

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
Special Visit

To: *Southern California University of Health Sciences*

Date of Visit
March 26-29, 2019

Team Roster

David M. Carlisle, MD, Ph.D., Chair
President, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science

Jan M Nick, PhD, RNC-OB, CNE, ANEF, FAAN, Assistant Chair
Professor, Loma Linda University

Juan Ramirez, Ph.D., Team member
Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Western University of Health Sciences

David Ely, Ph.D., Team member
Associate Dean, Fowler College of Business
San Diego State University

Barbara Gross Davis, Ph.D., WSCUC Staff Liaison
Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

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	3
A. Description of the Institution, and it’s Accreditation History.....	3
<i>WSCUC Accreditation History</i>	5
<i>Professional Accreditation History</i>	6
B. Description of the Team’s Review Process	7
C. Institution’s Special Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	8
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS	8
A. Issue 1: Financial sustainability (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.1).....	8
<i>Progress on the Issue</i>	9
<i>Ongoing Concerns or Need for Maturation</i>	12
B. Issue 2: Program Review (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6).....	14
<i>Progress on the Issue</i>	14
<i>Ongoing Concerns or Need for Maturation</i>	15
C. Issue 3: Professional Accreditation (CFR 2.1, 2.2 2.6, 2.10-2.13, 3.1).....	16
<i>Progress on the Issue</i>	17
<i>Accreditation Status for Doctor of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine</i>	17
<i>Accreditation Status for Doctor of Chiropractic</i>	18
<i>Accreditation Status for Master of Science: Physician Assistant</i>	19
SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution, and its Accreditation History

In 1911, an individual, Charles Cale with his wife, opened a training school under the name Los Angeles College of Chiropractic (LACC); over the next forty years, the school matured into an academic model. By 1950, LACC provided a four-year degree and because of institutional growth, moved to Glendale, CA. The chiropractic program continued to expand, so they moved to its current location in the fall 1981—still bearing the name LACC. In 2000, the institution expanded academic offerings by adding a College of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine. It was at this time that the institution was renamed as “**Southern California University of Health Sciences**” (SCU) to reflect a broadening of its mission to include more than chiropractic care. SCU continues to grow and add health sciences programs.

The health-focused mission of the university is to “develop competent, caring, and successful integrative healthcare practitioners.” The university strives to provide evidence-based integrative education and training in order to create graduates who are both sound clinical practitioners and leaders in the future of integrative health care.

There are currently four separate academic structures at SCU. Three Colleges offer health sciences graduate degrees and one School of Professional Studies offers an undergraduate degree:

1. **Los Angeles College of Chiropractic** (LACC) offers one terminal degree program, the Doctor of Chiropractic. The college also offers several clinical residencies.
2. **College of Eastern Medicine** (CEM) (originally named the College of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine-CAOM) offers two graduate programs in

Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine. The Master's program (MAOM) started in 2000, and the recent Doctoral degree (DACM) began in 2014. Since starting the doctoral program in Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine, the Master's program has seen declining enrollment while the DACM enrollment has increased.

3. **College of Science and Integrative Health (CSIH)** was established in 2014, and offers a Master of Science: Physician Assistant (MSPA)
4. **School of Professional Studies (SPS)**, founded in 2008, SPS houses the Accelerated Sciences pre-requisite courses, and certificates in Ayurveda, and Massage Therapy and the newest program, the BS in Biological Sciences (started in 2014). A previous certificate, Yoga instruction, is no longer available. The School of Professional Studies has plans to expand further by offering a Clinical Genomics & Precision Medicine Program in the future. The program curriculum is completed, well-qualified faculty have been identified, and the institution is moving through steps for requisite approvals. The program has been announced on the institution's website but they are not accepting students—the intention is for the advertising to be informational in nature.

In addition to the academic programs, certificates, residencies and internships, the institution is investigating the viability of adding three new doctoral programs: Physical Therapy (DPT), and Occupational Therapy (DOT). SCU has no off-campus or distance programs, but the Accelerated Science courses use a hybrid model for educating the students. The student enrollment for fall 2018 was 1208 students (headcount) divided amongst the academic programs and certificate programs whether full-time or part-time.

WSCUC Accreditation History

SCU was first accredited by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) in 1993 under the name Los Angeles College of Chiropractic and received reaffirmation in 1998. In 2000, the institution underwent a name change to SCU and received approval from WSCUC to add another program, the MS Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine. Several years later, with the advent of the new accreditation model, the Commission canceled a fifth-year report due in 2003 and scheduled a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) for 2008 with an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) scheduled for spring 2010.

During the 2008 CPR visit, the team identified institutional issues of: operational deficit, planning, need for increasing enrollment, retention and graduation rates, need to make progress on educational effectiveness, and better support of faculty. Because of the findings, WSCUC requested an interim report due March 2009 and asked that the institution respond to ongoing issues over finances and enrollment. In April 2009, WSCUC accepted the interim report from SCU based on its improved systems for admission and its progress on its strategic plan. However, WSCUC had continued concerns over the financial condition of the university, admission, retention and graduation rates, and measures and results related to educational effectiveness and therefore asked that the institution address these issues in the 2010 EER institutional report. After the EER visit in spring 2010, the Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation in June 2010, but also issued a formal Notice of Concern and requested another interim report due March 2011, again, focusing on finances and enrollment management. Additionally, WSCUC scheduled a special visit for 2012 that focused on financial stability, enrollment management, planning, educational effectiveness, and leadership. The results from the special visit in 2012 were sufficiently positive that the Commission acted to remove the

formal Notice of Concern, and scheduled an Offsite Review in October 2016, followed by the reaccreditation visit for April 2017.

During the April 2017 visit, the reaccreditation team found five issues that needed further attention and development: (1) financial sustainability, (2) program review process, (3) issues raised by professional accreditors, (4) assessment of co-curricular and certificate programs, and (5) faculty workload, compensation, and evaluation. In response, the Commission Action Letter dated June 30, 2017, WSCUC required a Special Visit for spring 2019 at which time the team would evaluate progress on the first three issues of achieving financial sustainability, implementing a program review process that leverages professional accreditation and other data collection systems, and addressing the issues raised by the California Acupuncture Board and the Council on Chiropractic Education.

Despite the last 10 years of intensive contact with WSCUC, SCU has continued to grow programs specializing in healthcare. The institution applied for and received WSCUC approval for the Doctor in Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine (DACM) in February 2014, the BS in Biological Sciences (BSBS) in June 2014, and the MS in Physician Assistant (MSPA) in August, 2015.

Professional Accreditation History

In addition to institutional accreditation by WSCUC, several programs also undergo programmatic accreditation by professional accrediting bodies. At the 2017 visit, the WSCUC reaccreditation team reviewed reports from professional accreditors regarding programs on campus, and included a recommendation to resolve the issues prior to the current WSCUC Special Visit. The institution responded and the program accreditation achievements *will be*

discussed in depth in Issue 3 of this report. The programs accredited by professional programmatic accreditors are:

1. The Council on Chiropractic Education (CCE)-responsible for accrediting the Doctor of Chiropractic program.
2. The Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (ACAOM)-responsible for accrediting the MS in Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine and Doctor of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine programs.
3. The Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA)-responsible for accrediting the MS in Physician Assistant (MSPA).

B. Description of the Team’s Review Process

The Special Visit team gained access to WSCUC historical documents on the institution on November 19, 2018 and received access to the SCU institutional report on January 16, 2019. Based on the Commission Action Letter, dated June 30, 2017, the team focused its review on the three areas identified earlier. The team reviewed the submitted documents, prepared comments and questions using the formatted “Team Worksheet” provided by WSCUC, and used this worksheet during the teleconference session held on Tuesday, March 19, 2019. In addition, the chair of the Special Visit team spoke with the president on February 14, 2019 to discuss the upcoming visit.

During the on-site visit held on March 26-29, 2019, the team reviewed additional documents provided in the document room, interviewed groups and individuals. The team also monitored the confidential email account provided by WSCUC.

C. **Institution’s Special Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence**

As part of the review process, the visiting team read the 38 page “2019 SCU WSCUC Special Visit Report” submitted by the institution and the accompanying 50 appendices. The team also reviewed additional evidence and materials in the document room and any additional requested materials. SCU was able to produce all requested materials in a responsive and timely manner.

The institution submitted an organized, well written, and detailed report that fully addressed the institution's response to the Commission Action Letter (CAL), dated June 30, 2017 regarding the five recommendations in the letter, although the focus of the Special Visit was only on the first three issues. Overall, the report reflected an authentic self-assessment of the institution’s status at the time of its writing.

According to the narrative, and confirmed by subsequent conversations with the steering committee, there were broad levels of involvement in the generation of the report. Specifically, individuals were assigned to take lead on each element based on role and expertise, but those leading the section, involved other appropriate constituents to contribute to the report. These constituents included administration, faculty and staff.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. **Issue 1: Financial sustainability** (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.1)

WSCUC communicated three sub-recommendations regarding financial stability in its letter of June 30, 2017. They were to: (1) align revenue flows with operating needs and expenses, (2) optimize enrollment by leveraging the institution’s expanded marketing and admissions expertise and developing a strategic plan to improve recruiting outcomes for

programs with growth potential, as demonstrated by rigorous market analysis, and (3) grow extramural support by cultivating relationships with alumni and community members who share SCU's vision for integrative healthcare, increasing Board of Regents contributions, and seeking extramural funds from foundations and/or government grants. (CFR 3.4)

Progress on the Issue

SCU's institutional response to the WSCUC Accreditation Visit team report, submitted on June 2, 2017, identified planned actions to address long-term financial stability. These included cutting expenditures in the short term, refining their segmented financial reporting process, improving marketing and recruitment efforts, engaging a consultant to assess the feasibility of the current development plan, and cultivating relationships with alumni. (CFR 3.4) In preparation for the Special Visit, the team reviewed the (1) narrative on SCU's financial situation in its institutional report, (2) audited financial statements for years ended August 31, 2016, August 31, 2017, and August 31, 2018, (3) the Cabinet's budget cost cutting decisions, (4) the Board-approved FY18-19 budget, and (5) accounting projections for FY18-19 as of January 31, 2019. Financial sustainability was discussed in most of the sessions held throughout the visit. (CFR 3.4, 3.7)

SCU has experienced operating deficits since FY1516. For FY1718, operating revenue, gains and other support increased by 10.7% while operating expenses increased by 15.0%, resulting in a change in net assets of -\$3.6 million. At mid-year, SCU projected that operating revenue, gains and other support will increase in FY1819 by 9.5% while operating expenses will increase by 7.6%. SCU projects that the change in its net assets for FY1819 will be -\$3.5 million, an unfavorable variance to budget of -\$2.9 million. (CFR 3.4) SCU has a composite ratio of 2.2 and the capacity to absorb projected near-term deficits. As of August

31, 2018, SCU held \$35.0 million in total assets, including over \$20 million in Cash and Cash Equivalents and Investments, and had \$10.5 million in total liabilities. (CFR 3.4)

SCU leadership explained to the team that the recent revenue shortfalls were primarily due to fewer enrolled students than planned. The factors underlying lower enrollments are myriad. They include a decision to delay the start of one program, lower than expected lead-to-enroll conversion rates in some programs, the presence of several small cohorts arising from past weak admissions cycles, a requirement that the accreditor of the MS Physician Assistant (MSPA) program approve changes to cohort size, and requiring newly-admitted students to submit an intent-to-enroll deposit. (CFR 3.4, 4.1)

In response to anticipated revenue shortfalls, the institution enacted mid-year cuts in FY1819. Managing expenses is challenging for SCU because the institution is at a stage where new programs incur development costs but revenue flows have not substantially materialized. SCU is also operating with business systems in need of upgrades and, given its current size, is unable to benefit from economies of scale. (CFR 3.4) SCU recognizes the urgent need to identify a pathway to financial sustainability and has been actively investigating a wide-range of tactics to achieve this goal. Since the 2017 Accreditation Visit, SCU has initiated steps to expand revenues and manage expenses.

The MS Physician Assistant program, launched in fall 2016, is exhibiting strong demand and has contributed toward higher enrollments. Science-based prerequisite courses, offered in an accelerated format, have proven to be popular enough that a hybrid option has been implemented, course offerings have been expanded, and classes are now scheduled on additional days of the week. A new program in genomics is in development. SCU expects that the introduction of new programs will contribute 5% to enrollment growth over the next 5

years. SCU is creating a segmented financial report that will lead to a more accurate calculation of each programs' financial contribution, allowing the institution to concentrate on growing those programs that can generate the greatest return. (CFR 3.4, 3.7, 4.1)

SCU has acted to improve the marketing and recruiting functions. Adoption of a more rigorous approach to measuring new student quality has led to better retention and a larger share of students keeping pace with their cohort. Spending on marketing has increased and the institution has engaged several outside vendors to improve lead generation and lead-to-enroll conversation rates. Additional steps taken by SCU include establishing additional articulation agreements and moving to a flat-rate tuition model to address students' concern over rising tuition costs. SCU leadership noted during the visit that spring 2019 enrollments had moved in a positive direction. (CFR 3.4, 4.1)

Largely by expanding contributions from advancement efforts and revenues from SCU Health Systems, the institution plans to lower its dependency on tuition from 90% of revenue to 75% by 2023. Recent advancement efforts have included greater outreach to alumni through organizing a class reunion, publishing a newsletter, social media, a jobs board, a career fair, and a website with donation functionality. Efforts to increase Board of Regents contributions have also been taken, though Board giving is not yet 100%. The team congratulates SCU for their collaboration with Dartmouth College for which a \$1.6 million in National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant funding was awarded and will yield increased scholarly productivity and future potential grants. (CFR 3.4)

To manage expenses, SCU has engaged consultants to review multiple business processes to identify opportunities to become more efficient. It plans to outsource information technology functions over the next year, and upgrades to the enterprise and student

information systems are in planning stages. While SCU can reasonably expect that improvements in information systems will lead to efficiencies, cost savings have not yet been realized. SCU has also actively reached out to other higher education institutions to explore possible partnerships that would lead to cost-sharing arrangements. A consortium or merger are possible forms of partnership under consideration. A merger could also offer the benefit of revenue diversification. At the time of the visit, two partners have been identified for the development of a possible consortium or merger and due diligence process is now ongoing. SCU has also sought to balance the need to align expenses with revenue against the goal of adequately supporting existing programs and investing in new programs. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

Ongoing Concerns or Need for Maturation

SCU recognizes the urgency of addressing its financial situation and the Special Visit team acknowledges their efforts to grow enrollments and to lower expenses. These goals are incorporated into SCU's refreshed strategic plan that now extends to 2023. While many of the initiatives will positively impact SCU's financial sustainability, the realization of the benefits will, in all likelihood, be several years into the future. The newly created MSPA and hybrid accelerated science courses are notable successes. However, enrollment and revenues do not materialize immediately with the creation of a new program. Marketing and recruiting campaigns take time to reach prospective students and to convert prospects into enrolled students. Additionally, a program is not fully enrolled until sufficient admissions cycles have been conducted to reach a steady state where cohorts are enrolled at every stage. The team commends SCU for initiating multiple tactics to expand and deepen relationships with alumni and community supporters. However, the team observes that development campaigns tend to show success only after years of steady relationship building. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

Upgrading campus-wide information systems and reforming business processes will generate efficiencies. However, such changes can be disruptive as the campus community migrates from one system or process to another. Efficiency gains may be substantial once migration is complete and administrators and staff become proficient at using the functions of the new system; however, the net efficiencies may be small at first. Forming a consortium or merging with another institution could also yield substantial efficiency benefits once integration is complete. However, SCU administrators will initially need to allocate time and resources toward defining new processes, responsibilities, decision making, and communications within a new organizational structure. Thus, the largest gains may not materialize for several years into the future. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

The reaccreditation team report for the reaffirmation visit in 2017 notes that the institution projected moving out of a deficit situation by FY1718 but that small enrollment shortfalls would shift the institution from financial surpluses to deficits. The goal of generating financial surpluses starting in FY1718 has not been achieved. Furthermore, financial performance in FY1819 is expected to fall short of budgeted targets. The Special Visit team commends SCU leadership for planning a FY1920 budget with revenues sufficient to cover expenses and to create a contingency fund. However, this will be challenging to achieve given the size of the deficit in the current year. Fortunately, SCU's liquid assets provide some capacity to absorb future losses. However, this capacity is lessened somewhat by the presence of an outstanding balance of \$3 million on a line of credit. (CFR 3.4)

In summary, the team commends SCU for recognizing the urgency of addressing its financial situation and the multiple tactics it is pursuing to create a path toward financial sustainability. However, the sense of the team is that the full realization of the benefits from

the planned actions will be several years into the future. Thus, financial sustainability remains a concern in the near-term.

B. Issue 2: Program Review (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6)

At the conclusion of the 2017 reaffirmation cycle, the WSCUC commission recommended that SCU “demonstrate successful implementation of a program review that leverages professional accreditation and other existing data collection systems.” SCU was advised to develop a review process that includes a longitudinal evaluation of student learning outcomes, opportunity for reflection and action planning, and to continue to build a data-informed culture. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3)

Progress on the Issue

SCU has taken significant steps to address these recommendations since that time. The institution developed an updated program review guide that was approved by various committees, with implementation in August of 2018. Under the new guidelines, academic programs will undertake a comprehensive review every six years which is aligned with professional accreditation timetables as appropriate. The institution’s process incorporates an external review with a site visit, the development of an action plan, and a method for tracking progress. The program review guide provides an eight-year schedule that included all SCU programs. The deans of the colleges/school created a process to “close the loop” and have the Deans’ Council review the findings and make recommendations for actions as the final step in the program review process. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.6)

The focus of the program review self-study also appears to align with good practices. Among other things, programs reflect on their mission/vision, curriculum, student and faculty profiles (including workload), admissions data, and student learning outcomes. An outcomes

assessment process that requires programs and colleges to send reports to the University Assessment Committee on an annual basis further bolsters assessment of student learning. (CFR 4.1)

SCU is also investing resources to support the implementation and sustainability of program review. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) has added staff, and an updated OIE structure will oversee institutional research, as well as the coordination of outcomes assessment and program review. While the position for Director of Assessment and Quality Improvement, which coordinates all institutional assessment activities, was vacant at the time of the visit, merging each of these functions should enable SCU to enhance data-informed decision-making. (CFRs 4.2, 4.3) Onsite discussions with representatives of the Ayurveda and Massage Therapy programs, both currently under review, revealed that they were on schedule, well supported, and had a good understanding of the program review process. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.1)

Ongoing Concerns or Need for Maturation

While SCU should be commended for responding in good faith to WSCUC recommendations on program review, there remain some areas that still need to mature. For example, while implementation of program review appeared to be going well, no SCU program had completed the process using the updated guide at the time of the visit. Self-study reports for the Ayurveda and Massage Therapy programs are due in July of 2019, with external visits to occur in the fall. It is crucial for the review process for these, and future programs, to stay on time to capitalize on the momentum they have created around a culture of evidence.

Furthermore, the team noted a relative scarcity of documentation to supplement the completion of program reviews. To bridge any existing gaps and eliminate uncertainties about

the review process, additional worksheets, definitions, guides, rubrics, templates, and other materials are needed. For instance, supporting documentation could be used to help programs prepare for the review, collect and use data, write a self-study, or create an action plan. Educational trainings or additional instructions intended to guide external reviewers would also be appropriate.

The team also suggests that SCU revisit how they plan to leverage professional accreditation. Under the updated guide, programs complete the internal program review process before starting professional accreditation activities. What's more, professionally accredited programs would host two separate external visits, one under each process (professional and institutional). This arrangement could lead to unnecessary duplication or worse yet, conflicting sets of recommendations for programs to consider. It would likely be more effective, and less costly, for SCU to develop a strategy to incorporate the professional accreditation reviews into their review process and create a system whereby programs that undergo professional accreditation are not required to have external review by visiting faculty as part of the institutional program review process.

In summary, the team believes that SCU has put in place a solid program review process that needs some supporting materials (e.g., a template for a program's self-study) and time to mature.

C. Issue 3: Professional Accreditation (CFR 2.1, 2.2 2.6, 2.10-2.13, 3.1)

At the conclusion of the 2017 reaffirmation cycle, the WSCUC commission recommended that SCU "Continue to address issues raised by the California Acupuncture Board (CAB) and the Council on Chiropractic Education (CCE)." (CFR 2.1)

Progress on the Issue

Accreditation Status for Doctor of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine

The addition of a College of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine in 2000 marked the initial expansion of SCU beyond its origins as the Los Angeles College of Chiropractic. Initially offering a Master's Degree in Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (MAOM) in 2000, an entry-level Doctor of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (DACM) degree was added in 2014.

The California Acupuncture Board (CAB), a unit of the California Department of Consumer Affairs, regulates acupuncture programs. Students graduating from CAB-approved programs are eligible to take the California Licensing Exam in order to become licensed to practice acupuncture in California.

CAB denied the initial May 2016 application by SCU for approval of the DACM because of non-compliance with curriculum requirements. A re-submission in early 2017, prior to SCU's site visit, was also denied approval by the CAB because of non-compliance with CAB curriculum requirements. SCU re-submitted a third application to the CAB in June 2017 and was granted approval to award the DACM degree. In the letter from CAB to the institution, it stated "the DACM is approved for demonstrating full compliance with Board curriculum requirements." The website for CAB (<https://www.acupuncture.ca.gov/students/schools.shtml>) presently lists the SCU DACM on its Approved Training Programs page as having been approved effective 8/9/17. Additionally, the Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine includes SCU on its list of approved programs (Directory of Accredited/Pre-accredited Programs and Institutions -

<http://acaom.org/directory-menu/directory/>) under its “Approved Doctorate” tab. This listing, however, does not further specify the ongoing status of the DACM. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.10-2.13)

The team commends SCU for addressing the issues raised by the California Acupuncture Board as well as achieving professional accreditation for the Doctor of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine degree.

Accreditation Status for Doctor of Chiropractic

In February 2017, the Council on Chiropractic Education (<http://www.cce-usa.org/>) reaffirmed the accreditation status of the SCU Doctor of Chiropractic (DC) degree for another eight years, yet also placed the DC program on probation effective February 2017 due to concerns over standards and policy, namely in the area of Mission, Planning, and Assessment. Specific concerns included: being in the early stages of assessment, inability to analyze and interpret data due to data integrity issues, inability to identify and track AATP students, and inability to show evidence of Meta-Competency achievement of outcomes. In January 2018, the CCE removed the probationary status and instead assigned a “Warning” to the DC program. To follow up, the CCE performed a site visit to the DCP later that year in fall 2018. CCE, in a letter dated January 2019 removed the sanction of warning, based on the findings from the fall visit, considers the concern resolved. The SCU DC program is listed on the Accredited Doctor of Chiropractic Programs/Institutions page of the CCE website (<http://www.cce-usa.org/dcp-info.html>). (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 2.10-2.13)

The team commends SCU for addressing the issues raised by the Council on Chiropractic Education.

Accreditation Status for Master of Science: Physician Assistant

The Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) provides accreditation to Physician Assistant programs in the United States. The SCU Physician Assistant Program opened in 2015 with initial provisional accreditation from the ARC-PA and graduated its first class of 26 students in December 2018. Accreditation by the ARC-PA is a three-step process that includes three site visits over a period of three years. In September of 2018, the SCU PA program received its second site visit. The ARC-PA then presented the PA program with 14 observations. In October 2018 the SCU program provided the ARC-PA with responses to the observations. After a Commission meeting in March 2019, the program expects to receive a Commission decision regarding the continuing status of the SCU PA Program in April 2019. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.6)

The team commends SCU for launching a Physician Assistant program that advances the institution's mission, expands the university's portfolio of integrative healthcare programs, and enhances financial performance.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Special Visit team was encouraged by the institution's attention to detail, clarity of mission, candidness, and efforts at working through each issue to create a more sustainable financial model, advance program review, and achieve programmatic professional accreditation. The result was a smooth, well-organized special visit and the team received sufficient information to make informed interpretations.

In summary, the team believes that SCU has taken the process of institutional accreditation seriously and has addressed Commission concerns in two of the three areas.

Financial sustainability continues to be an issue. Below are the official commendations and recommendations from the team.

Commendations

The Special Visit team commends the institution for:

1. Cultivating an educational model of team-based, collaborative care that prepares students for integrative health practice.
2. Launching a Physician Assistant program that advances the institution's mission, expands the university's portfolio of integrative healthcare programs, and enhances financial performance.
3. Addressing the issues raised by the Council on Chiropractic Education and the California Acupuncture Board as well as achieving professional accreditation for the Doctor of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine degree.
4. Establishing the infrastructure for a program review process that includes a longitudinal evaluation of indicators of educational effectiveness and incorporates reflection and action planning.
5. Recognizing the urgent need to identify a pathway to financial sustainability and actively investigating a wide range of strategies to achieve this goal.

Recommendations

The Special Visit team recommends that SCU:

1. Achieve financial stability by: (CFR 3.4)
 - a. Aligning revenue flows with operating needs and expenses;
 - b. Optimizing enrollment by continuing to adjust marketing and recruiting processes and, where beneficial, by partnering with effective vendors;

- c. Continuing to explore, develop, and implement improvements in business processes that are intended to boost efficiency; and
 - d. Continuing to diversify revenue streams by using newly established outreach programs to expand relationships with alumni and community members, improve Board of Regents contributions, and seek extramural funds from foundation and government sources.
2. Implement the program review process by: (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.3)
- a. Developing and applying additional worksheets, definitions, guides, and templates to support the review process;
 - b. Clarifying the relationship between the professional accreditation process and institutional program review to minimize duplication of efforts; and
 - c. Adhering to the established program review schedule.