Application for Pre-candidacy Approved
Spring	2000	Program Requested to Submit Accreditation Plan in time for Fall 2000 Committee Meeting and Vote
Fall	2000	Program Advanced to Candidacy, Year 2000 to 2001
		Initial Site Visit Scheduled for Spring 2002
FALL	2002*	Initial Accreditation – 3 years
Fall	2003	1st Year Progress Report Accepted
Spring	*2006	Accreditation – 4 years. Strong letter to program concerning rigor, faculty size, PD and/or Faculty Turnover. Program Improvement
Spring	2007	1st Year Progress Report Accepted
Spring	2008	2nd Year Progress Report Accepted
Fall	2010	Reaccreditation - 6 Years
Fall	2011	1st Year Progress Report Accepted - All Recommendations Completed

Program Description

Our Master of Science (MS) in Health Care Administration degree programs--offered in both "traditional" (MSHCA) and "accelerated program" (MSHCA-AP) formats--are administered through California State University, Long Beach's (CSULB) Department of Health Care Administration (HCA). HCA is one of nine departments and three schools of CSULB's College and Health and Human Services (which itself is one of eight academic colleges at CSULB).

CSULB is part of a 23-campus California State University (CSU) system, one of the largest public education systems in the world. Among the CSU campuses, CSULB has recently ranked first on as number of levels, most notably in the number of enrollments. (In fact, in 2014-2015, CSULB had more than 37,000 undergraduate and masters-level graduate students.) U.S. News & World Report's "Best Colleges 2014" guidebook ranked CSULB as the fifth-best public regional university in the western United States; with private institutions taken into consideration, CSULB



ranked 32nd overall among all colleges and universities in the western United States. Too, CSULB was listed in Kiplinger's Personal Finance's 2014 list of the top 100 best values in public colleges; appearing at no. 92 on this list, it is only one of twelve California institutions to have made this list.

For the CSULB HCA graduate program itself, it was listed at number 57 in the US News & World Report's health care management rankings of 2015, making it one of the top-ranked graduate programs on the CSULB campus. Too, Modern Healthcare magazine listed CSULB on its 2014-2015 list of "Top Business Graduate Schools for Physician Executives," with CSULB's Health Care Administration graduate program ranking 17th among accredited business or health administration programs.

CSULB currently carries the designation of a "non-research" university. Although the CSU, by legislative mandate, traditionally does not offer doctorates, recently the California State Legislature permitted the CSULB system to begin offering doctorates in a nursing, physical therapy, and educational leadership in order to keep pace with the demands of these health care fields.

This self-study is prepared for both our traditional (MSHCA) and accelerated (MSHCA-AP) graduate degree programs. These degrees are nearly identical, with a few minor differences: the accelerated format currently requires a minimum of three years of work experience for admission; the traditional program, though not requiring work experience, instead requires the GMAT or GRE for admission consideration. In addition, another small difference is that students in the traditional program have the ability to select two elective classes from a pre-approved list of courses to be applied towards the fulfillment of the degree requirements; accelerated students, although still following the same fifteen-course degree plan as do the traditional students, have their elective courses pre-selected by the department.

Findings

CAHME sends a team on-site to review the program. On the first day, the CAHME Fellow reviews the records and resources of the Program. On days two and three, the full team completes an extensive evaluation of the Program based on CAHME requirements. These findings are reported, and programs are designated as being a leader in meeting the requirement (a "strength"), meeting the requirement; partially meeting the requirements, or not meeting the requirement. Sometimes, a program may "meet" a requirement, but the site visitors suggest a recommendation for the program to improve ("Consultative Recommendations").

Programs need to report to CAHME following their site visit their remediation activity for all requirements that are not "Met" in a "Progress Report". Thus, evaluating a program based on "Not Mets" or "Partially Mets" may not reflect the progress a program has made since their last site visit. Programs have two years to complete all criteria found partially or not met on their site visit report. Accreditation past two years indicates that the program has successfully completed progress reporting.

		Number	Percent
Met	Strengths	1	3%
	Other Met	26	80%
Partially Met		8	9%
Not Met		0	0%
Total		35	100%
<i>Consultative Recommendations</i>		3	9%

Program Strengths

III.A.6 THE PROGRAM CURRICULUM WILL DEVELOP STUDENTS' CORE COMPETENCIES: Professionalism & Ethics

Strength Comment:

The multi-campus and multidisciplinary fishbowl ethics exercise discussed during the faculty meeting was cited as a strength for its innovative approach to develop student competency achievement in professionalism and ethics.

Partially Mets

II.A.1 THE PROGRAM WILL MAKE AVAILABLE FULL AND ACCURATE INFORMATION REGARDING ITS APPLICATION PROCESS; THE COMPETENCIES THAT FORM THE BASIS FOR ITS CURRICULUM; THE CURRICULUM; TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT METHODS; AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

Assessment:

The program competencies were inconsistently disseminated across the student handbook, website, and course syllabi.

Criterion Related Concern:

There is inconsistent information (i.e. website, student handbook, syllabi) regarding the competency model.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must publish accurate information on its competency model throughout its publications, to include the website, student handbook, and course syllabi.

II.A.2 THE PROGRAM WILL HAVE RECRUITING PRACTICES AND WELL-DEFINED ADMISSION CRITERIA DESIGNED TO ADMIT QUALIFIED STUDENTS AND PURSUE A DIVERSE STUDENT POPULATION.

Assessment:



The admission criteria (i.e. GPA, GRE, work experience) listed on the website, student handbook, and faculty minutes were inconsistent. The scoring tool used by the Program for admissions decisions differed from listed criteria.

Criterion Related Concern:

The website and student handbook publish divergent admission criteria for each program and neither reflect the actual admission criteria or practice.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must develop, publish, and apply consistent admission criteria for each program.

II.A.5 THE PROGRAM WILL ENSURE THAT GRADUATES' CAREER PREPAREDNESS IS MONITORED, DOCUMENTED AND USED FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.

Assessment:

The site visit team conducted a record review and discussed with the Program how graduates are tracked. Students complete an exit survey just prior to graduation but are not monitored longitudinally for three years.

Criterion Related Concern:

There is insufficient evidence that the Program monitors and tracks the careers of graduates for at least three years.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program shall monitor and track the careers of graduates for at least three years

III.B.1 THE PROGRAM WILL INCORPORATE A RANGE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS DRIVEN BY ADULT LEARNING PRINCIPLES. THE METHODS WILL BE BASED ON HIGHER EDUCATION TAXONOMIC LEVELS APPROPRIATE TO GRADUATE EDUCATION.

Assessment:

During the evaluation of assignments, meeting with students, and discussion with faculty, the site visit team identified a higher ratio of lower versus higher level teaching.

Criterion Related Concern:

The Program does not sufficiently incorporate a range of teaching and learning methods commensurate with a graduate level education, throughout the curriculum.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must sufficiently increase the proportion of higher level teaching and learning methods commensurate with graduate level education throughout the curriculum.

III.B.4 THE PROGRAM CURRICULUM WILL INCLUDE INTEGRATIVE EXPERIENCES,



INCLUDING FIELD-BASED APPLICATIONS THAT REQUIRE STUDENTS TO DRAW UPON, APPLY AND SYNTHESIZE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS COVERED THROUGHOUT THE PROGRAM OF STUDY.

Assessment:

The site visit team conducted a comprehensive review of syllabi, spoke with students and faculty, and sampled completed capstone projects. The site visit team did not find sufficient evidence of field-based experiences throughout the curriculum. The capstone project frequently addresses a hypothetical problem through simulated data. The internship is an integrative experience but is an elective course, and is not attended by all students. There is also a lack of field-based applications in the remainder of the curriculum.

Criterion Related Concern:

The Program lacks systematic integrative experiences, including field-based applications that require students to draw upon, apply, and synthesize knowledge and skills covered throughout the curriculum.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must incorporate and integrate field-based experiences throughout the curriculum. Consultative Recommendation: The Program should consider requiring an internship for the traditional program.

III.C.2 THE PROGRAM WILL EVALUATE COURSE INSTRUCTION AND THE CURRICULUM AND USE THE RESULTS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.

Assessment:

The site visit team examined course student evaluations and meeting minutes, and discussed course evaluations with faculty and students. There was a lack of evidence that results from accelerated students' surveys were used for quality improvement of the Program's curriculum. Few students in the accelerated program completed course evaluations.

Criterion Related Concern:

There is insufficient evidence the Program uses course evaluations in the accelerated program for continuous quality improvement.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must develop a plan to utilize student course evaluations for continuous quality improvement in the accelerated program.

III.C.3 THE PROGRAM WILL REGULARLY EVALUATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENTS AND GRADUATES ATTAIN THE COMPETENCIES AND USE THE EVALUATION FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.



Assessment:

The Program has exit surveys of all students to assess competency attainment just prior to graduation, but their limited assessment of competency occurs during the program. The Program uses the ACHE competency model. The model has not been adjusted since it was first used in 2008.

Criterion Related Concern:

The Program does not have a system to regularly evaluate the progress toward mastery of competencies at all levels throughout the Program.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must have a mechanism to accurately measure student progress toward mastery of competencies assessed at the course and Program level. In addition, these assessments should be used for continuous quality improvement.

IV.C.1 THE PROGRAM WILL ENSURE THAT THERE IS A SYSTEMATIC PLAN FOR, AND INVESTMENT IN, INDIVIDUAL FACULTY PEDAGOGICAL IMPROVEMENT.

Assessment:

There is not sufficient evidence that there is a systematic review for post tenure-track faculty. The review for post tenure-track faculty is required every five years, by collective bargaining agreement.

Criterion Related Concern:

There is insufficient evidence that there is a systematic plan for, and investment in, individual faculty pedagogical improvement.

Criterion Related Recommendation:

The Program must develop a systematic plan for individual faculty pedagogical improvement.

Consultative Recommendations

I.A.1 THE PROGRAM WILL HAVE STATEMENTS OF MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES THAT GUIDE THE PROGRAM'S DESIGN, EVALUATION AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS.

Consultative Recommendation:

The program should provide more specificity in defining the target student population

I.A.2 THE PROGRAM WILL ESTABLISH GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES THAT ARE ACTION-BASED, OBSERVABLE, AND MEASURABLE.

Consultative Recommendation:

The Program should augment existing goals with stretch goals to be used in tandem for continuous quality improvement



I.B.1 THE PROGRAM WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT TO ENSURE THAT ITS MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACHIEVED.

Consultative Recommendation:

The Program and administration should continue to work together regarding obtaining additional space allocation, resulting from student growth and new faculty appointments.

Program Response

Factual corrections:

1. On the very first page, the length of our previous accreditation should have been six years (from Nov 2010 to Nov 2016).
2. Criterion IV.C.1 Assessment says there is not sufficient evidence that there is a systematic review for post-tenure evaluation. The next sentence says there is a post tenure track review is every five years which is the systematic review. Site visit team may have not asked for evidence or examples of this systematic evaluation, but several tenured faculty members went through this evaluation in the past and we could have provided examples. We cannot develop something new in the department for this type of evaluation due to the Collective Bargaining Agreement.