

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To Alliant International University

September 23-25, 2020

Team Roster

Vivian Sanchez, MBA, Chair
CEO, University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences

Stephanie Juillerat, PhD, Assistant Chair
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs/ALO
Azusa Pacific University

David Ely, PhD, Associate Dean
Fowler College of Business
San Diego State University

Daniel Grassian, PhD
Vice Provost for Academic Programs
California State University, Chico

Kenneth Nelson, MD
Assoc. Director, Office of Educational Effectiveness
Loma Linda University

Barbara Gross Davis, PhD
Vice President, WSCUC
Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History.....	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process.....	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	5

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions.....	6
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.....	7
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees.....	16
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation.....	19
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation.....	22
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence.....	25
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment.....	28
H. Component 8: Optional Essay on Institution-Specific Themes	
I. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement.....	34

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)..... 36

SECTION IV – COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM..... 36

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review.....	38
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....	40
3. Student Complaints Review.....	41
4. Transfer Credit Review.....	43
B. Off-Campus Locations Reviews.....	44
C. Distance Education Review.....	53

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Accreditation History

At the time of the visit, Alliant International University (Alliant) educated students for professional practice careers that create a positive impact for individuals, schools, organizations, and communities. As a predominantly graduate institution, Alliant offered graduate programs in psychology, education, business and data sciences, law, and forensic studies through an “alliance” of five schools: California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP), California School of Education (CSOE), California School of Management and Leadership (CSML), California School of Forensic Studies (CSFS), and San Francisco Law School (SFLS). Alliant offered three undergraduate degree majors at the San Diego campus that were closely aligned with the graduate training programs.

Alliant delivered academic programs at six California campuses: Fresno, Irvine, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, and Emeryville and in an online/hybrid modality. Facilities at all locations were leased. Campuses in international locations were viewed as a limited part of the university’s historical international identity, and Alliant’s leadership made decisions in 2016 and 2017 to discontinue operations at the three international locations in Mexico City, Tokyo, and Hong Kong, while continuing to support the remaining students to graduation. Alliant still maintains a controlling interest in the St Luke Medical School, Mexico. Team members conducted off campus reviews of the Los Angeles and Emeryville campuses (see appendix B). Alliant enrolled 3,275 students including 3,154 graduate students and 121 undergraduate students in spring 2019. Recent graduation rates for U.S. campuses were 78% for doctoral, 77% for master’s and 58% for undergraduate, including those who changed programs while enrolled. In 2017-18, Alliant awarded 55 bachelor’s degrees, 529 master’s degrees (of which 73 were non-terminal), 355 research and scholarship doctoral degrees (DBA, EdD, PsyD and PhD) and 7 law JD degrees. In addition, 369 students completed a certificate or education credential program.

Alliant focused on strategic enrollment growth in graduate-level degree and credential programs with investments initiated in distance learning in 2014 to reach a wider market. In spring 2019, 19 degree, credential, or certificate programs were offered online and enrolled 38% of Alliant students. The online programs were based in the schools and supported by the Department of Online Learning. A review of Alliant's distance education is provided in appendix C.

Alliant's last reaffirmation of WSCUC accreditation occurred in 2011; however, there had been 28 substantive change submissions, three interim reports, two progress reports, and two special visits to the San Francisco Law School to which Alliant had responded well (see component 1).

Alliant received programmatic specialty accreditation where such accreditation was applicable and relevant to programs' mission and goals. Nine U.S.-based doctoral clinical psychology programs were independently accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA). Master's and doctoral marital and family therapy programs were accredited by the Committee on Accreditation for Marital and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE). Education credential and certificate programs were approved in California by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and elementary and secondary teacher education programs were also approved by the Arizona State Board of Education (AZSBE). The law program was accredited by the Committee of Bar Examiners of the California State Bar (CBE). Five business and management programs were accredited by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). The MA in Clinical Counseling program was in the process of seeking Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accreditation. None of the professionally accredited programs were under sanction.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team engaged in a thorough review and evaluation of the institution. Beginning with an Offsite Review in November 2019 where materials were examined and five lines of inquiry were developed, and ending with a virtual site visit in September that was delayed six months due to COVID-

19, the team spent considerable time and energy reviewing the substantive institutional report and appendices, followed by the additional documents it requested, and finally with a multi-day virtual site visit where 29 sessions were held to engage different groups or individuals in dialogue. Alliant was continually responsive to requests for documentation and information, and the team felt sufficiently resourced to conduct its visit with a clear picture of the institution's status.

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

As indicated above, Alliant's team report, at 94 pages, was organized and well-written, although unnecessarily lengthy. Additionally, Alliant produced over 3,000 pieces of documentation for the team to review. Thus, supporting information was provided for its claims through research and evidence. The team felt, however, that the report and subsequent conversations during the visit indicated a potentially unrealistic optimism at the institution's performance in some areas, particularly as it related to their financial situation (see component 7). Overall, the report, additional evidence, and conversations during the visit indicated that the institution had a much greater understanding of itself as a result of the self-study.

According to a review of materials and an interview with the WSCUC Steering Committee, a wide range of constituents were involved in the reaffirmation process. In addition to the committee, there were four writing groups that addressed the various subsections of the report. Faculty and staff were invited to give feedback primarily by rating the institution's success toward meeting the standards, and while students were not directly surveyed, various existing data were utilized (e.g., the net promoter score) to ascertain student views. The steering committee, as well as the board of trustees, verified the board's involvement in the process, and the board spoke knowledgeably of the findings from the report, as well as the steps that had been taken to address notable issues.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

As indicated, Alliant has had regular interaction with WSCUC since its spring 2011 Educational Effectiveness visit where the Commission reaffirmed its accreditation for nine years. Of particular note, Alliant submitted and was approved by WSCUC to change its legal status and move from a non-profit institution to a for-profit California benefit corporation in 2014. Initially, Alliant was jointly owned by Arist Education Systems, a subsidiary of Bertelsmann SE & Co. and a non-profit entity (Alliant Educational Foundation). However, in October 2019, Bertelsmann became the sole owner of Alliant after purchasing the remaining 3.15% in outstanding stock from the Alliant Educational Foundation.

The six items raised in the Commission action letter (strategic planning for fiscal sustainability and enrollment; educational effectiveness and program review; student success; staff morale; technology; and board roles and governance) were adequately addressed by Alliant in their interim and progress reports, as well as in the most recent self-study. From review of subsequent documents and interviews, the team noted significant progress on four of the initiatives (program review; morale; technology; governance); however, two issues (fiscal sustainability; student success) were identified by the review team as areas of ongoing inquiry that were explored during the visit and are discussed herein, rising to the level of recommendation from this team (see components 5 and 7).

As with every other institution of higher education, the onset of COVID-19 presented a major challenge that affected the institution, particularly fiscal sustainability, as well as its own commitments to quality higher education. Alliant created and enacted a COVID-19 mitigation plan, which it shared with the team, and which seemingly helped the institution continue forward progress toward fulfillment of its strategic initiatives. Notably some operational expenses were cut and a hiring freeze was enacted, but the president made a public commitment to retain all employees which, according to several conversations at the visit, contributed to improved morale at the institution.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Alliant conducted its Review under the WSCUC Standards in a collaborative, inclusive manner by sharing and gathering feedback from various Alliant schools, the faculty senate, and the Executive Staff Council. While there were differences in perspectives and experiences, Alliant reported that there was general agreement on strengths and areas for prioritization. By identifying areas that were both successful and emerging, they exhibited a reflective and analytical process. A brief review of the team's findings for each of the standards are noted below.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

Alliant's mission to prepare "students for professional careers of service and leadership," and to promote "the discovery and application of knowledge to improve the lives of people in diverse cultures and communities around the world" was appropriate for an institute of higher education, and its vision of "an inclusive world empowered by Alliant alumni," while perhaps overly ambitious, did involve contributing to the public good. (CFR 1.1) Alliant also recognized and shared educational objectives (CFR 1.2), and its investment in Taskstream and the new SIS should help in this regard.

Integrity and Transparency

Alliant had an academic freedom policy. (CFR 1.3) The university identified diversity, inclusion and equity as "a strength and an institutional priority." While a few students reported facing views or actions by faculty that were not inclusive, the administration had expressed its ongoing commitment to its core values of diversity. (CFR 1.4) As it related to diversity, Alliant identified equity gaps in pass rates (page 42) and presented a process to address them, but data was not available at the time of the visit to indicate if efforts were fully successful. Conversations at the time of the visit confirmed that students of color had differential success in various programs, but the institution articulated a strong commitment

to closing success gaps. The team encouraged Alliant to reduce disparities between historically underrepresented students and all other students. (CFR 2.10)

In its report, Alliant's faculty and staff demographics did not completely align with its student demographics; conversations with leadership indicated an interest in hiring more faculty of color, which the team endorsed. Consistent with Alliant's stated mission and values, Alliant will want to continue the efforts to infuse inclusive excellence throughout the institution by hiring and retaining a diverse faculty and staff (CFR 1.4) and addressing retention and graduation equity gaps (see component 5).

From its materials and subsequent conversations at the time of the visit, Alliant's board of trustees provided appropriate educational leadership and oversight, and operated autonomously from the corporate board of directors. (CFR 1.5)

Academic programs, services, costs, and other financial aid related information were clearly described on Alliant's various websites. There was also a clearly detailed student complaint process and grievance policy, and Alliant reported that it tracks grievances on a yearly basis. (CFR 1.7)

Alliant was committed to honest and open communication with WSCUC, and the university was responsive and comprehensive to requests for additional information. (CFR 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Alliant's programs followed standard academic nomenclature and rigor for the level of the degree awarded and were staffed by the required number of faculty who met the educational attainment set out by their professional accreditors. In review, Alliant programs adhered to standards, had peer reviewers, and content was aligned with what was expected by specialty accrediting bodies. (CFR 2.1)

Courses of study at Alliant had well-documented requirements for completion available in the university catalog, and Alliant gave evidence that learning outcomes aligned with professional competencies. Alliant's educational mission was outlined through A-IMPACT, and in interviews with students and faculty, they appeared to place students on a trajectory for success in professional practice. Both undergraduate and graduate education appeared to meet standards set forth by the institution and the program learning outcomes (PLOs) as listed in the catalog. PLOs aligned both with content standards and Alliant's A-IMPACT competencies. (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a, and 2.2b)

Clinical directors reported that there were adequate locations for their program's clinical/practicum requirements, and students were meeting required competencies. Alliant had an institution-wide policy for student reviews that was carried out by the Student Evaluation and Review Committee (SERC). Reviews were conducted at the program or school level where they could be best assessed by content experts. Alliant's program or school-based SERC worked with students to create remediation plans for students not meeting program standards or making sufficient academic progress. While SERC could make recommendations, the individual program director was responsible for the final decision related to a student's status and remediation plan. Additionally, students who met with SERC were referred to central university educational support services as needed. (CFR 2.3)

Development of student learning outcomes and standards of performance was a collaborative process among faculty and academic administrators and reflected the mission of Alliant. As revisions were needed or new programs introduced, the process was reviewed at both the program and school level. Course outcomes were predefined and embedded for each course. (CFR 2.4)

Alliant utilized various processes to assess student learning. While some of these processes were still in their initial stages, Alliant felt confident that it was on track. Through the use of Taskstream, student learning outcome achievement was aggregated and presented for data-informed decisions. While reporting trends had not yet been realized, the newly planned data warehouse was expected to

add this capability and further facilitate assessment work. The team concurred that significant progress had been made but noted inefficiencies in the distribution of data that needed remedy (see component 6). The newly planned data warehouse was expected to facilitate assessment work. In alignment with emerging practices in higher education, Alliant correlated its program review process with that of its professional accreditors whenever possible. Programs that were accredited through Alliant's overarching accreditation were given specific review cycles. (CFRs 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7)

Scholarship and creative activity expectations were defined in the faculty handbook. Faculty reported on their scholarly and creative activity annually. To encourage scholarship and creative activities, core faculty received funds, one quarter time off, and a sabbatical every seventh year. (CFR 2.8); however, conversations with faculty indicated a desire for greater support of research. Alliant recently (2018-19 academic year) had the Academic Council review and revise the scholarship matrix that was used to determine allocation of workload credit for scholarly and professional activities. At the time of the visit, some faculty claimed that less emphasis was provided on service, and that they would like to see evaluation criteria re-visited. (CFR 2.9)

Student learning and success was monitored both by advisors and program directors. At the doctoral level programs tended to meet their benchmark for graduation rates, but time to completion was variable. Alliant identified a greater need for disaggregated student success data for identifying learning and achievement gaps, and the team strongly encouraged improvement in this area. While co-curricular programs and outcomes were reviewed, a new process was being implemented that would better align co-curricular activities and outcomes with the academic programs. Again, this is an area where Alliant identified the need for improvement and was addressing it through A-IMPACT competency compliance (see component 6). (CFRs 2.10 and 2.11)

The Alliant catalog defined program completion expectations and included sample curriculum plans that enabled the student to clearly understand what was required for successful completion.

Alliant advisors were assigned by programs allowing them to become content experts to better support students. Student services were available over a wide range of categories, but in meeting with students, there seemed to be a consensus that while they believed services were available, they were not able to locate them easily on Alliant's website. Student responses indicated that there was a greater need for financial aid counselors, and Alliant responded by increasing staffing to include a director, an associate director, and six student finance officers. (CFRs 2.12 and 2.13)

Alliant's transfer credit policies were available in the university catalog, and limits had been identified for transfer credits and transferable courses. Several articulation agreements had also been established with regional and international institutions to better serve transfer students. There was a consensus among students that Alliant was clear on policies and was overall generally helpful in assisting them in understanding what courses were transferable in support of their chosen program's requirements. (CFR 2.14)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard. Final determination of compliance rests with the Commission.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

Faculty and Staff

In fall 2019, Alliant employed 125 core faculty and three lecturers. Core faculty were employed in all five Alliant schools and were mostly full-time employees who were responsible for academic leadership and were on three- or five-year rolling contracts or they were new employees on a track eligible for a rolling contract. Collective bargaining agreements cover some but not all of the faculty, an issue that created seemingly unavoidable inequities. In AY 2018-2019, 389 adjunct faculty were employed. Some adjunct faculty had workload responsibilities beyond teaching. For spring 2019, FTE student-to-FTE faculty ratios across programs were generally between 8:1 and 16:1. The average class

size was generally below 20 students. Alliant's faculty staffing plan, which included faculty-student ratio targets, guided the institution in adding core faculty positions and the hiring of additional adjunct faculty. Alliant employed 201 staff members and administrators in fall 2019. (CFR 3.1)

Policies regarding faculty were documented in a faculty handbook that covered matters pertaining to governance, faculty titles and roles, work assignments, hiring and terminations, and evaluation. The faculty handbook covered recruiting and hiring of faculty for each academic rank and other workload matters, descriptions of academic ranks and accomplishments needed to move to a higher rank, compensation, benefits, and conduct. The faculty handbook also listed the procedures and evaluation factors in the areas of teaching-learning, scholarship, and service and provided the criteria related to multicultural and international competencies. Core faculty were evaluated annually on their contributions in the areas of facilitating learning and multicultural/international competencies, scholarship, and service. The annual review of core faculty also incorporated a standardized process to apply for status change and rolling contract extension. Adjunct faculty were evaluated using school-specific processes as described in the Adjunct Faculty Assessment and Feedback policy. Structured orientations existed for new faculty. Administrator 360-degree reviews and staff performance reviews were conducted annually. (CFR 3.2)

In its report, Alliant briefly mentioned development and training. It referenced quarterly orientations, professional development funds for core faculty, training in the learning management system, and various optional colloquia as evidence of professional development for faculty. Staff development, however, was predominantly characterized by compliance training. The team engaged in several discussions with constituents about faculty and staff development. Conversations with various groups confirmed that faculty have access to financial resources, as well as the opportunity to acquire continuing education credit through events offered by the institution. Professional development was most commonly described as staying current in the professional discipline. What seemed to be missing

from the conversation was development in pedagogy and teaching practices, particularly inclusive pedagogy, which seemed surprising in light of Alliant's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. At the time of the visit, the institution had just begun to conceptualize a Center for Teaching Excellence, having conducted a needs assessment of its faculty and deans, as well as starting a collection of electronic resources on a website. Discussions at the time of the visit revealed a lot of ideas but no firm plans. Deans indicated that they had expectations that the center would help to improve pedagogy and assist adjunct faculty. Given the institution's transition to online education and strong commitment to multicultural competence and diversity, equity, and inclusion, the team recommended that Alliant expand faculty development opportunities that include adjunct faculty, with particular emphasis on inclusive pedagogy and best teaching practices in all modalities. (CFR 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources

Fiscal stability and enrollment management are addressed in detail under component 7. (CFR 3.4) Alliant invested in upgrading learning and student services technology. Online courses had migrated to Canvas as the learning management system, while on-ground courses were planning a migration at the time of the visit. Alliant had migrated to CampusNexus as its student information system. Taskstream (program assessment), EvaluationKIT (course evaluation), Purple Briefcase (career planning), Starfish Retention Solutions, and Zoom had also been implemented. Statistical and survey software was available to faculty and students. Faculty and students were also supported by the Department of Online Learning, the Alliant library, and an IT helpdesk. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

At the time of the visit, Alliant employed a full-time president/CEO and CFO. During the visit, the team heard from numerous groups of their respect for the president's transparency, responsiveness, and success in restoring financial stability. The organizational structure, at the institutional level and within each school, was generally well-defined in terms of roles and lines of authority. The faculty

handbook defined the memberships and roles of the president and other leadership positions, as well as leadership councils and committees, both administrative and academic, which comprised the organizational and governance structure of the institution. In response to survey feedback that decision making could be more transparent, a comprehensive decision-making matrix was developed by the Academic Council with input from the faculty senate and Staff Council. Additional use of this tool will lead to greater effectiveness and increased trust in how decisions are made. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8)

The board of trustees had responsibility for the institutional budget, tuition, educational programs, performance review of the president, and the strategic plan. The board was composed of the president and eight other members with substantial experience in business and higher education. The board structure also included an Executive and Finance Committee, Governance Committee, University Audit Committee, Development Committee, and Academic, Faculty and Student Success Committee. On July 1, 2020, the board initiated a Committee on Diversity and Inclusion. (CFR 3.9)

The faculty senate was the delegated body responsible for representing faculty perspectives on academic and faculty matters. Its role and structure were well-defined in its bylaws and the faculty handbook. Membership was by election, and seats were allocated to represent schools and regional campuses. Faculty assemblies existed on each campus. The senate leadership described a collaborative working relationship with the administration; however, they were disappointed that a faculty member no longer attended trustee meetings and only provided written reports. (CFR 3.10)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

Quality Assurance Processes

Alliant's commitment to continuous improvement and quality assurance is discussed in component 6.

Institutional Learning and Improvement

Alliant's leadership was committed to engaging multiple constituencies throughout the organization, including the board of trustees, the foundation, faculty senate, faculty, staff, and students in formulating university strategy, initiatives, and target metrics. The organization gathered relevant information from these constituencies through formal university forums, routine meetings, direct dialogue, and surveys. Though more rigorous analysis of information was required, as depicted in component 6, the data gathered also helped set organizational priorities and a common strategic direction. In addition, external benchmark information and industry reports were used to identify future trends and growth opportunities as was evidenced in the minutes of the two most recent board of trustee meetings.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Federal Requirements

A review of each of the federal forms is provided as appendices to this report.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

In addition to producing a completed IEEI worksheet, Alliant also produced a summary of the six required elements of the IEEI. Between these two pieces of evidence, and after many conversations with deans, program directors, the University Assessment Committee, and the institutional research

staff, Alliant produced sufficient evidence that it consistently and systematically collected indicators of effectiveness.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

Alliant's degree programs generally focused upon the development of professional practitioners, and its students were regularly involved in the community in which their practice may lie, thus aligning education and training. Alliant's programs also contained an important mentorship and relational component, especially evident through their emphasis on an individual educational journey. Further, Alliant stressed community involvement and alignment to the needs of its respective communities, which was especially valuable for its professional practice focus. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.9)

A-IMPACT Competencies

Alliant had a tiered approach to learning outcomes evident through its A-IMPACT competencies, which were aligned with its four Pillars of Excellence (Education for Professional Practice; Scholarship; Multicultural and International Competence; and Community Engagement) and derived from an analysis of program outcomes. While the outcomes were defined, some of the definitions indicated that the competencies could overlap with one another. For instance, "Insight into the context of practice" could be more clearly distinguished from "Professional literacies." Another of Alliant's A-IMPACT competencies, "Conduct, judgment, dispositions, and ethics," may be overly bundled and challenging to assess. Further, its definition of this competency ("Students demonstrate ethical conduct in all aspects of personal interactions") may go beyond the scope of an academic degree as it is not possible to assess "all aspects of personal interactions." With a clear assessment plan and sources of evidence, some of these challenges could be addressed. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.7, and 2.1)

Distinctiveness of Alliant's Training: From Students to Professionals

As mentioned earlier, Alliant had a strong and clear focus in its practical approach to degree programs in that it viewed such programs as helping students become practice ready, prepared for leadership roles, and responsive to community needs. Toward that end, many of Alliant's programs offered important experiential activities or capstones for students, such as supervised internships or clinicals. The real-life professional experience seemed to offer students, especially those enrolled in more practical graduate programs, an opportunity to hone their skills and prepare for their respective careers. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, and 2.9)

Alliant reported that all doctoral programs except law incorporated doctoral projects or dissertations as a culminating project. In addition to doctoral work, Alliant encouraged its graduate students to pursue research and scholarship, as well as ongoing professional development opportunities. (CFR 2.2b)

Meaning by Degree Levels and by Program

Alliant aligned its undergraduate curriculum to its A-IMPACT competencies and incorporated the five WSCUC core competencies in its general education program as well as in its majors. General education and undergraduate assessment were primarily based on key assignments or capstones with defined rubrics, with the exception of general education quantitative reasoning, which used exams. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4 and 4.1)

As with its undergraduate programs, Alliant aligned its graduate programs to its A-IMPACT competencies and regularly assessed the learning outcomes in these programs. Alliant also had more defined, general outcomes for its graduate programs such as "diversity and inclusion" and "ethical, professional roles." The additional attention Alliant placed on graduate degree competencies and outcomes (as opposed to undergraduate competencies and outcomes) indicated that graduate programs are preeminent at Alliant. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, and 4.1)

Degree Quality: Quality Assurance Through Review and Assessment

Alliant reported that a significant majority (83.5%) of its students were enrolled in programs that had met specialty accreditation standards. For these externally accredited programs, Alliant largely relied on the external accreditor to evaluate the program and provide recommendations/guidance. It did not require these programs to go through the same internal program review process as non-accredited programs, but all programs were required to address eight Alliant standards (see component 6). For non-externally accredited programs, Alliant utilized external peer reviewers to ensure objective evaluation. At the time of the visit, in order to ensure rigor with the program review process, the University Assessment Committee was planning to incorporate the review of all program reviews as part of its charter; it would benefit the institution to move forward on this plan. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.7, and 4.1)

Degree Integrity: Alignment of Outcomes and Standards

Alliant reported that its programs were compliant with external accreditation requirements, and that their programs had curricular maps and courses, which were sequenced as appropriate with pre- or co-requisites. They also reported that their programs required the incorporation of multiple worldviews, inclusive excellence, and social justice in its curricula. Admirably, their syllabi template required that courses cover these areas, but it was not clear how they were ensuring, as much as possible, that such issues were being incorporated in a significant and meaningful way into the course content and in the instructional delivery of the faculty member. Given the significant value that Alliant placed on diversity, equity, and inclusion, it would be important to develop a process to ensure that all courses incorporated multicultural views in their content and materials, as well as their pedagogical strategies. (CFRs 1.2, 1.4, 2.2, and 2.12)

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Alliant described its assessment and program review process to be faculty-driven and professionally-based, supported by administrative leaders, such as associate/assistant deans, institutional research staff, and other administrative staff. During the site visit, the team was encouraged to see the positive results that the centralized institutional research and assessment staff had brought in establishing university-wide standards and guidance for assessment. Alliant utilized Taskstream to maintain its assessment materials and had developed a centralized website to educate and maintain assessment-related materials. Further, Alliant had begun work towards the assessment of its co-curricular programs, but such assessment was more or less in the formative stages. Progress on co-curricular assessment needed to continue. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.11, and 4.1)

Student Standards of Performance During the Program and at Graduation; Post-Graduate Professions-Based Outcomes Assessment; Information for Consumers on Student Achievement

Alliant reported that each program established its own benchmarks and standards of performance, and that the vast majority of the programs met or exceeded its benchmarks. This finding was impressive, but the team wondered if Alliant could consider whether the benchmarks it set may be a little too low or if its analysis could be more rigorous. Alliant established clear measurements for success in its assessment of its degree programs, although they were sometimes too reliant upon indirect measures (e.g., exam results and alumni surveys) to gauge success. In addition, there was also some circularity between pass rates for professional licensure and decisions about the quality of its academic programs, whereas there may not be such a clear cause and effect relationship. Alliant posted various measures of student success, such as graduation rates, licensure pass rates, and internship information publicly. (CFRs 1.2, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, and 4.1)

Core Competencies and Outcomes Assessment in Undergraduate Programs

Alliant aligned its undergraduate general education outcomes with the WSCUC core competencies and connected these to its A-IMPACT competencies. Alliant reported that students had not consistently met the established 75% target levels for some competencies. Specifically, students performed better in the areas of quantitative reasoning and critical thinking, but not as strongly in written and oral communication and information literacy. Given Alliant's professional focus, the university will want to devote more energy to helping students build a higher level of competency in these critical areas. (CFRs 2.2a, 2.4, and 2.5).

Core Competencies and Outcomes Assessment in Graduate Programs

Alliant regularly assessed its graduate learning outcomes and core competencies through dissertations, comprehensive exams, portfolios, and other capstone projects. Alliant provided compelling examples of how it closed the assessment loop in an effective manner in their DBA, their psychology programs, and the MS in Data Analytics programs. While Alliant provided data detailing how competencies were met for preparing its students for ethical, professional roles, it was less clear how such competencies were defined and assessed. On the other hand, Alliant provided much clearer analysis and data for how programs (e.g., the Fresno clinical PhD and PsyD programs) met competencies in diversity and inclusion. (CFRs 1.4, 2.2a, 2.4, and 2.5).

Achievement of Alliant Impact Competencies University-Wide

According to the data they provided, Alliant did extremely well in meeting its institutional outcomes. They reported that among all of their programs, the aligned program outcomes were met or exceeded in 84-91% of the assessments, which covered course-embedded work, competency and proficiency exams, field training, and, in a couple of cases, grades. However, as mentioned before, Alliant appeared to be over-utilizing indirect measures like student surveys for its assessments. Alliant will want to challenge itself to find additional ways to improve its instructional programs, including

analyzing how they set benchmarks and considering whether those benchmarks are sufficiently rigorous. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5).

Disaggregation of Data

Alliant disclosed that it had a number of underperforming undergraduate international students. While it reported that faculty were providing additional support for these students, it was not clear how helpful such resources had been or will be for these students. Alliant also analyzed student success data by breaking down its students by demographics. It reported that historically underrepresented students generally had lower course pass rates than white students in the majority of courses across all levels, although there were exceptions. While Alliant indicated that it planned to hold focus groups and student interviews with the students with achievement gaps, and to increase mentorship and connections to affinity groups, at the time of the visit there was not any data to address the success of these initiatives. In addition to its listed strategies, Alliant could investigate best practices of colleges and universities that have decreased or even eliminated its equity gaps. (CFRs 1.2, 1.4, 2.2a, 2.6, and 2.13)

Co-Curricular Support for Learning and Co-Curricular Assessment

Alliant reported that its student services department had engaged with assessment, that co-curricular data gathering was taking place, and that the university was streamlining data collection from student services. While Alliant was collecting some data for its co-curricular program assessments, by its own account during the site visit, these assessments were in formative stages. Alliant's library seemed to take an active and helpful role in student learning by providing dissertation boot camps and workshops for students to help them with writing, math, and statistics, among other subjects. To address information literacy, librarians had posted tutorials and provided students with relevant mini-courses. (CFR 2.11)

Support for Teaching

Alliant provided support for teaching primarily to those faculty who taught online. The Department of Online Learning provided faculty with individual consultation and feedback, while program directors co-enrolled in online courses with new faculty to provide initial mentorship. Program directors also reviewed student evaluations and worked with faculty accordingly. As previously mentioned, Alliant also provided core faculty members with professional development funds, which could be used to support their teaching, but was often used for professional memberships or scholarship. As plans for the Center for Teaching Excellence move forward, Alliant will want to emphasize best practices in teaching as part of its offerings. (CFR 3.3)

Overall, Alliant students were meeting outcomes and were professionally prepared by their respective programs. Alliant acknowledged that improvements could be made through its assessment process by writing clearer and more specific outcomes, utilizing rubrics, and gathering and sharing pertinent data more efficiently. It also acknowledged, and the site team concurred, that more could be done to close the loop for programmatic improvement. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 2.4., and 2.5)

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Alliant framed its vision of student success through a series of seven strategic goals that focused on promoting lifelong learning, improving student support services and satisfaction, promoting a rich and engaging programmatic experience, improving retention, graduation, and student loan default rates, and offering effective immersion experiences. (CFRs 1.4 and 2.2)

Alliant indicated that while most goals were not new, they more clearly defined expectations for student success. The promotion of lifelong learning, though, was a new goal, and Alliant outlined how it offered discounted continuing education to support its graduates in their chosen field. Emphasis on student success was broad-based and was supported by advising, tutoring, financial aid counseling, student business services, accessibility services, international student services, military and veteran

services, and career services. In meetings with program directors and faculty, they showed an understanding that while they were somewhat siloed in their professional programs and impacted by the history of the separate schools that were combined to form the university, they understood the importance of a united approach to the success of their students. Success in Alliant's mission had been demonstrated in part by receipt of maximum accreditation terms from their professional accreditors. (CFRs 2.2, 2.7, and 2.10)

Reported graduation and completion rates for graduate students met or exceeded their strategic goal. While meeting benchmarks in most programs, these rates are always an area of focus for improvement. Undergraduate graduation rates showed room for growth to reach their strategic goal of 70%. The WSCUC Graduation Rate Dashboard was less helpful to Alliant because the Absolute Graduation Rate (AGR) is affected by changes in enrollment. The AGR for Alliant ranged from 52% to 108%. In terms of disaggregated graduation rates, issues of disparities were identified and solutions proposed. Specific approaches included addressing courses that were barriers to retention by creating course success dashboards and then sharing these with program directors so they could better realize what courses stood out as identifiers for program attrition. Closing the loop approaches included adding support labs for these identified courses. Support for dissertation completion was another identified area that could be enhanced to support disparity subsets. In response, program curricula had been modified to strengthen course sequences and require proposals earlier. Dissertation "boot camps" were another feature that supported this group. Alliant stated that in 2017, there were 207 students in this dissertation-only status. Each program began working more intensively with these students by requiring specific timelines with accountable goals and outcomes. By spring 2019, this number was reduced to 150. (CFRs 2.7 and 2.10)

At the time of the visit, the San Francisco Law School had a reported cumulative minimum pass rate (MPR) of 41.7% which was just above the minimum MPR threshold of 40% set by the California

State Bar Committee of Bar Examiners. While Alliant desired to “provide opportunity to underserved and disadvantaged populations to enter the field of law and serve their communities” (Alliant, 2019, page 61), support needed to be strengthened to meet the needs of this demographic. The law school’s most recent retention rate, cohort year 18-19, was 90%, and the most recent graduation rate, cohort year 15-16, was 56% (27% changed program; 14% withdrew from the program; 3% were still enrolled). Steps Alliant had taken towards improving student success included expanding focus on legal writing and legal analysis. Alliant had also instituted a minimum LSAT score of 135 which, while below the “sweet spot” of 150, still allowed Alliant to educate missional populations. In support of Alliant’s stated desire to improve student success, the review team recommended that Alliant improve student success outcomes in the San Francisco Law School. (CFR 2.10)

Year over year success metrics was another area Alliant felt needed capacity to promote student success, and it had hired an analyst to assist in strengthening this for the university. At the time of the visit, the institution was in the process of adding a data warehouse, which, when instituted, would play a significant role in reporting both enrollment trends and disaggregated graduation and retention rates over time. (CFRs 1.2 and 2.7)

With revisions to the approach in assessing student learning (new templates and a dedicated individual to support) and the planned addition of a data warehouse, significant improvement was expected in the reporting of student success outcomes. There was sufficient enthusiasm surrounding this venture that it should have a significant impact on measuring achievement and making data-informed changes as needed. With the new data warehouse providing a strong foundation for analytics and resultant visualizations, it should allow for a greater level of distribution and resulting opportunities for sharing learning experiences in data consumption and utilization. (CFRs 2.4 and 3.5)

With the addition of new technologies there are inevitable challenges to adoption and implementation. Alliant was not an exception, and it addressed implementation challenges by hiring

new staff and outlining timetables for transitions. The new student information system was fully functional at the visit, but information technology staff explained that stored procedures would need to be updated and developed for populating the newly planned data warehouse. All online programs use Canvas; the ground-based programs that use Moodle were projected to move to Canvas within a year. In all processes Alliant would be well-served by leveraging their system affiliation with Microsoft, utilizing products such as Microsoft Power BI, Microsoft Power Automate, Microsoft Forms, and Microsoft Teams for analytics, collaboration, and workflow processes across the university. (CFR 3.5)

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

Alliant produced substantial documentation of its assessment and program review practices. Conversations with deans, program directors, the University Assessment Committee, and the institutional research and assessment staff confirmed that Alliant had made considerable progress in addressing identified gaps in assessment and program review, even since writing its report; this progress was commended. Most notably, Alliant had re-designed program review so that programs addressed eight Alliant standards; professionally accredited programs utilized a cross walk so that they did not need to duplicate any standards that were already addressed by their professional accreditor. Alliant had also begun to utilize external reviewers for programs that were not professionally accredited, and conversations with deans indicated that the feedback had been useful for making curricular changes. Information from advisory boards was also considered for program review. (CFR 2.7)

Assessment processes had also been streamlined and standardized. At the time of the visit Alliant was still in the process of shifting some manually completed assessment tools (such as clinical/internship rubrics) to an electronic format, which would help further with data distribution. While the assessment process was clear, it was still a bit cumbersome, as described to the team. Course outcome data was entered into Canvas by the instructor, while other forms of data, such as manually completed rubrics, were sent to staff in institutional research. Institutional research staff then either

manually entered hard copy findings or pulled data out of the SIS or Canvas and archived it into Taskstream. However, since Taskstream did not produce year over year reports, the same IR personnel pulled the information back out of Taskstream to feed multi-year reports back to the programs so that they could have meaningful conversations about programmatic change. In the interviews during the site visit, Alliant recognized that Taskstream was not working well, and it would seem that a less expensive repository could be utilized if Taskstream reporting features were not helpful. Additionally, educating program directors on how to enter material directly into Taskstream themselves might produce more efficiency than the back and forth described. Alliant staff and program directors acknowledged that the process could use some efficiency. However, conversations with various constituents, and a review of the assessment materials, indicated that there was broad participation by program faculty in the process and that programmatic decisions stemmed from an analysis of student learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.4, 4.1, and 4.4)

The assessment of co-curricular outcomes were less developed and actually undergoing another revision at the time of the visit. The University Assessment Committee indicated that the first attempt at designing co-curricular outcomes was unsuccessful, so it was piloting a new process with more involvement from and collaboration with the academic programs. At the time of the visit, Alliant had developed six institutional co-curricular outcomes but had not progressed beyond that point. The team encouraged Alliant to assess its co-curricular outcomes and develop a process for evaluating the effectiveness of its support programs. (CFR 2.4)

In related conversations about using data for decision-making, Alliant shared with the team some of the processes for getting other forms of institutional data where it needs to go. While many conversations indicated the helpfulness of the IR staff, there was a common acknowledgement that the data distribution processes were reactive rather than proactive, and that getting data when needed, particularly for accreditation or program review reports, could be slow. Thus, the team recommended

that Alliant create proactive, efficient data collection, aggregation, and distribution systems in order to use institutional research and assessment data more effectively. (CFR 4.2)

Once data was received, the process of making data-informed decisions seemed to vary in levels of effectiveness. Substantial evidence was shared from programs for how data was used to make curricular changes; however, the process for broader, institutional decisions was less clear. (CFR 4.4)

Matters were made more complex because of the regional campuses and the autonomy given to them to address stated student needs, often stemming from the net promoter survey. The institution seemed to lack a centralized, decision-making process for addressing matters related to student success. While the Academic Council was reported to have viewed disaggregated retention and graduation rates, no evidence could be found of a systemic approach to address equity gaps. Alliant's organization was program-centric, such that decisions were made most readily in each program, rather than looking more broadly at student needs across the institution. One notable example of this decentralized approach was the Student Evaluation and Review Committee (SERC). Each program had its own independent SERC that served the students in its program, thus resulting in numerous, autonomous entities trying to provide resources for student success. At the time of the visit, the SERC chairs did not meet as a group, thus never gaining perspective or best practice that could be shared. The team was told that the group of SERC chairs did meet in preparation for the team visit, and the conversation was meaningful and enlightening. While decentralization has its advantages, in some cases it might be wise to consider ways to share data, evidence, practice, and policy more broadly across the institution, especially if student success could be positively impacted. A more centralized approach would be very important if students were served differentially depending on program or location. Even if decentralized processes remained, Alliant would benefit from a more systemic approach to reviewing and acting on data. Thus, the team recommended that Alliant strengthen and expand the strategic analysis of data to inform decisions

about practices, policies, and the allocation of resources to bolster academic quality and student success. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 4.3, and 4.7)

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Financial Position

Along with a narrative describing Alliant's financial situation in the institutional report, the team reviewed (1) Artist Education System LLC's audited consolidated financial statements for the years ended June 30, 2018 and June 30, 2019, (2) Compliance Audit Report of its Title IV Programs for fiscal year ending June 30, 2018, (3) enrollment data, (4) profitability by program, campus, and modality, (5) Summary Profit and Loss Statements on a calendar-year basis for Alliant, and (6) 2020 budget documents. Team members also met with administrators responsible for financial planning and reporting. (CFR 3.4)

Alliant's fiscal condition had improved significantly since 2017. Total revenue increased over the prior year by 8.4% in CY2018 and by 10% in CY2019.¹ Adjusted earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization (EBITDA) was negative in years CY2015 through CY2017 but turned slightly positive in CY2018 and improved further in CY2019. At the time of the visit, the institution was forecasting that revenue and adjusted EBITDA would fall by approximately 5.4% and 14.1% short of the budgeted amounts. Net income and cash flow from US operations was negative in CY2018 and CY2019 but was projected to turn positive in CY2020.² Based on its most recent (year ending June 30, 2019) audited consolidated financial statements, Alliant's parent entity, Arist Education System, LLC had a healthy equity position, and a current ratio of 2.0. For FY2020, Arist's composite score was well above 1.5. (CFR 3.4)

¹ COVID-19 Mitigation Action Plan, 4

² Alliant Summary P&L for US Operations, version August 2020

At the time of the writing of the institutional report, Alliant forecasted that adjusted EBITDA would improve through CY2022,, the final year of its five-year strategic plan. Due to the disruptions caused by COVID, reaching the original EBITDA target would take 12 to 18 months longer. The institution still forecasted that it would generate a positive free cash flow for CY2020 and would continue to do so going forward. (CFR 3.4)

The 18-month turnaround plan implemented in May 2016 and Alliant's five-year 2022 strategic plan led to numerous actions that contributed to Alliant's improved financial sustainability. The turnaround plan consisted of multiple goals related to enhanced revenue generation and expenses reduction. These included developing new online and hybrid programs, improving the admissions and marketing functions, eliminating low-enrollment programs, closing international locations, reducing the institution's real-estate footprint, better aligning administrators, staff, and faculty resources to student populations, and investing in information systems. (CFR 3.1, 3.4, 3.7)

Alliant remained highly dependent on tuition and other student fees. Therefore, financial stability depends upon steady enrollment growth. Alliant succeeded in boosting tuition revenue by growing enrollments. New starts increased between 2015 and 2019. Total enrollment grew between 2015 and 2019 and, at the time of the visit, was forecasted to continue growing by 2022. The number of on-ground students fell between 2015 and 2019 and was expected to dip in 2020 and 2021. Enrollment growth was attributed to Alliant's expansion into online learning, especially in online teaching and credential programs, and the transition of existing, historically offered on-ground degree and credential programs to the online modality. The number of online students was expected to continue to grow. Alliant leadership explained that a decision to enter a new program area, unlike in the past, would require evidence and analysis of market demand in the discipline. Alliant remains almost entirely a graduate institution with a very modest undergraduate enrollment,. It was unclear what role

undergraduate education will play in the future in revenue generation and profitability. With the closing of international locations, no tuition revenue will be generated from this source going forward. (CFR 3.4)

Alliant effectively conducted program marketing and student recruitment. A range of marketing tactics were used to recruit students, including promoting Alliant at external events, outbound marketing, paid search, the use of social media, and follow-up efforts after initial contact. Alliant followed a number of best practices, including ensuring that admissions counselors were knowledgeable about the programs they represented to prospective students, applying established criteria to make admission decisions, delegating to faculty the responsibility for admission decisions, and annually benchmarking tuition amounts. (CFR 3.4)

Alliant also acted to moderate the growth of its expenses. Operating expenses had grown far slower than revenue. Operating expenses as a percent of revenue fell from around 50% in 2015-2017 to 37% in 2019.³ These expense reductions were attributed to Alliant's decisions to close operations in Mexico, Hong Kong, and Japan, eliminate underperforming academic programs, discontinue student housing and dining services in San Diego, reduce its real estate footprint, and eliminate low-impact employee positions. The most significant change regarding real estate was to move the San Francisco operations to Emeryville in Alameda County. The team member who visited the location heard feedback that the new facility was more functional and convenient to access though concerns were raised that student services were cut. (CFR 3.4)

Bertelsmann SE & Co., which became sole owner of Alliant in 2019, demonstrated a commitment to the financial stability of Alliant, through investments and loans.. Oversight of funding for investments was provided by the board of directors and ultimately approved by the CEO of Bertelsmann Education Group. The new student information system was the most recent example of a major investment funded by Bertelsmann. Alliant incurs an interest expense on a loan from Bertelsmann that

³ Alliant Institutional Report, page 86

negatively impacts its cash flow; repayment of the loan principle is more than a decade away.

Bertelsmann provided some administrative support services but allowed Alliant to operate with a high degree of autonomy. Based on conversations with Alliant and Bertelsmann leadership and the board of directors, the team was confident that Bertelsmann is committed to supporting Alliant's financial stability and beneficial capital projects into the future. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7)

At the time of the visit, Alliant had successfully managed the financial impact of the pandemic for 2020. Enrollment in fall 2020 fell slightly from the level in fall 2019 and was 9% short of the 2020 budget target. The challenges of enrolling international students shared by all US institutions of higher education was one contributor to the shortfall. Total revenue was expected to increase from 2019 to 2020 but to fall approximately 5.4% short of budget. In 2020, the institution was able to mostly offset the reduction in revenue through lower instructional expenses, lower staff expenses through a hiring freeze, and lower travel and other operational expenses. (CFRs 3.1 and 3.4)

Allocating Resources in Alignment with Institutional Priorities

Alliant's strategic plan identified priorities that fostered educational effectiveness; specifically, commitments to education, scholarship, multicultural and international competence, and community engagement. Annual budgeting was reported as an inclusive process that involved academic and administrative units along with institutional leadership. Individual program directors and other unit heads used the BudgetPak system to supply information on their budget requests. The executive leadership team then allocated funds based on the persuasiveness of the submitted spending justifications. The annual budget was reviewed and approved by the trustees. At the time of the visit, the finance team had received positive feedback on the software system, noting that faculty awareness of their budgets had increased since its adoption. Monthly reports were created for unit heads to help them track spending relative to budget allocations. (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, and 3.9)

With the goal of improving the effectiveness of the budgeting process, an Office of Financial Planning and Analysis, consisting of a director and two financial analysts, was created. A decision-making matrix was implemented in summer 2019 to clarify to faculty and staff how various types of institutional decisions are made. (CFRs 3.4 and 3.7)

The institution provided a number of examples of how resources were deployed to align with priorities and educational effectiveness. These included the closing of international locations, reducing staff and faculty in programs with declining enrollments, hiring institutional design staff to support online learning, investing in marketing and student services for online programs, and increasing staffing in financial services. The institution had also invested heavily in information systems. A new student information system was implemented in fall 2019. Other systems expanded its capacity in program assessment (Taskstream Accountability Management System), course evaluations by students (EvaluationKIT), career planning (Purple Briefcase), marketing and recruiting (Salesforce), budgeting (BudgetPak), scholarships (NextGen), learning management system (Canvas), Starfish Retention Solutions, and Zoom. With these systems in place, the institution anticipated resources would be directed toward training and developing ways to leverage data for decision making. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7)

Responsiveness to Higher Education Environment

Alliant had a clear mission that was supported throughout the university community and that provided a clear sense of the role it expected to have in higher education. Alliant had identified mental health and teaching as two fields with rising workforce demand that built on their areas of strength. These also aligned with the institution's four pillars of education for professional practice, scholarship, multicultural and international competence, and community engagement. Programmatic accreditation standards also fostered responsiveness to the higher education environment. These accreditors included the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs, American Psychological Association,

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Committee of Bar Examiners of the California State Bar, Committee on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education, and the Arizona State Board of Education. (CFR 3.4 and 3.7)

In summary, at the time of the visit, Alliant had made significant progress toward achieving financial sustainability. The team commended Alliant leadership for implementing an 18-month turnaround plan and a strategic plan that culminated in addressing substantial operating deficits. Also, the institution capably managed resources during the early stages of the pandemic, continuing to deliver a remote learning experience to students while avoiding an operating deficit. However, concern over financial sustainability still existed since Alliant reported losses in net income and a negative cash flow for CY2018 and CY2019. Though CY2020 was expected to result in positive EBITDA, net income and cash flow, at the time of the visit, Alliant had not functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. The team believed that Alliant's 2022 strategic plan's financial targets were realistic but noted that the institution projects that the achievement of the financial targets will be delayed by twelve to eighteen months. To ensure financial sustainability, the team recommended that Alliant continue to: (1) pursue opportunities articulated in the 2022 strategic plan to grow new enrollments and revenues, (2) thoughtfully manage expenses that align with anticipated revenues to generate dependable, positive operating cash flow, and (3) actively manage the virtual learning student experience during the COVID pandemic to minimize the impact on new and continuing enrollments and develop a strong ongoing operating model. Additionally, the team encouraged Alliant continue to use its decision-making matrix tool to build on the faculty and staff's understanding of how decisions are made. (CFRs 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7)

Longer term, Alliant will need to thoughtfully develop financial goals and strategies for the new strategic plan that guides the institution beyond 2022. Along with identifying new graduate program areas with potential to advance its mission and support financial sustainability, the institution will need to determine the role of undergraduate education at Alliant. The team also encouraged Alliant give

careful thought to how it can best use the free cash flow it projected for 2020 and beyond. This could be directed toward investments in the instructional and student services infrastructure, development of new programs, and the repayment of debt to its parent organization. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7)

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Throughout the visit, Alliant reiterated its commitment to ongoing improvement. As indicated above, the university had strengthened its viability by creating and implementing a focused 18-month Strategic Turnaround Plan and a unifying Alliant 2022 Strategic Plan. The strategic plan was developed through an inclusive university-wide process resulting in collaborative implementation efforts, increased awareness of challenges, and higher levels of accountability. Deliberate steps had been taken to execute the two plans, including the transition to greater online education, the closure of international programs, changes to facilities to reduce fixed costs, and investments in technology to create a base for more informed decisions and improved support services. Frequent communication and transparency on organizational performance and progress had engendered trust and improved morale throughout the university.

Despite the negative financial impact from lower enrollments than budgeted in 2020 primarily due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the organization cut expenses that were expected to yield a positive cash flow position in 2020 and positive EBITDA. cause a delay in execution of the strategic plan and, as such, Alliant would not realize the expected financial improvements in 2021 and 2022, specifically due to flattening enrollment and tuition freezes. Financial progress will be necessary in cash flow to meet critical investments for a post-COVID recovery and growth.

With commitment from the university board of directors and a long-term ownership perspective from Bertelsmann, Alliant's strategic direction remained unchanged. Though demand for health sciences and education degrees and credentials were assumed to remain strong into the future, sustainable revenue would require that Alliant manage the return of international student enrollment or identify

alternative revenue streams within emerging disciplines and the continued expansion of online delivery. The administration responded to the COVID-19 crisis quickly, creating multiple financial scenarios, shifting to remote teaching, and cutting operating expenses. This plan will need to extend further to ensure long term sustainability by not only focusing on an enrollment recovery, but also designing and implementing a safe and effective return to campus strategy that meets academic quality standards and results in an effective, ongoing operating model. In addition, sustainability will require greater urgency and additional resources focused on retention and graduation rates in key campus-based programs and online degrees. Alliant was proud of being one of the largest granters of graduate degrees to students of color. This impact will be enhanced as the university strengthens its assessment capabilities, process, and support structures to improve graduation rates and guide student employment and placement. Overall, the continued development of university-wide processes and role definitions will result in a more consistent, coordinated and efficient organization.

Finally, the potential regulatory risks that may affect for-profit higher education institutions related to the upcoming presidential election were being monitored by Alliant’s leadership. Based on the election results, more detailed action may be required to ensure Alliant programs can meet potentially stringent student performance metrics.

While Alliant remained very optimistic about its future, it did identify areas of growth and plans for improvement, many of which have been named in this report.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

NA

SECTION IV –COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Alliant fully engaged the self-study process and produced a comprehensive review. The materials presented before the site visit and the conversations engaged during were open and transparent, allowing the visiting team an honest glimpse into the heart of the institution.

As a result, the visiting team commended Alliant University on the following:

1. Implementing an 18-month turnaround plan and a strategic plan that addressed substantial operating deficits in 2020 and set the institution on a trajectory toward financial sustainability.
2. Committing to inclusive excellence by increasing focus and resources.
3. Articulating a strong emphasis on professional practice, values and making a positive contribution to the community.
4. Improving morale through increased transparency, communication structures, accessible leadership, stronger financials, and commitment to employee well-being.
5. Strengthening and systematizing assessment support and practices by establishing a University Assessment Committee, creating standardized assessment templates and practices, and developing a comprehensive assessment website as a centralized resource.
6. Adopting new technology to strengthen the infrastructure that will increase operational effectiveness and improve the student experience.

The team identified a variety of recommendations where intentional effort, energy, and/or resources were necessary in order for Alliant to attain its stated mission and purpose. Specifically, the team recommended that Alliant

1. Expand faculty development opportunities that include adjunct faculty, with particular emphasis on inclusive pedagogy and best teaching practices in all modalities. (CFR 3.3)
2. Create proactive, efficient data collection, aggregation, and distribution systems in order to use institutional research and assessment data more effectively. (CFR 4.2)
3. Strengthen and expand the strategic analysis of data to inform decisions about practices, policies, and the allocation of resources to bolster academic quality and student success. (CFRs 1.2, 2.1, 4.3, and 4.7)
4. Ensure financial sustainability by continuing to: (CFRs 3.4 and 3.5)

- a. pursue opportunities articulated in the 2022 strategic plan to grow new enrollments and revenues;
 - b. thoughtfully manage expenses that align with anticipated revenues to generate dependable, positive operating cash flow; and
 - c. actively manage the virtual learning student experience during the COVID pandemic to minimize the impact on new and continuing enrollments and develop a strong ongoing operating model.
5. Consistent with Alliant's stated mission and values, continue the efforts to infuse inclusive excellence throughout the institution by hiring and retaining a diverse faculty and staff and addressing retention and graduation equity gaps. (CFR 1.4)
6. Improve student success outcomes in the San Francisco Law School. (CFR 2.10)

**Appendix A
FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS**

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? Credit Hour policy is available in the 20/21 catalog under academic policies: https://catalog.alliant.edu/content.php?catoid=36&navoid=1400#credit-hour-policy
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Credit hours are determined during the course development process. The program director and/or online learning instructional design staff review and ensure the credit hours are appropriate working with faculty. Hours are calculated in the syllabus for all online courses. Program reviewers including specialty accreditors review syllabi for rigor. University policy requires additional review to ensure there are sufficient hours expected outside of class for the credit hours assigned. Summer 2019 review data indicated that all courses reviewed met the requirement. A new Simple Syllabus Template implemented in Spring 2020 includes additional guidance for faculty on calculating assignments and a link to the Rice University workload calculator, a tool for faculty developing courses and reviewers of course hours. Curriculum Committees and academic administrators review syllabi for appropriate rigor. The addition of audits of courses is a newly established and implemented policy.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The institution provided class schedules for 2019, including their locations. These schedules show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours. The Records Specialist III in the Registrar's Office ensures that on-ground courses contain the correct number of credit hours. Courses that do not meeting credit hours are referred back to the program or a relevant academic administrator for resolution.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	How many syllabi were reviewed? 6
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral

<i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	What discipline(s)? Information Systems and Technology Management, Business, Education, Psychology, Educational Leadership and Management
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of courses? Field Placement, Practicum, Dissertation Research
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Psychology and Criminal Justice, Psychology, Organizational Psychology
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Six
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? PhD in Clinical Psychology, San Francisco PsyD in Clinical Psychology, San Francisco Juris Doctorate Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (hybrid; on-ground) Master of Business Administration (On-ground, online, hybrid) Doctor of Business Administration (On-ground, hybrid, online)
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Psychology, Law, Business
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: David Ely

Date: August 17, 2020

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Alliant trains all recruitment and admission members on federal regulations regarding recruiting and enrolling students including areas such as misrepresentation. Alliant's Training Plan for new employees was reviewed.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The Alliant catalog (available online) provides program information, including a full description of the basic course schedule by semester/term. Each entering student signs an acknowledgement they have received a catalog and an Enrollment Agreement prior to entry. The Enrollment Agreement also specifies a scheduled completion date. A sample Enrollment Agreement was reviewed. Information on the cost of each program is listed in the Alliant catalog. The charges for the first term are listed as well as total estimated charges for the full program at the current tuition rates. Each entering student signs an acknowledgement they have received a catalog and signs an Enrollment Agreement prior to entry specifying the charges for the first term and total estimated charges for the full program.
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: General information on career positions are provided on the Alliant website and in the catalog in each program's description. Student consumer information is on the Student Achievement web page and information obtained from post-graduate surveys is provided on programs' Performance Fact Sheets , which are signed by enrolling students.

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

Review Completed By: David Ely
Date: August 17, 2020

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation *§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaint policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?</p> <p>The institution has two relevant policies: (1) Problem Solving and Dispute Resolution Guidelines, which includes a formal Grievance Policy and (2) Sexual Misconduct and Title IX Policy.</p> <p>The <u>Problem Solving and Dispute Resolution Guidelines</u> appear in the 2020-21 catalog. The institution stated that the full version is available from the Campus Director or Vice President of Student Services and provided a copy of the policy to the team.</p> <p>The institution's 2020-21 catalog contains a paragraph on <u>Sexual Harassment and Misconduct</u>. A copy of the policy was provided to the team. The policy is available in the <u>Consumer Information</u> section of the institution's website under the heading Emergency Response and Evacuation Procedures: <u>Title IX: Sexual and Gender Based Harassment and Misconduct Policy</u></p> <p>Comments:</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>The institution has three processes pertaining to student complaints</p> <p>Student Consumer Complaint Process: The institution's website includes a Complaint Process for students under the Consumer Information section.</p> <p>Problem Solving and Dispute Resolution Guidelines: The 2020-21 catalog includes a section on Problem Solving and Dispute Resolution Guidelines that covers procedures.</p> <p>Sexual Misconduct and Title IX Policy: The 2018 Annual Campus Security and Fire Safety Report (released in September 2019) procedures pertaining to sexual misconduct.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The institution provided the following summary description of the problem solving and dispute resolution procedures.</p>

	<p>Alliant’s problem solving and dispute resolution procedures are a series of steps to resolve issues before they become formal grievances.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Students should attempt to resolve the problem through direct discussion. 2) If step 1 is unsuccessful, help should be sought from the campus director or designee. If harassment or discrimination is involved, the campus director will assist with safety issues and ensure reporting to the appropriate office. Harassment or discrimination issues are reported directly to the Vice President of Student Services and may also be reported to the appropriate state or federal agency or academic dean. 3) Students have the right to file a grievance at any time within 180 days of the incident without using the first two steps of the process. The campus director seeks assistance from other personnel in determining whether the issue is grievable. Grievances against faculty members are referred to the dean. A Grievance Officer is identified, depending on the issue. The Grievance Officer, who manages the process, provides an appropriate level of information about the grievance to relevant parties, investigates the grievance, issues a written report and notifies the complainant and the respondent. The respondent would be notified of any referrals for disciplinary action or recommendations for disciplinary action if the grievance is substantiated. <p>Sexual misconduct reports are made to the Title IX Officer, the Vice President of Student Services, or any Title IX Deputy or Coordinator at Alliant. When the complainant does not wish to engage in informal dispute resolution, the University will formally investigate the complaint, including times when there is not written complaint, or when the complaint is made by a third party. The Title IX Officer conducts a formal investigation into all allegations of discrimination or sexual misconduct. A written report is filed, and the complainant and respondents are notified. An appeal process is available if there is disagreement with the process.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Vice President of Student Services maintains a record of the formal grievances filed by students/student applicants/alumni. ● The Director of Compliance and Regulatory Affairs maintains complaints filed with the California Bureau of Private Post-secondary Education or the Department of Education. ● The Associate Provost of Institutional Research/WSCUC ALO maintains a record of complaints filed with the WASC Senior College and University Commission. <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>The Vice President of Student Services provides an annual report to the Board of Trustees regarding Formal Grievance complaints received, any trends noticed, and any action items to be implemented.</p> <p>Comments:</p>

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

Review Completed By: David Ely

Date: August 17, 2020

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Transfer credit policy appears in the 20-21 Alliant catalog under academic policies: https://catalog.alliant.edu/content.php?catoid=36&navoid=1400#transfer-credit
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The policy describes multiple aspects of the transfer credit parameter as well as the process to request and obtain transfer credit. The policy describes differences at the undergraduate and graduate degree levels including the maximum number of units allowed by level and/or program. The policy includes a link to articulation agreements with California community colleges. There is an additional link to Transcript Requirements.

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

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

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

Review Completed By: David Ely
Date: August 17, 2020

Appendix B
OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEWS

Institution: Alliant International University

Type of Visit: Reaccreditation

Name of reviewer/s: Stephanie Juillerat

Date/s of review: February 4, 2020

1. Site Name and Address
Alliant International University – Los Angeles
Address: 1000 South Fremont Ave.
Alhambra CA 91803
WSCUC Campus Status: Branch Campus

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

The Los Angeles campus, currently located in Alhambra, is one of the first two campuses of Alliant's legacy institutions, the California School of Professional Psychology and opened in 1970 offering doctoral degrees in psychology in a new model of training practitioners for professional practice. The campus opened in 1970 with AA and PhD programs in Los Angeles. It moved from a long-standing facility in Los Angeles to its current location in Alhambra during the 1990-1991 academic year.

The campus has 26 core faculty (25.5 FTE) and 22 adjunct faculty (11.0) FTE.

The campus currently enrolls students in six graduate degree programs, all of which are part of the California School of Professional Psychology:

- Clinical Psychology PsyD (170 student FTE)
- Clinical Psychology PhD (94.2 student FTE)
- Marital and Family Therapy MA (35.3 student FTE)
- Marital and Family Therapy PsyD (14.5 student FTE)
- Organizational Psychology MA (15.4 student FTE)
- Organizational Psychology PhD (16 student FTE)

The programs seek and maintain specialty accreditation where possible, since this provides important value for students in their professional careers and employment opportunities. The clinical psychology programs are separately accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA). The Marital and Family Therapy programs are accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Marital and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE).

A small number of California School of Education students in a campus-based delivery of the Educational Psychology PsyD are completing their doctoral programs on the Los Angeles campus. This program now admits students only in the online modality. Previously, the campus offered additional California School of Education programs at the site, but those have also transitioned to online delivery. The Industrial-Organizational Psychology PhD is now offered as with a revised curriculum as the PhD in Organizational Psychology; seven students are completing the prior curriculum.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
Nine group interviews and a facilities tour were conducted as part of the review. Interviews were conducted with senior and campus leadership teams, core and adjunct faculty, day and evening students, student services staff and regular staff, and program directors.

Alliant provided extensive materials, including a Campus Briefing with detailed demographic and enrollment data, NPS results for spring 2019, and all assessment and program reviews conducted at the site for the 18-19 academic year.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>Campuses are a key component of Alliant's ongoing connection to and integration with the local community. Alliant is committed to maintaining academic programs at California locations. Alliant's mission is training students for professional careers that serve diverse communities. This location, as a legacy site, embodies the mission of the California School of Professional Psychology and operates as a fully contained operation.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The campus and members of the campus community are strongly connected to the larger institution through shared statements of purpose and goals, and are included in planning, university-wide meetings, and opportunities for collaboration.</p> <p>Students are integrated into the life of the institution through the institution-level policies and practices as well as through the expectations established in academic programs residing in the schools. At Los Angeles, this is primarily through the California School of Professional Psychology, CSPP. CSPP and its programs promote a strong graduate culture in which programs incorporate theory, scholarship and practice. Faculty mentor students to become practicing professionals. Students are encouraged to attend conferences and present information and represent both their programs, CSPP and Alliant.</p> <p>I-MERIT, the institutional International/multicultural initiative, is active on campus and reinforces the institution's commitment to inclusive excellence. Webinars, lecture series, conference opportunities and tutoring opportunities are made available both at the campus and electronically for all students.</p> <p>Students access a unified Alliant library system, in which they can share print and electronic resources across the system and receive help from any available librarian through a variety of communication methods. They also benefit from the single, streamlined university processes developed for IRB review and dissertation publication process which is now managed by the library.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site</p>	<p>The campus occupies 33,672 square feet within a 38-acre complex and has 19 classrooms including an integrated computer classroom, a computer laboratory, a few group and individual study spaces, a faculty lounge, and a small, open area student lounge. While small,</p>	

<p>is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>classrooms are equipped for multimedia and web conferencing with projection screens, Smart TV monitors and Blu-ray/DVD units, with Wi-Fi connectivity available throughout the campus. The campus library is located adjacent to the classrooms and houses multiple group study spaces as well as our computer laboratory. Students indicate that there are insufficient study spaces because the students want them at the same time.</p> <p>While the property is older, there is a facility manager who keeps it well-maintained.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>Alliant strives to provide a positive and successful student experience. Student services on site are coordinated and delivered by the campus director. On-campus student services staff include a student advisor, student finance officer, field training support, IT support, and library support. The campus director integrates services on campus and, with the student advisor, is the first point of contact for accessibility services, veteran's and military services, international services, tutoring, and career services for which the departmental directors are at the San Diego campus.</p> <p>Tutoring resources are also provided online through the Brainfuse tutoring platform and AlliantHAWK videos.</p> <p>Alliant engages all staff in training to serve students, called the Blue Carpet Experience and monitors the student experience through the Net Promoter Score (NPS) survey.</p>	<p>Follow up on staff capacity</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>26 core faculty and 22 adjunct faculty. Faculty report feeling connected to the institution and having oversight of their curriculum. Each program engages in on sight assessment of student learning.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>Curriculum and courses at the site are designed by the program faculty. The curriculum action review and approval process includes a multi-step process.</p> <p>All clinical psychology programs have the same competencies and similar, but not identical, curricula across locations in order to meet disciplinary and specialty accreditation standards. The MFT program is a system-wide program that operates with input/program design from faculty across the system. The organizational psychology faculty across the system have worked to revise the current curriculum to make it more effective for students, meet market demands, and respond to current issues in the program.</p> <p>If a significantly new program was developed to be implemented on the Los Angeles campus, it would also require approval at the Academic Council and Board of Trustees level.</p>	

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Retention and graduation data are compiled on CSPP single program Dashboards and distributed to the program directors. CSPP diversity dashboards provide data by gender and racial/ethnic category. Two single year attrition calculations (first year and total program) are provided on the Annual Report Forms, Part II (this is a new process which was developed by the University Assessment Committee and implemented in 2019-20.).</p> <p>In general, students have more positive outcomes in retention rates, graduation rates and time-to-degree than students in comparable San Diego programs.</p> <p>The campus works to create a campus climate that is welcoming and affirming of people of all groups through university commitments such as the mission and university values and creating academic engagement and relevance by infusing all programs with multicultural/international content. Alliant works to hire a diverse faculty who can support and mentor students of color. The Los Angeles campus I-MERIT committee regularly sponsors co-curricular events that supports the development of multicultural competence and inclusiveness. Most recently, the clinical psychology doctoral programs have engaged a consultant on retaining students of color.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Program faculty and the program director develop the program's assessment plans. Clinical psychology doctoral programs and organizational psychology program assessment plans have variations across campus, but generally incorporate similar measures such as exams, dissertation, and field training. The marital and family therapy program uses a single plan system-wide and meets to review and discuss data across all locations each fall. Programs are still using grades as well for some competencies.</p> <p>The results indicate that students are meeting the assessment benchmarks in both Los Angeles and San Diego.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Quality assurance processes at Los Angeles are those used throughout the university. Some of these are related specifically to assuring student success and others to assurance of quality and academic excellence:</p> <p>Student success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring student success through dashboards and taking steps to improve data, including monitoring the numbers of students in an all-but-dissertation status • Student learning Outcome plans and data • NPS Surveys – which gain information on the student experience and student satisfaction with multiple aspects of the program • Graduate licensure data • Alumni employment data 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clinical psychology students obtaining APA licensure Academic and institutional quality <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program Reviews including specialty program reviews• Course Evaluations• Faculty and Staff Reviews, including Adjunct Faculty Reviews – a university policy and review and feedback format was recently implemented• Credit hour Reviews of syllabi was recently added to registrar's office review of sufficiency in class hours for the units of the course	
--	--	--

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW

Institution: Alliant University

Type of Visit: Review for Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: David Ely

Date/s of review: February 10, 2020

1. Site Name and Address

Alliant International University – Emeryville
1475 66th Street, Emeryville, CA 94608

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

Programs Offered at this Site:

Psychology Programs:

- PhD in Clinical Psychology
- PsyD in Clinical Psychology

Juris Doctorate

PhD Organizational Psychology and PsyD Organizational Development have been discontinued.

Table 1. Student Headcount and FTES by Degree

	Headcount	FTE
PhD in Clinical Psychology	56	52.4
PsyD in Clinical Psychology	197	156.7
Juris Doctorate	26	19.4
PsyD Org Development	3	1.3
PhD Org Psychology	7	1.6

Faculty teaching in the ongoing degree programs include 18 core faculty (FTEF 16.9) and 23 adjunct faculty (FTEF 8.5).

The California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP) was founded in 1969 in the Bay area and the San Francisco Law School (SFSL) was founded in 1909. CSPP and USIU joined to become Alliant in 2001; Alliant acquired control of SFSL in 2010. The campus relocated from the Fisherman's Wharf area of San Francisco to Emeryville in January 2020. Square footage of the facility is 26,250.

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

The WSCUC review team member met with campus leadership, including the Provost/VP for Academic Affairs, Associate Provost for Institutional Research, Campus Director, Directors of the Clinical Psychology PhD Program and Clinical Psychology PsyD Program, Dean of the San Francisco Law School, Chair of the Faculty Assembly, Academic Program Coordinator, Director of Library Services, Student Finance Officer, Vice President of Student Affairs, Director of Clinical Training, Clinical Training Coordinator, Associate Registrar for the San Francisco Law School, Facilities and IT Coordinator, and Academic Advisor. The team member also met in four open meetings with core faculty, adjunct faculty, students, and staff.

Alliant provided a briefing report prior to the visit. The team member also examined retention and graduation data for Emeryville-based students.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p>		
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>CSPP and SFSL operated for years in the San Francisco Bay area before becoming part of Alliant. Many faculty and staff view themselves as one among an affiliation of semi-independent campuses rather than an off-campus site.</p> <p>Consistent with its commitments as a California benefit corporation, students in the professional psychology programs engage the local communities through practicums and internships. Operating campuses in multiple locations in California supports Alliant's mission to prepare "students for professional careers of service and leadership" "to improve the lives of people in diverse cultures and communities."</p> <p>Emeryville-based academic deans and program directors administer the programs offered at this location. Student services are managed by a mix of local administrators and staff in San Diego. Local staff also manage the facility (e.g., operations, IT, and payroll).</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The Emeryville and San Diego campuses are well connected. Faculty and staff contribute toward institute-wide strategic planning, shared governance, and curriculum development. Faculty, staff, and administrators engage with colleagues in San Diego and other locations. The library system, student information system and other platforms are shared across locations. Alliant has instituted quarterly university updates to share information on achievements and planning, budgetary, and operational matters.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>Square footage of the Emeryville facility is 26,250. Classroom and office space are well designed and modern. An on-site campus director is responsible for managing day-to-day operations and reports to the AVP of Student Engagement based in San Diego. A Sr Financial Analyst, Student Financial Officer, IT and Facilities Coordinator, Payroll Manager, Sr Admissions Counselor, Library Services Director, Associate Provost of IR, and Deans have direct reporting lines to system-wide administrators.</p>	

<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>A Student Financial Aid Officer, IT and Facilities Coordinator, Sr Admissions Counselor, Student Adviser, Library Director, Library Technician, SFSL Associate Registrar, CSPP Academic program Coordinator, and Associate Provost for IR are onsite. The Campus Director provides overall coordination. Working with the Campus Director and Student Adviser, students access accessibility services, veteran's and military services, international student services, and career services from San Diego offices. Online tutoring services are available. Surveys are used to collect feedback on student services. Net promotor scores (NPS) derived from the survey data are tracked by service function and compared across locations.</p>	<p>Alliant migrated to a different Student Information System (SIS) in late 2019 and early 2020. Is the SIS now fully functional and stable? And if not, what is the timeline for resolving remaining issues?</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>Faculty teaching in the ongoing degree programs include 18 core faculty (FTEF 16.9) and 23 adjunct faculty (FTEF 8.5). The CSPP core faculty in the PhD and PsyD develop curriculum for their respective programs. The curricula must align with American Psychology Association requirements. Competency models are employed by faculty to assess learning. Students unable to meet the standards for competency are dismissed from the program.</p>	<p>Assessment of learning for the JD program is not yet mature. Moot Court, Bar Pass Results, and written assignments are currently used to assess student learning, but these effects are relatively recent. What steps are being taken to reach a greater degree of maturity?</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>CSPP core faculty designs the programs and courses at the Emeryville site. The doctorate programs in clinical psychology are not standardized across locations. However, program competencies are the same across locations and APA accreditation requirements impose a significant degree of similarity. APA conducts separate accreditation visits for each of the locations offering APA-accredited programs.</p> <p>SFSL programs and courses at the San Diego and Emeryville locations are the same since they are developed jointly by faculty.</p> <p>Alliant has a formal curriculum review process that mandates proposals are reviewed by a series of committees and approved by the Provost.</p> <p>Alliant maintains program-level dashboards by location for clinical psychology programs of student-to-faculty ratios, share of units taught by core faculty, accredited internship participation, time-to-degree, attrition, diversity, admissions rates and yields, licensure rates, and probation rates.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any</p>	<p>Retention and graduation rates for PsyD, PhD, and JD degree programs are collected and are disaggregated by gender and ethnicity. The graduation rate for the PsyD program is 82%, 72% for the PhD program, and 58% for the JD program. In the PsyD program, the graduation</p>	

<p>concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>rate for females is greater than for males. For both PsyD and PhD, graduation rates for diverse students is high than for white students. Retention rates, graduation rates, and time-to-degree compare favorably to San Diego programs.</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The faculty associated with the PsyD and PhD programs at Emeryville are responsible for developing and implementing assessment plans. The APA competency model provides a framework for assessing the achievement of program competencies. Metrics consist of course grades and scores on competency-based assessments conducted during multiple practicums. The institution concludes that students in the PsyD and PhD programs, at both Emeryville and San Diego, are meeting the benchmarks.</p> <p>The assessment of student learning for the JD program is less mature. Assessments based on students' performance on components of moot court are currently being used. However, the number of JD students is low. Additional data will need to be collected and analyzed before conclusions can be reached.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Measurement of student success common across campuses include dashboards on retention, graduation rates, and time to degree, assessment plans and results stored in Taskstream, net-promotor score surveys on academic and student services, licensure data, alumni employment data, and internship data. Standardized procedures are used across campuses for program reviews, course evaluations, faculty and staff reviews, and syllabi review. Feedback collected through alumni surveys and course evaluations are favorable.</p>	

Appendix C
DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW

Institution: Alliant International University
 Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
 Name of reviewer/s: Vivian Sanchez
 Date/s of review: February 2020 with an update in September 2020

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs [1] and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)
 - Instructional Leadership ELM78400-rev
 - Clinical Practice 1: Planning EDU62360-rev
 - Content Knowledge and Instructional Practice IV: Differentiated Learning
 - Ethics, Values and Diversity in Forensic Context FOR61800-rev
 - Psychopharmacology EDP8525
 - Trauma and Crisis Intervention PSY6325-rev
 - Violence and Criminal Behavior ALNT FOR61150-rev

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)

Fall Term	2017	2018	2019	2020
Headcount	746	1,158	1,383	1,488
% growth	-	+55%	+19%	+10%
FTE	541	796	966	997*
% growth	-	+47%	+21%	+3%

In 2002, Alliant launched its first online degree program, an MA in Education with a concentration in Teaching. The post-doctoral MS in Clinical Psychopharmacology also began in an online modality in 2002. In 2013 Alliant was approved by WSCUC to act as the teach-out institution for Chancellor University in Ohio, and to admit students into three online teach-out curricula. Beginning in 2014, Alliant began to further develop and implement online programs.

Online programs with students currently enrolled during Fall 2020 include:

Non-Degree/Credential: 7

Administrative Services Credential*
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) CLAD Certificate*
Multiple Subject Preliminary Teaching Credential*
Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling*
Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology*
Single Subject Preliminary Teaching Credential*
Education Specialist Preliminary Teaching Credential*

Bachelors: 0

Master's and EdD, including postdoctoral masters: 12

Clinical Counseling MA^
Clinical Psychopharmacology MS*
Education/School Counseling MAE (with PPS credential)*
Education/School Psychology MAE (with PPS credential)*
Education/Special Education MAE (with Education Specialist credential)*
Education/Teaching (with Multiple or Single Subject credential)*
Education/TESOL MAE#
Forensic Behavioral Science MS*
Marital and Family Therapy MA^
Organizational Psychology MA^
School Counseling EdS*
School Psychology EdS*

Doctoral: 3

Business Administration DBA^
Educational Leadership and Management EdD#
Educational Psychology PsyD#

*Indicates the program is only offered online

^Indicates the program is actively offered in two modalities

#Indicates the program has some on ground students remaining but is not recruiting students for the on-ground program

Alliant has offered other distance education programs that are currently inactive and has some new programs planned for implementation. Alliant's programs are mainly online/hybrid, with online coursework plus either a clinical practice/field training component or weekend residencies. Shorter certificate programs do not have a residency. Alliant uses Canvas as its learning management system.

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

Program and course reviewed and LMS demonstration undertaken with directors and faculty across the programs representing the largest percentage of enrolled students. Faculty, online students, student advisors, instructional designers, instructional technologist and Information Technology interviews completed. Interviews completed in February 2020 and in September 2020 including a discussion with diverse university representatives of the online programs relative to the new COVID remote teaching environment. Material examined included student outcomes and student surveys.

Observations and Findings

<p>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</p>	<p>Observations and Findings</p>	<p>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</p>
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>Alliant’s distance education program fits with its mission and aligns with its plan to achieve financial stability through enrollment growth and efficiency. The programs sit within each school and are integrated into the regular institutional budget cycle.</p> <p>The online programs were established to extend Alliant’s ability to provide education and training to a broader community of students who seek the accessibility, flexibility, and instructional delivery methodology of the online educational environment. Alliant transitioned some high-quality programs with small cohorts and stronger outcomes offered at multiple campuses to the distance education format allowing the program to share faculty expertise across campuses and improve class size and program sustainability.</p> <p>Online programs are located within one of the institution’s schools. New programs are proposed through Alliant’s curricula action process, which requires full curriculum review including the school’s curriculum committee, the academic council, the provost office, as well as functional departments such as marketing, finance, financial aid, which review the program to ensure that the program is aligned with university policies, course scheduling parameters, and minimum units needed for various financial aid. Once approved, an implementation plan and timeline are developed by the school in concert with the Department of Online Learning. Representatives from marketing, financial aid, admissions, the registrar’s office, and compliance office, meet with academic representatives on a bi-weekly basis to support the successful launch of the approved program. The budget for the program is proposed as part of the initial new program submission process and funded through the annual budget development and approval process run by the finance office.</p>	

<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>Distance education students are integrated into the university through deliberate touch points and activities with the primary linkage being the faculty.</p> <p>Students' connection to the University begins prior to admission; each prospective student is assigned to an admissions counselor who serves as liaison, coordinating interviews and informational meetings with program directors and faculty to further support applicants to render informed decisions regarding their educational careers. Upon admission the student is assigned the advisor to provide support throughout their time at Alliant beginning with an online "Walk-to-Class" during which the student's log-in credentials are validated and the student is oriented to the learning management system, the student portal, the library, and the student resources, including accessibility services, military and veteran's affairs, the student assistance program, and tutoring services. During the first week of class, the advisor monitors student activity and, should a student not log into a course by mid-week, will proactively reach out to the student to determine the assistance that might be needed.</p> <p>Faculty and Program Directors support students' integration into University life by providing on-going mentoring both within the virtual classroom and during virtual office hours. Faculty also make use of the Canvas LMS's announcement section to post video messages during courses/weeks when instruction is predominantly asynchronous. Most of Alliant's online degree programs have either a clinical practice/field training component and/or minimum of two weekend residencies during the course of study held on the campus most proximate to the majority of students in the program and organized well in advance of the scheduled dates. These residencies are often preceded by an evening social during which students have opportunities to socialize with peers, faculty, and the staff advisors.</p> <p>Online students are extended opportunities to engage in Alliant alumni events and activities, to receive discounts (such as those extended for continuing education), and attend lectures offered via webinars to ensure students from all locations can connect with enrichment opportunities. Examples are the CSPP Lecture Series, Dissertation Power Hour, and I-MERIT diversity and inclusive excellence speakers and activities. Online students are also encouraged to celebrate their educational accomplishment by participating in the University's commencement ceremonies.</p>	
---	--	--

<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>Alliant’s distance education infrastructure is adequate for current programs and degree offerings. As the university expands, additional investments in faculty development and support services including advising and technology will be required and are being assessed by leadership.</p> <p>Alliant’s online education program is delivered through the Canvas Learning Management System (LMS), which provides a robust learning platform allowing Alliant to deliver educational content. The technology is supported by Alliant’s in-house Department of Online Learning, which is overseen by the associate provost for strategic initiatives and partnerships and includes three instructional designers and one instructional technologist. This team provides pedagogical and technological support to faculty delivering content in the online environment and assists with the integration of a variety of supplemental tools, including Kaltura, Zoom, Issuu, and others to support a rich and interactive educational experience. Embedded in each course are a variety of assignments that can include discussion posts, role plays, groups presentations, individual presentations, and synchronous sessions and which support both peer-to-peer and faculty-to-student interactions.</p> <p>Online programs are also supported by Alliant’s Information Technology Department, which includes a university Helpdesk integrated with AlliantHELP that provides support to routine phone and email inquiries. The IT Help Desk that can address technological support needs either via e-mail or phone (Monday-Friday = 7:30am-7:30pm; Saturday = 7:30am-3:30pm). In addition to Alliant Help Desk hours, Canvas provides additional technology support for students and faculty who need assistance. Alliant’s learning management systems are cloud-based technologies run by third-party vendors who are responsible for management of the systems, system redundancy and back-up power. Alliant’s information technology department works with the vendor providers to plan system interruptions in advance, whenever possible. Canvas has a 99.9% guaranteed uptime (uptime has been 99.991% for Alliant during the latest 2.5-month reporting period). Planned interruptions are scheduled to minimize disruption during breaks and maintenance limited to non-impact or low-impact hours.</p>	
--	--	--

<p><i>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?</i></p>	<p>Students within Alliant's online programs have access to all the student resources available to the Alliant student community. These include academic and student advising, accessibility services, military and veteran affairs services, tutoring, library access, IT support, and career services. Access to frequently used academic resources, such as the library and tutoring services (Brainfuse) are embedded as links directly into the courses. Investment have been made to strengthen some of these services and others are expected to receive additional support once the COVID pandemic hiring freeze is lifted. These investments are necessary to improve student satisfaction and outcomes.</p> <p>The Alliant Library is a distributed network of print, electronic, and human resources. Focused print and media collections are maintained at the four primary campuses, but content is delivered across all locations – physically through courier service and electronically through online materials. Access to resources is facilitated through the Millennium web-based shared integrated library system. Library patrons can view all University holdings and easily request materials from anywhere in the system. The online catalog and its resources are available 24 hours a day, from internet-accessible computers, on- or off-campus. The library has focused on the shift to building its online journal and e-book collections and works with each program to ensure that enough materials are available.</p> <p>Distance learners can receive assistance by phone from any campus library during its regular hours of operation – the San Diego campus library is open the greatest number of hours (Monday-Thursday 8:30 am – 9 pm; Friday 8:30 am – 5 pm; Saturday 9 am – 5 pm; and Sunday 11 am – 5 pm). The librarians – who work in a distributed library system serving the Alliant community – are experts in serving students at a distance via multiple methods of communication including email, text and chat in addition to phone, Skype and Zoom.</p> <p>Net Promoter Score Satisfaction data from Spring 2019 (no survey was conducted in Spring 2020 because of the pandemic) is utilized to demonstrate effectiveness of services.</p> <p>Alliant has been working to improve all student satisfaction and services scores, and structurally shifted the advising department in the last year to provide students with a more seamless transition to services at Alliant.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><i>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?</i></p>	<p>Distance education faculty consist of a similar mix as on-ground, receive similar onboarding and development and participate in curriculum development and assessment in the same way as their on-ground counterparts. Many faculty teach in both on-ground and through distance education. Programmatic accreditor requirements guide the sufficiency of faculty for specific degrees. On-going training of distance education faculty requires greater focus.</p> <p>Consistent with on-ground programs, faculty in the online programs represent a mixture of core and adjunct faculty who are retained for their skills as educators, and their expertise within their respective fields. Faculty in programs that also have on-ground programs may teach in both modalities (an example is the marital and family therapy MA program). If the program was originally on ground, then the core faculty may have shifted to teach in an online/hybrid modality (an example is the school and educational psychology MAE and PsyD programs). Core faculty are usually 1.0 FTE, but some may be less than 1.0.</p> <p>Online faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated into academic life identically to on-ground faculty. All core faculty participate in a general onboarding orientation through Alliant’s human resources department, which provides a basic overview of the institution, employee rights and responsibilities, institutional policies and resources, and benefits. Core faculty also participate in an orientation by the Provost’s Office covering issues key to their role as faculty member and introducing them to resources that support their activities and experience as an Alliant faculty member. Online core faculty also have access to the same resources as those who teach on-ground, such as the library, continuing education at no cost and faculty development funds. Online core faculty participate in quarterly University Update webinars and Q&A sessions.</p> <p>Online faculty report to their program director who oversees the curriculum approval process and is responsible for working with Alliant’s department of Institutional Research and the Assessment Office to assess student and program learning outcomes and identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Program directors and core faculty are responsible for curricula development and assessment of student learning.</p> <p>The program director and core faculty are responsible for the development of program learning outcomes, a curriculum map and an assessment plan. The program director provides leadership for this effort, which is supported by assessment staff.</p> <p>All faculty who teach within the online environment receive one-on-one training with an instructional designer in the Department of Online Learning as well as general training through the Canvas learning library. The former ensures that the training is responsive to the individual faculty member’s knowledge and experience working in the online environment generally, and in the Canvas LMS specifically. Training is augmented by “train-the-trainer” sessions embedded in monthly online Program Director</p>	

	<p>meetings, during which best practices and innovative assignment designs are demonstrated and Program Directors who share this with their faculty.</p> <p>Online adjunct faculty are hired by the Program Director to teach one or more courses in the program in which the faculty member has specific expertise. The Provost's Office provides an orientation to Alliant through the Faculty Orientation SharePoint site, and adjunct faculty members are also oriented to the program and program expectations by the program director.</p>	
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>Online programs and courses are subject to the university curriculum action policies and the same development, review, approval and evaluation processes as on-ground programs and courses. Faculty, program directors and/or the School Dean propose a program or course based upon market need and alignment with the University's mission or program need.</p> <p>A new program is developed and subject to review by the School curriculum committee, the Academic Council, the Provost Council and, if applicable, the Academic, Faculty and Student Success Committee of the Board (formerly the Academic Affairs Committee) and reviewed by the Faculty Senate. The program/course is also reviewed by key departments, including marketing, admissions, the library, financial aid, finance, and institutional review to ensure alignment with Alliant policies and monitoring of any potential administrative issues.</p> <p>New program courses are designed by faculty with support from the instructional design team of the Department of Online Learning. For programs that are also offered on-ground, such as the Master of Arts in Clinical Counseling and Master of Arts in Marital Family Therapy, program learning outcomes, course learning outcomes and core content is consistent across modalities.</p> <p>Course changes occur through the university curriculum action process.</p> <p>Equivalency is also reviewed by the attainment of specialty accreditation, where available, across both on-ground and online programs.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What</p>	<p>Alliant collects retention and graduation data for students in online programs and has also been reviewing grades awarded to online students. Overall, distance education student performance needs to be improved and the efficient collection, assessment and implementation of initiatives is required. Alliant would benefit from a broader view of the student experience and a systematic approach to addressing gaps. New initiatives that attempt to address outcome gaps are underway and their effectiveness on improving student performance and reaching a predetermined benchmark are pending.</p>	

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?

Grade data for ground and online students continue to show that students in online courses are more likely than campus students to get a failing grade in most school and levels, although not in Education at the doctoral level.

Overall, current retention/graduation rates for the 2017-18 cohort to date for online programs are:

Programs	Graduated/ Completed	Active/ Reentering	Withdrawn	N
Graduate Certificate	90.1%	-	9.9%	192
Credentials	60.0%	5.3%	34.7%	150
Master's Degrees	57.0%	12.6%	30.4%	565
Doctorate	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%	7

Some online students who withdraw are stopping out and return for further study later.

Students in online programs have had a lower rate of graduation in some online programs compared to their current campus program counterparts. The differential is about 3% for the TESOL MAE. The Educational Leadership and Management program which recently transitioned to online has a higher attrition rate as well over the first three cohorts (50% vs. 26% on ground) although the number of students is limited. The online MBA program was discontinued due to a combination of low enrollment and a relatively higher attrition rate.

The 2017-18 year was the first year of online Marital and Family Therapy and Clinical Counseling program students. The online program modality had a much higher attrition rate than the on-campus programs. Administrative changes were made to improve program leadership and support (64% vs. 85% graduated or continuing on-campus). The online students in the Clinical Counseling program were retained at a similar rate as on campus students for the cohort (83% graduated or continuing vs. 84% on-campus).

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?

Assessment of student learning for online students is measured by attainment of course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, scores on key assignments and, successful completion of a dissertation, practica/internship and/or capstone project/comprehensive examination.

When the program is offered in both modalities, faculty use the same assessment plan and collect results by modality.

Examples are:

TESOL MA Education: percent of student meeting benchmark

TESOL MA 2018-19	Online	Ground/Campus
TES 7485 Research Paper	94.44% (N=18)	100% (N=32)
TES7410 Task or Content-Based Activity	100% (N=14)	100% (N=3)

Marital and Family Therapy MA: Compiled data from 2018-19 indicate comparable student learning outcomes. Examples are:

Assessment; SLO	Clinical Supervisor's Rating-Basic Skills-SLO 1	Clinical Supervisor's Rating Diversity-SLO 2	Clinical Supervisor's Rating-Community Engagement-SLO 3
Irvine	97.56%	100%	100%
Los Angeles	94.34%	100%	97.44%

Sacramento	97.59%	97.78%	100%
San Diego	94.89%	100%	98.61%
Online	100%	100%	100%

Exit Exam – December 2019 Administration

Location	MA Outcomes Exam Overall Average score	Percent Pass Rate
Irvine	--	--
Los Angeles	92% (N=1)	100%
Sacramento	60% (N=1)	0%
San Diego	80% (N=3)	100%
Online	76% (N=8)	87.5%
Overall Average of All Locations and Modalities	77% (n=13)	84.6%

Exit Exam – August 2020 Administration

Location	MA Outcomes Exam Overall Average score	Percent Pass Rate
Irvine	81.3% (N=18)	100%
Los Angeles	80.5% (N=13)	92%
Sacramento	83.2% (N=18)	100%
San Diego	85.3% (N=21)	100%
Online	71% (N=4)	50%
Overall Average of All Locations and Modalities	82 (n=74)	88.4%

Clinical Counseling: Data from the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) for the MA program in clinical counseling and from the comprehensive exam.

Exam	Alliant 2019-20 CPCE
Online	68.0 (N = 4)
On Campus (Fresno)	77.9 (N = 7)

These are the first four students graduating from the program in the online modality. The program director and faculty made several revisions to the program during 2018-19 to better ensure the curriculum and basic syllabi were the same for the two modalities, strengthen the alignment with

CACREP standards, and ensure consistency of practicum and internship supervision.

Teacher Education:

CCTC reported data on normed exams. The program is only offered online; comparison with State score are included.

Some data are available for teacher education program for required exams (Data are for Group 3 =Completers) where exam taker number meets the reportable threshold:

Exam (pass is 220)	Alliant Pass Rate/ Avg. Scaled Score	State Pass Rate/ Avg. Scaled Score
2017-18 CBEST- Traditional	100%/159	95%/156
2017-18 CBEST- Alternative	100%/166	94%/154
2017-18 RICA.1 Traditional	95%/234	95%/233
2017-18 RICA.1 Alternative	100%/236	94%/231
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject I Traditional	100%/242	95%/238
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject I Alternative	100%/246	94%/238
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject II Traditional	100%/251	95%/247
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject II Alternative	100%/250	94%/244
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject III Traditional	100%/246	95%/241
2017-18 CSET Multiple Subject III Alternative	100%/244	94%/240
2017-18 CSET English Subtest I – Alternative	100%/248	94%/245

2017-18 CSET English Subtest II Alternative	100%/255	95%/244
2017-18 CSET English Subtest III Alternative	100%/248	95%/242
2017-18 CSET Mathematics Subtest I Alternative	100%/241	95%/245
2017-18 CSET Mathematics Subtest II Alternative	100%/234	94%/242

As noted in the report, the teacher education programs are working to improve CSET pass rates by providing additional resources to students, working to more precisely embed content in the courses, and focus the students on the need to pass the CSET exam from the beginning of the program. The literacy curriculum has also been recently revised to focus more specifically on knowledge and skills necessary to pass the RICA exam.

School Counseling and School Psychology:

Through mid-August 2020 ETS summary report data and Alliant modality-disaggregated data indicate

Exam	Alliant Mean Score 2019-20	State Mean Score 2019-20	Campus takers in prior years
School Counselor	164.29 (N = 31)	165.16	164.67
School Psychology	159.43 (N = 72)	162.77	160.10

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 *Contracts with*

Alliant's online programs are developed, managed and delivered by Alliant faculty and staff. There are no contracts for services other than the Canvas LMS. This contract comports with WSCUC policies.

<p><i>Unaccredited Organizations?</i></p>		
<p><i>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?</i></p>	<p>The Quality Assurance processes for the online department parallel those of Alliant's on-ground programs. There are various types of review processes implemented. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence assesses Alliant's quality assurance processes and the team's recommendations. In summary, Alliant would benefit from a more systemic approach to reviewing and acting on data. Thus, the team recommends that Alliant strengthen and expand the strategic analysis of data to inform decisions about practices, policies, and the allocation of resources to bolster academic quality and student success</p> <p><u>Programs Outcomes:</u> Outcomes are assessed, and programs are generally meeting benchmarks. Areas for improvement are identified in the assessment process.</p> <p><u>Program Review:</u> Programs are subject to intensive program review; specialty accreditation program review can stand for the intensive program review. Program reviews cover all program modalities. Recent program reviews of online programs include the Marital and Family Therapy program – all modalities 2019-20 (COAMFTE specialty accreditation review-pending decision), and the intensive program review for the MA in clinical counseling program (both modalities although online had recently begun) 2019. The TESOL MAE (both modalities), clinical psychopharmacology and school and counseling MAE programs went through intensive review in 2018.</p> <p>Annual Reports. An annual report process assists in monitoring the assessment plan and key indicators. Continuous improvement plans are submitted.</p> <p><u>Specialty accreditation:</u> Online programs seek and gain specialty accreditation as another level of quality assurance where possible. Teacher education programs are accredited by CCTC, the marital and family therapy MA program is accredited by COAMFTE, the clinical psychopharmacology doctoral program is designated as meeting standards for Psychopharmacology training. The clinical counseling MA program (both online and on ground modalities) is seeking CACREP accreditation.</p> <p><u>Student Satisfaction:</u> The NPS is used to monitor student satisfaction. There are two scores: an NPA Promoter rating (range -100 to +100), and a satisfaction rating (those who rate 7 or above on satisfaction). A 0-10 scale is used for both questions. Fall 2019 data are below:</p>	

Ratings Fall 2019 – most recent survey	Online	On campus – <u>average</u> of 6 California campuses
NPS score (-100 to +100)	+2	-19
Satisfaction Percent	73.08%	71.37%

Of all locations including online, the Irvine campus has the highest ratings (15; 88.46%), and the San Francisco campus has the lowest ratings (-57; 56.18%)

Course satisfaction: Course evaluations for each course are collected via EvaluationKIT system. Results for on ground and online students are similar, with online courses scoring higher on the “course” items including use of technology and on campus courses scoring higher on the “instructor” items.

Online and on campus courses receive close ratings, with on campus courses only slightly above online. Across the system, the average score across 23 questions in the course evaluation for all course was:

Average of survey items for courses	Online	On campus
Fall 2019	4.37	4.40
Spring 2020	4.36	4.42

Online courses are rated slightly above on campus courses in the “course” questions, such as “Did the course achieve its objectives?” and slightly below on campus courses in “instructor” questions, such as, “Was the instructor’s own professional experience incorporated into the course?”. The online program directors and faculty have been working together to strengthen the interactions between online students and the instructor. An Online Engagement – Faculty Assessment Tools was developed to provide support online faculty and improve instructional, engagement and student feedback practices.

Faculty Expertise and Effectiveness: Online core faculty submit an annual report on their activities in a format required by the university as part of a

peer review process. Adjunct faculty are reviewed by program directors and provided with feedback on the Adjunct Faculty Feedback form.

Alumni and Completer Surveys: Most online program have conducted a recent alumni survey or have completer survey results from CCTC which provide indirect data on program quality and the student experience. Not all programs have conducted alumni surveys, which is an area for improvement.

Employment and Licensure Data: Data are collected on program completers. Data indicate that students are proceeding on a professional trajectory and getting jobs in their fields of study at Alliant. Some students engage in additional education at Alliant, such as continuing to a master's after a teaching credential, or a doctorate after a master's degree.

[1] See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general, only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.