REPORT OF THE WASC TEAM

SPECIAL FOCUSED VISIT FOR INITIAL ACCREDITATION

To NewSchool of Architecture and Design

November 13 through 15, 2013

Team Roster

Stephen Beal, Chair
President, California College of the Arts

Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Principal Institutional Research Analyst, UCLA

Carol Ann Gittens
Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences, Santa Clara University

Mary Matyseck
Associate Professor, Art Center College of Design

Jennifer Rissler
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, San Francisco Art Institute

Barbara Gross Davis
Vice President, WASC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University 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.

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 WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit 3
B. The Quality of the Focused Visit Report and Supporting Evidence 6
C. Description of the Team's Review Process 7

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES OF FOCUS

A. Issue: Strengthening the Systems and Processes for Assessment of Student Learning 8
B. Issue: Refining Program Review and Creating a Culture of Evidence 19
C. Issue: Understanding Student Success 27
D. Issue: Developing the Governing Board 33
E. Issue: Clarifying Budget Preparation and Management 37

SECTION III. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 44

APPENDICES 46

Student Complaints Review
Marketing and Recruitment Review

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

In 1980, the NewSchool of Architecture was founded in response to the absence of four-year architecture undergraduate degree programs in the San Diego region. The institution left its initial Chula Vista site and moved to its current urban San Diego campus in 1988. Since the late 1980s, several for-profit enterprises have owned the institution in succession. Bislin Education Corporation, a subsidiary of Futures in Education, Inc., acquired the NewSchool of Architecture first, followed by ForeFront Education, Inc., which acquired the institution in 2001 and changed its name to the NewSchool of Architecture and Design (NSAD). NSAD is currently maintained as a separate legal entity, NewSchool of Architecture and Design, LLC, which has been a subsidiary of Laureate Education, Inc., (Laureate) since 2008. Laureate is a for-profit education company that is affiliated with or owns a total of 78 higher education institutions on six continents, including programs in art, architecture, and design offered through more than 30 institutions in 17 countries.

NSAD was granted initial accreditation by the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS) in 1994, and the institution's Master of Architecture and Bachelor of Architecture degrees have been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) since 1998. The Executive Master of Architecture degree has been NAAB-accredited since 2001. NSAD currently enrolls students in a total of nine

degree programs. The institution offers six programs in architecture: two bachelor's degrees (Bachelor of Architecture and Bachelor of Arts in architecture, established in 1980); and four master's degrees (Master of Architecture I, Master of Architecture II, and Master of Science in architecture, established in 1991; Executive Master of Architecture, established in 1996). In allied disciplines, NSAD offers three additional bachelor's degrees (Bachelor of Science in design media arts, established in 2009; Bachelor of Science in construction management, established in 2010; Bachelor of Interior Design, established in 2013), and one master's degree (Master of Construction Management, established in 2011). A Master of Science in landscape architecture has suspended new enrollments. The institution's degree programs are organized into three schools, established within NSAD in 2012: The NewSchool of Architecture; the Domus Academy School of Design at NSAD; and the Media Design School of Digital Arts at NSAD.

In fall 2013, 514 students enrolled at NSAD, 375 undergraduates and 139 graduate students. The largest degree programs were the Bachelor of Architecture (329 students) and the Master of Architecture (102 students, totaling the Master of Architecture I and II programs). The Master of Construction Management, offered solely (100%) online, enrolled 25 students in fall 2013, and a limited number of general education sections have been instructed online for the undergraduate programs; however, no online general education sections were offered fall 2013. The institution educates a commuter student population, 71% male and 29% female, with an average age of 23.5 for undergraduate students and 29.4 for graduate students. The ethnic/racial background of NSAD students as of fall 2013 was as follows: <1% American Indian or Alaskan native; 9% Asian

American; 4% black or African American; 29% Hispanic or Latino; 30% white; 3% two or more races; 14% non-resident alien; and 11% unknown ethnicity/race.

The WASC Eligibility Review Committee approved NSAD's application for Eligibility in a letter dated January 14, 2011. The institution was authorized to pursue the Pathway B initial accreditation process, a WASC review track designed for institutions currently holding accreditation with an accreditor recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. The institution's comprehensive review self-study for initial accreditation was submitted by NSAD, and the initial Pathway B visit took place March 14 to 16, 2012. In a letter dated July 9, 2012, the Commission decided not to authorize Initial Accreditation but did grant Candidacy to NSAD for four years, through spring 2016, and scheduled both a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) (spring 2013) and an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) (spring 2014) for Initial Accreditation.

After further consideration and policy development related to the Pathway B process, the Commission, in a letter dated February 25, 2013, approved a single focused visit in place of the CPR and EER. In fall 2013, the single focused visit was scheduled to address five specific issues identified in the July 9, 2012, Commission letter granting Candidacy, thus providing the institution with the opportunity to establish its substantial compliance with WASC Standards without requiring a re-examination of "Standards and Criteria already found to have been met during the 2012 visit."

In 2013, four substantive change proposals from NSAD were reviewed and approved by WASC's Substantive Change Committee. All four approvals were at the bachelor's degree level. Three of the programs – Bachelor of Arts degrees in animation and in game art, and a Bachelor of Science in game programming – are to be offered by the Media Design School of Digital Arts at NSAD, and the fourth program, a Bachelor of Arts in product design, will join the newly established interior design bachelor's program in the Domus Academy School of Design at NSAD.

In addition to concentrating its review on the five issues of focus for this visit, the team completed the required appendices regarding NSAD's student complaints policy and its marketing and recruitment.

B. The Quality of the Focused Visit Report and Supporting Evidence

The institution's focused visit report aligns with the five issues as they are stated in the Commission's letter of July 9, 2012, with a section devoted to each issue, each section separated into the following subsections: summary of key issues, action to address key issues, reflection of effectiveness and impact, and plans for continuous improvement. The relevant institutional constituencies were consulted in the preparation of the report, including NSAD's faculty, administration, and staff, with the extent of participation of each group varying given the issue being explored. For example, more elaborate contributions of faculty and program chairs developed the description of learning outcomes assessment and program review, while the institutional research staff provided

the statistics and analysis required for the section exploring student success measured with graduation and retention rates. Items of evidence expanded on the report's content successfully, and the tables and diagrams included as figures in the report elaborated on various points developed in the narrative. In the team's judgment, over a relatively brief period of time, the institution's culture has transformed toward an embrace of evidence-based decision making, which was documented through the focused visit report's account of assessment and program review processes that drive budgeting and planning at NSAD. The balance of data and other evidence presented in this institutional report outlines the current status of these systems and how they address the five issues of focus.

The team appreciated the institution's candid participation in this review process and how generously it disclosed the information and analysis that the team required to observe and to evaluate NSAD's status regarding the five issues of focus. It is the team's goal in this report to analyze the evidence presented in the institution's focused visit report and additional evidence collected during the visit, to review the extent to which NSAD has addressed the focused issues substantially as they relate to the WASC Standards.

C. Description of the Team's Review Process

The team's members studied the institution's focused visit report independently. During the pre-visit conference call, the team discussed its initial impressions of the institution's status regarding the focused issues as well as strategies for investigation to be undertaken during the visit. In advance of the visit, the team requested additional materials from the

institution, and these materials were supplied electronically before the team's arrival or made available in the team's meeting room at NSAD. Reports, documents, and analyses that were requested by the team during the scheduled visit were provided promptly by NSAD's faculty, staff, and administration.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES OF FOCUS

A. Strengthening the Systems and Processes for Assessment of Student Learning

From the Commission letter, July 9, 2012:

> "As the team noted, 'The tools, mechanisms and commitment all existed to make the process of assessment more broadly institutionalized' at NSAD, but more progress is needed. The Commission appreciated hearing that efforts are underway to map learning outcomes across courses, programs and the institution. NSAD will need to continue this work to (1) articulate and integrate student learning outcomes across the curriculum at the course, program and institutional levels; (2) take steps to assess whether students are meeting expected levels of performance (using direct assessments of student work products); and (3) develop a process for systematically addressing areas of concern identified through assessment to improve the curriculum and pedagogy. NSAD might consider unbundling some of its larger learning outcomes (for example, research skills) and measure them with focused rubrics 'to gauge improvement of all parts of the skill

set.' A positive step is your announcement that workshops are being planned for faculty to enhance their expertise and engagement in the assessment of student learning, which is an important step in creating a broader culture of assessment. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7-2.9)"

A specific focus of this visit was to ascertain the degree to which NSAD has strengthened the systems and processes of student learning assessment throughout the institution. It was acknowledged at the time of the previous peer review that NSAD had established tools, mechanisms, and commitment, but more time was needed to generate sufficient evidence that a culture of assessment had truly taken hold. The team observed considerable evidence to affirm that NSAD adopted the practice of evaluating student learning and of engaging in evidence-based decision making to promote curricular and pedagogical improvements, to enhance educational quality, and to support student success. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7-2.9)

Integration of Student Learning Outcomes across the Curriculum

During the course of interviews with the president, provost, faculty, and the staff of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), the team learned that the NSAD community had been engaged in a disciplined and concentrated process of identifying and articulating NSAD's mission, values, and student learning outcomes. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2) It merits comment that since the initial visit the NSAD administration made two key administrative changes that directly impacted the institution's ability to achieve dramatic

improvements in student learning assessment. The first was establishing the special assistant to the president for institutional effectiveness and planning as a member of NSAD's administration. The special assistant to the president joined NSAD full-time from a position at Laureate and was dedicated to working with faculty and chairs to cultivate ownership of the assessment process and to promote greater understanding of the work done by OIRA. The other significant change was adding a full-time research analyst under the director of institutional research and assessment. These three individuals – the OIRA team and the special assistant to the president – institutionalized a culture of assessment that was palpable in every conversation throughout the visit.

The OIRA team was instrumental in prompting each department and student services unit to articulate program learning outcomes (PLOs), to align them with institutional learning outcomes (ILOs), and to develop assessment plans. Particularly notable was the architecture programs' concerted effort to move away from a lengthy list of NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPCs) as their PLOs. Instead, the programs implemented the NAAB SPCs as a framework for establishing their own more manageable and meaningful set of program learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.1 - 2.3)

Undergirding this ILO and PLO articulation process, the OIRA team directed the academic units in a preliminary leveling project. The resulting NSAD Course-Leveling Map enumerated 16 institutionally valued knowledge and skill domains and a detailed progression for performance expectations at each developmental level beginning with pre-college, spanning the four years of the undergraduate experience, and extending into

master's level competencies. (CFRs 2.1 - 2.3) The map was used as reference for evaluating students' learning and for new course and new program development, as well as periodic curriculum review. The team praises NSAD for these efforts and this articulation of learning outcomes at the course level.

The OIRA team created documentation to ensure that course syllabi consistently communicated students' expected learning outcomes and the instructional plan for courses. The NSAD Minimum Items Checklist for Syllabus outlined all necessary elements of a NSAD course syllabus. Required on all syllabi was a statement of course level outcomes (CLOs) and how they aligned with PLOs and ILOs. Where appropriate, this alignment was accompanied by NAAB SPCs. To promote a common format in syllabi, OIRA also created a syllabus template to model the required elements. It was estimated by the OIRA team that approximately 80% of syllabi followed this adopted template. The team was encouraged to learn from NSAD leadership that the provost and chairs were active in engaging level coordinators regarding the representation of CLO, PLO, and ILO alignment on syllabi. (CFRs 2.2, 2.3)

ILOs and PLOs were documented on the institution's website and in the Academic Catalog. The team heard from the institution's faculty and administration that having ILOs and PLOs in place allowed for greater synchronization among course-level learning outcomes and increased integrity across the curriculum. There was enthusiasm among the faculty that the infusion of a system of student learning assessment had transformed the curriculum and had been of great benefit to the students of NSAD. (CFRs 2.1- 2.3)

The team had numerous opportunities to observe concrete examples of how implementing outcomes across institutional levels has benefited NSAD: namely, the growing "interdisciplinary culture" that has been promoted, especially among the architecture and emerging design programs. The examination of student learning outcomes in those programs led to the realization that there are many shared foundational skills expected of first-year students. Consequently, it was determined that first-year studio courses should be common across these student cohorts. Academic year 2013-14 marked the inauguration of a combined first-level studio course taken together by new architecture and design students. The initial response from students enrolled in this sequence appeared to be quite positive. Furthermore, the tour of the campus and the open meeting with students enabled the team to gather commentary from across the undergraduate majors: many students expressed their appreciation of open studio spaces where students from different programs could work in teams and learn from observing one another's projects in development. (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.7)

The team concluded that NSAD had successfully integrated student learning outcomes across the curriculum and had provided ample evidence of how assessment of those outcomes led to program improvements.

Direct Assessment of Student Learning Based on Performance Standards

NSAD had put in place strategies for the ongoing assessment of student learning at the undergraduate (including general education) and graduate levels. Annual Program Assessment Activities Summaries documented the programs' mission and learning outcomes. Programs created a comprehensive matrix, organized by academic year, to display the alignment between PLOs and ILOs as well as course alignment with PLOs. Indirect and direct measures of student learning were designated to provide data sources, benchmarks, and standards of performance. Programs reported the status of progress toward assessment of each PLO with findings from completed analyses, and lastly, documented any recommendations and actions that have been taken toward program improvements.

The team reviewed program assessment activities summaries across the wide array of academic and student services at NSAD and found that most programs successfully articulated a manageable set of measureable student learning outcomes and associated these PLOs meaningfully with the coursework or services offered through the unit. (CFRs 2.4, 2.11) The team also found that performance standards were included and that NSAD could be characterized as having a general program-level responsiveness to initiating program improvements that are evidence-based and focused on enhancing learning and student experience.

NSAD provided the team with concrete examples of how assessment data were used to make improvements. For example, the academic advising office had a PLO related to students' ability to retrieve their online graduation audit. Surveys of students revealed a level of familiarity with the online resource far below performance expectation. Subsequent workshops, focus groups, and posters that were visible during the visit have significantly improved the results for this PLO based on follow-up assessment data. Other examples included how student learning outcomes data were being used in the general education program to develop placement tests in basic algebra skills, how employer and alumni survey results were being used to modify general education curriculum to promote the institutional learning outcome that students will develop knowledge of diverse cultures, and how the OIRA team had assisted the architecture program in reviewing courses and curriculum assessment results in light of NSAD student performance on the Architecture Registration Exam. (CFRs 2.4, 2.10, 4.4, 4.8)

The team concluded from its conversations with faculty and review of materials available that NSAD had moved toward wider adoption of assessment rubrics that align with Program Learning Outcomes. Many faculty members already used course-level assignment grading rubrics; consequently, PLO assessment rubrics were being viewed as a natural extension of this best practice. (CFRs 2.4, 2.5) Notable in discussions with faculty about the evolution of their assessment practices was how extensively they reflected on the process of on-going assessment and the impact this reflection had on teaching and learning at NSAD. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7) For example, over the past two years the institution-wide Assessment Summary template was amended to identify

assessment results more clearly as based on direct methods versus indirect methods. Overall, NSAD recognized the importance of distinguishing between direct and indirect assessment methods, and increased its focus on direct assessment strategies.

Closing the Loop – Using Assessment to Improve Curriculum and Pedagogy

The team observed that assessment of student learning rested primarily with the academic programs and student service units, with a considerable supporting role played by the OIRA team. The structure of the assessment system was developed with the expertise of OIRA, which created the uniform Assessment Summary template, the institution-wide assessment schedule, and the template for the periodic Program Review Process. Nevertheless, the team was able to conclude that this system had become a part of the broader NSAD culture and had become more sustainable because of the committees and processes that were established in the program units themselves. For example, faculty revealed to the team that the evaluation of assessment data and the "closing of the loop" on assessment findings occurred during level coordinator meetings and in the general education assessment committee meetings. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7)

A particularly salient example was shared by the chair of the general education (GE) program regarding the use of assessment data to make evidence-based decisions about strategies for improving curriculum and pedagogy. Using rubrics that were locally developed and aligned with the program and institutional learning outcomes, a group of the general education faculty identified information literacy as an area in which students

were not demonstrating sufficient mastery. As a result, the GE program faculty partnered with the institution's librarian to develop a protocol to enhance students' knowledge and skills of information literacy through their general education coursework.

The team commends the NSAD community for the creation of the Assessment Council, an institution-wide committee that was established in 2013. The Assessment Council had only met twice at the time of this visit, but the energy, optimism, and vision of the membership was evident to the team. Conversations with the Assessment Council left the team with a distinct impression of the Council's vital role integrating assessment results across programs, providing feedback related to curriculum change and development, and monitoring assessment processes to ensure their effectiveness in achieving the institutional learning outcomes and goals for student success. (CFRs 4.1, 4.4, 4.7)

Other successful strategies merit mention for nurturing the culture of assessment and for building faculty and staff expertise in the assessment of student learning: the periodic faculty workshops and other professional development opportunities such as annual faculty retreats, presentations at department meetings, assessment meetings with the Academic and Student Affairs staff, and Assessment Summits.

Annual Assessment Summits were initiated in 2012 and began as a program of brief presentations. The Summits have become a valued opportunity to share with colleagues from academic and co-curricular programs a status update on the program-level assessment of student learning as well as unit alignment to ILOs. To date there have been

two winter term Assessment Summits, and even with only one year elapsing between the events, the increased sophistication of the Assessment Summit was evident. Sessions at the 2013 Assessment Summit were more elaborate and organized into academic and student services panels with the opportunity for question and answer. Creating an opportunity to showcase student learning assessment, this event also included a lunchtime discussion of an assessment related ethical case study (in 2013 it was a case study about grading). These annual assessment showcase events educated the NSAD community about the institution's mission and ILOs, as well as the cycle of assessment and NSAD's expectations for annual assessment activities and reporting.

The team concluded that NSAD had fostered a culture of assessment by virtue of its investment in committee action, professional development, and assessment-related events that underscored not only the value of evidence-based decision making but also provided the platform on which assessment could improve curriculum and pedagogy.

Areas for Continuous Improvement in Student Learning Assessment

In its focused visit report, NSAD outlined plans for continuous improvement in the area of student learning assessment as the institution's culture matures. The team would like to emphasize and to encourage areas of growth that coincided well with the stated action plan. First, the team echoes NSAD's desire to increase the visibility of the Assessment Council and that group's potential contribution to the strength and sustainability of the culture of assessment at NSAD. Second, the team reinforces what it heard mentioned by

NSAD leadership, the OIRA team, faculty, and staff: a widespread desire to develop effective and efficient communication methods by which to share student learning outcomes results and student success data on a broad and regular basis.

While the assessment of student learning appeared to be less developed in the student services and co-curricular units than in the academic units, the team also encourages NSAD to continue its pursuit of direct assessment and program review in these areas. The team observed several positive signs:

- alignment of student services PLO's with the institution's ILOs;
- growing involvement of student services offices in the Assessment Summit over the past two years;
- progress in responding to the findings of student learning outcomes assessments in student services/co-curricular areas;
- plans to develop a dashboard of quantitative findings for key outcomes in the student services area related to student learning, engagement, and success;
- recognition by the institution of the value of student affairs assessment as an essential lens for developing a holistic perspective on the overall student experience and the overall quality of educational programs.

In addition, the team appreciated learning that the academic and student affairs unit had been recently consolidated to include the offices of Student Life, Career Services, Alumni Relations, Registrar, Advising, Financial Aid, Student Success, Facilities, and Information Technology under common leadership. This realignment of administrative structures

promises to mobilize the institution's resources effectively in pursuit of NSAD's goals, and the team commends such reorganization to enhance institutional success. The team urges NSAD to ensure that the impressive progress in student learning assessment in the academic programs, including general education, be mirrored in the co-curricular and student services programs. (CFRs 2.13, 4.6)

B. Refining Program Review and Creating a Culture of Evidence

From the Commission letter, July 9, 2012:

> "According to the team, NSAD needs to 'develop a culture of evidence… with systematic cycles of data collection and analyses, and with feedback loops that revise and improve institutional planning and educational effectiveness.' NSAD will need to continue to refine its annual program assessment and program review process so that the results are integrated with planning and budgeting. A comprehensive program review process can help NSAD assure that its educational programs are effective and that the expectations for student learning are widely shared among campus stakeholders. In addition, a robust institutional research capability can support a culture of inquiry and educational effectiveness and can help NSAD close the loop and link planning and budgeting, implementation, data collection and analysis, and improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)"

Educational Effectiveness Promoted through Program Review

NSAD implemented dual program review protocols – an annual program assessment report and a comprehensive program review conducted on a five-year cycle. The annual program assessment reports used data depicting the direct assessment of student learning, enrollment trends disaggregated by demographic categories, new student profiles, retention trends, degree completion statistics, graduation rates, student satisfaction measures, and loan default rates. The comprehensive program review self-study examined the cumulative annual program assessments, and required narrative describing the program, its development since prior comprehensive review, its faculty, and the co-curricular/student support services related to the program, as well as a follow-up summary of annual action plans. At the time of the visit, all NSAD programs had participated in the annual program assessments, and the institution had conducted pilot comprehensive program reviews of the bachelor's and master's degrees in architecture. The team interviewed the institution's faculty, staff, and administrators who were involved in program review, and examined relevant documentation including annual program assessments and the completed pilot comprehensive program reviews.

The team learned that NSAD had used results from program review to make improvements. For example, through the exercise of collecting assessment and program review data, and through the subsequent reflection of the faculty and administration, the undergraduate foundation-year experience was thoroughly reevaluated by faculty chairs toward a re-articulation of curriculum that included design thinking. The institution

implemented this pedagogical strategy to ensure that students in new programs would be successful, and likewise, students beginning in architecture would have an appropriate foundation if they transferred into other degree programs, rather than withdraw from NSAD. The institution planned to evaluate the success of this curricular change. Similarly, interdisciplinary seminars/studios expanded to include an introduction to collaborative ways of thinking. Project-based courses overlapped among architecture, design, and gaming, in direct response to student feedback and assessment of student learning. The team observed that evidence for these changes was provided by NSAD's annual program assessment component of program review. (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.7)

Changes in general education were also made as a result of NSAD's program review process. Global citizenship and knowledge of diverse cultural practices were reevaluated as learning outcomes both articulated in the curriculum and pursued at the course level, and instruction in these areas was strengthened in response. Information literacy learning outcomes were similarly emphasized across programs; institutional resources were redirected and instruction was enhanced to increase the attainment of these outcomes. (CFRs 2.7, 4.7)

Program Review Development

The team observed that NSAD had increased its institutional research capacity, and there was broad support of and investment in creating a culture of inquiry. Throughout the visit, the team learned how the institution's leadership pursued an overarching goal of

improving educational effectiveness by linking planning and budgeting with new program development, data collection, and analysis. It was a common experience for the team to hear about the reporting of critical data and analysis to support a process or decision, and all references cited the OIRA team's valuable contributions. (CFRs 4.3, 4.5)

NSAD's program review template and rubrics were developed appropriately by the director of institutional research and assessment. The first pilot of comprehensive program review, undertaken during the 2013-14 academic year, overlaid Student Performance Criteria (SPCs) from the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) standards. Initially there were 34 criteria, which were subsequently reduced to 32 during the pilot phase. Such an approach to program review – adapting preexisting assessment rubrics and metrics of known and quantifiable standards from a specialized accrediting agency – could be characterized as "emerging" but NSAD's administrative leadership was committed to developing institutionally-specific initiatives more fully. (CFRs 2.7, 4.4)

The team encourages NSAD to continue to refine this metric/model, moving toward a template that aligns with institutional size, values, and educational philosophy. As the institution completes its first year of formal comprehensive program review, it will be able to use evidence to refine its approach and diagnostics even further. The director of institutional research and assessment has been trained formally in WASC's assessment academy – the OIRA team as well as the special assistant to the president all demonstrated the capacity to advance faculty engagement in the process and to integrate program review even deeper within the culture of the institution. (CFR 4.5)

The team commends NSAD's embrace of evidence-based decision making while simultaneously recommending that the institution engage in a reflective development process to examine its recent program review implementation, and sustain comprehensive program review with external evaluation. Specifically, the team suggests initiating external evaluation within its comprehensive program review cycle. The end result of this endeavor will be added value to the assessment of student learning. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3. 4.4)

Faculty Engagement

Continued faculty engagement in the program review process will be crucial to its success, longevity, and value to NSAD. Early indications observed by the team pointed to appropriate levels of faculty engagement and to protocols to ensure its sustainability. Specifically, OIRA attended program chair and assessment committee meetings regularly to discuss program review with academic leadership. The enterprise of program review itself placed responsibility for development, implementation, and maintenance of student learning outcomes assessment on the faculty of each academic program and department. The team observed that faculty members were supported in this endeavor by program chairs, OIRA, and the special assistant to the president. Consequently, expectations regarding the implementation of student learning outcomes assessment became shared across the institution by designing learning outcomes assessment into the program review process. (CFRs 2.7, 4.6)

The team found evidence of how faculty members, engaged in the institution's decision-making processes, were enriched by what they had garnered via information and reflection originating from NSAD's annual assessment initiatives and comprehensive program review:

- Chairs performed institutional long-term planning and made recommendations to the NewSchool Curriculum and Academic Policy Council (NCAP) and other standing committees regarding program content, academic standards, and admissions policies.
- Chairs convened regular meetings with faculty from their respective departments, as well as with level coordinators, to discuss the status of the programs and the institution's budgeting and planning processes.
- Adjunct and part-time faculty were involved in faculty governance and served on appropriate committees, utilizing the same information and analysis institutionalized by program review.

Creating a Culture of Evidence

Institutional knowledge of and support for a culture of inquiry and evidence, while not uniformly integrated through a complete cycle of program review, was fairly consistent across the faculty, administration, and staff. (CFRs 4.5- 4.7) The team regards the future success of program review at NSAD as requiring this emphasis on evidence-based decision making to continue its development at the institution. NSAD's implementation

pattern for program review seemed appropriate and manageable in terms of institutional history and enrollment magnitude, with architectural programs reviewed initially in the pilot. (CFRs 2.3, 2.7, 4.4)

There is a clear timeline and logical roadmap for subsequent program review, considering NSAD's history. According to the institution's 2013 Educational Effectiveness Plan, following review of the architecture programs, NSAD will move forward to assess its programs in construction management (both undergraduate and graduate) before a comprehensive program review of the Executive Master of Architecture (2015), Bachelor of Interior Design (2016), and Bachelor of Science in digital media arts (2017). The team observed that NSAD developed its annual program assessment and comprehensive review processes significantly from the time of the initial visit in 2012. Furthermore, the institution matured the integration of assessment and review with planning and budgeting. The team concluded that NSAD had implemented the collection, analysis, interpretation, and use of evidence to make programmatic and instructional decisions.

Ongoing Institutional Challenges

Student exit interview analyses indicated that NSAD had an emerging understanding of the reasons for student attrition, including costs, personal and family reasons, time constraints, and faculty issues. The team suggests that NSAD consider implementing a more formal and less anecdotally driven or qualitative rubric for conducting exit surveys and for developing attrition reports. Student services offices and OIRA, from the team's

perspective, would work more closely together to document and to review the reasons for attrition, following the same cycle of program review and assessment already underway in academic programs. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.4, 4.6)

With the introduction of new degree programs, the team suggests that OIRA collaborate with enrollment staff to assess the recently adopted "holistic approach" to recruiting, admitting, and matriculating students and to examine whether the results of this approach are more appropriate for the institution than a reliance on academic performance indicators in admissions, especially in light of the new degree programs. Alternatives may yield more competitive acceptance rates (which hovered at approximately 97% across all degree programs at the time of the visit) and matriculation rates (approximately 60%), which may in turn influence retention and graduation rates. The team encourages NSAD to advance its program review process to include details regarding the academic preparedness of programs' entering cohorts – particularly for programs new to the institution – to ensure that resource allocation for co-curricular and support services can enhance the educational experience of students pursuing their degrees at NSAD. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

C. Understanding Student Success

From the Commission letter, July 9, 2012:

> "The Commission had some difficulty interpreting NSAD's retention and graduation data. The Commission expects NSAD to gather, analyze, publish and understand the meaning of its graduation and retention data, using methodologies appropriate to its institutional size and instructional context. Besides reviewing aggregated data, NSAD should examine disaggregated data to identify performance gaps among various subpopulations (such as Pell recipients or adults returning to higher education studies) to seek to understand any disparities it finds and to develop and implement strategies to raise the rates in areas identified. In addition, the Commission expects NSAD to use comparative data from other institutions to contextualize and understand its graduation and retention rates. (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 4.4)"

Data Reports of Student Success

NSAD provided the team with an ample volume of statistical reports that detailed the institution's student success, including retention rates, graduation rates, and time-to-degree, not only among the evidence accompanying the institution's focused visit report but also in materials available to the team during the visit. Interviews with various faculty and administrators confirmed the value and usability of the information and analysis

presented by the OIRA staff. The team learned from multiple faculty and administrative audiences that student success data provided by OIRA supported budgeting and planning decisions. The team commends the OIRA staff for its insight into the institution's data and reporting needs as well as for its commitment to providing thorough and up-to-date records that focus on many aspects of student success. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

OIRA had gathered, analyzed, published, and made understandable the array of student retention, persistence, and completion statistics that the team would expect to find available and useful at WASC institutions throughout the region, including the WASC Retention, Graduation, Time-to-Degree Summary Report for full-time and part-time cohorts by entry type (freshman, lower- and upper-division transfer), and gender, race/ethnicity, and Pell Grant sub-cohort status reported separately. An internal institutional research data definition document was developed by OIRA to enable the institution's constituents to interpret the statistics presented. With these standard definitions uniformly applied on various reports, NSAD was able to engage in dialogue across its organization in a meaningful fashion and with confidence that common ground had been established and could be maintained. Throughout the interviews conducted by the team, a common refrain was how available and helpful the OIRA team had been in orienting faculty, administrators, and staff to the data presented on these reports – both one-on-one and in groups, during both formal committees and ad hoc meetings. As a consequence, the team can identify OIRA's indefatigable effort as a critical component in the foundation for NSAD's burgeoning culture of evidence. (CFRs 2.10, 4.5)

NSAD selected three institutions for a peer comparison of its full-time first-time freshman entrants' retention and six-year graduation rates, basing its selection of peers on student population, faculty body, and Carnegie classification type. NSAD's focused visit report published this peer comparison, which provided context for the institution's success statistics and offered the potential for a deeper understanding of the institution's educational effectiveness. The team calculated average graduation rates of these peer institutions for one set of entering cohorts and found that NSAD's 50% six-year graduation rate for freshmen was only 3% lower than these peers. Its 61% freshman-to-sophomore retention rate was 18% lower than the comparison group average. A comparison of four-year rates was not performed, given the disproportionate number of undergraduates enrolled in NSAD's five-year Bachelor of Architecture program. A compelling majority of NSAD undergraduate students, however, entered as transfers, and a comparison of such entry cohorts could not be established using the freshman comparison's data source (i.e., IPEDS statistics available at the NCES website). The team appreciates this emerging peer comparison effort of the institution and suggests that the OIRA team develop summary-data exchange relationships with institutional research professionals at the identified peers. Access to relevant statistics – such as retention/graduation rates and time-to-degree for transfer students – would enable NSAD to better gauge its own transfer students' performance, on average, in light of how similar students perform at comparable institutions. A peer comparison of NSAD students' Architecture Registration Exam performance data, disaggregated by test topic/section, was incorporated into program assessment at the institution and served as a worthwhile starting point for conversation about the institution's preparation of students for that examination.

The team encourages continued tracking of this comparison into the future as a means of reviewing the curricular elements of the architecture programs. (CFRs 2.6, 4.4, 4.5)

Strides in data availability and the institution's quantitative fluency had been made at a critical time for NSAD, and the team considers OIRA as having provided fuel for these expedited gains. The team urges NSAD to persist in its efforts to equip the institution's faculty, administration, and staff with detailed reports and in-depth consultation, by way of maintaining the OIRA's capacity to address such a vital need. (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

Disaggregated Reporting of Subpopulations

A noteworthy aspect of NSAD's statistical reporting was how thoroughly various populations were divided into meaningful subgroups, according to entry type (freshman versus transfer), entry cohort (by term), major degree program and academic level, and demographics. Reports such as the Annual Institutional Report had occasion to drill down into a combination of such categories simultaneously. Exceptionally small statistical values were reported as a matter of consequence, and the team remained sensitive to the impact that even incremental student count changes have on calculated outcome percentages for such small groups. Many reporting contexts at this institution, such as program review, required statistics that at times exhibited volatility because of small cell sizes followed along trend lines. The team heard numerous accounts of OIRA explaining

to individuals and committees how to use such data effectively, and the team commends this effort. (CFRs 2.10, 4.5)

A statistical examination for the performance of various student groups led to general conclusions about the obstacles undergraduates face when completing degrees at NSAD. Primarily, the analysis of the institution's exiting student survey identified a cost-of-attendance issue. With students reporting financial hardship as preventing their pursuit of the Bachelor of Architecture's required fifth year of study, the institution's response was to offer scholarship awards to relieve this pressure. The program targeted students whose exemplary performance could be at risk because of an inability to pay. NSAD reported that the awards had a favorable impact on the completion of individual students. The team urges analyses that focus on entering student characteristics, such as demographics and family status, academic propensity for the math and physics coursework required for study in architecture, and performance in initial studio courses that may be more demanding than any other work the student has undertaken prior to bachelor-level study. The team notes that understanding the variance in student success will be critical for maintaining the highest retention rates for every program offered at NSAD, if resources are to be allocated strategically to address disparate performance of student groups. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Success and Growth

The team commends the institution and its faculty for exploring new areas of design and expanding both the viability and visibility of the institution in the process. The design areas of NSAD strengthened their identities by aligning the institution's degree programs with new academic structures recently recognized with separate names (i.e., the NewSchool of Architecture, the Domus Academy of Design at NSAD, and the Media Design School of Digital Arts at NSAD). (CFR 3.8) Commencing enrollment in fall 2014, the newest degree offerings will be well served by OIRA's analysis and reporting in the annual assessment and review processes at NSAD. The assessment of student success and the reporting of program assessment data at NSAD will increase as a function of the new programs about to enroll students, and the team suggests that a keen eye closely follow these programs' graduation, retention, and persistence rates. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 4.4)

The team urges that NSAD, when developing any additional proposals for new degree programs, observe on the recent recommendations the institution received from the WASC Substantive Change Panel regarding the submission of: fully-developed course syllabi (including references to ILOs and PLOs) for the program; explanation of curricular overlap when similar programs are submitted; data describing student and employer demand for the specific program proposed; narrative regarding the program development process; articulation of partner collaboration in program development and its day-to-day operations; explanation of the linkage of program need, program design, and retention

efforts at NSAD; and initial program investment expenses, continuing operational support, and their sources.

The team recognizes how recent curricular redesign efforts could lead to a portability of fundamental courses among majors, should students choose to change programs at NSAD. This represented one of many approaches that the team encourages the institution to explore as it pursues enrollment growth alongside greater student success. Enabling student persistence and fostering retention are paramount. The team recommends that NSAD balance its enrollment growth with sound retention strategy, that it retain its continuing students while growing new programs. Smart retention strategies – accompanying program growth – involve the deployment of a comprehensive student services function that promotes retention and graduation while demonstrating sensitivity to the unique challenges facing NSAD's students. (CFRs 1.2, 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

D. Developing the Governing Board

From Commission letter, July 9, 2012:

> "The team observed that 'the multiple and concurrent relationships among NSAD, its Board and its parent company created a complex structure… (that) warranted both praise and continued review.' WASC standards, guidelines, and policies emphasize the importance of institutional autonomy and an independent governing

board. The Commission was pleased to see the steps NSAD has taken to increase the size of the board so that it has a majority of independent members, to put in place procedures for the evaluation of the president, and to define the length of term of the president. The Commission expects that board policies and bylaws will be reviewed and updated as needed, to reflect WASC expectations for independent governing boards, and that particular attention will be given to the professional development of its members and assessment of board effectiveness. (CFR 3.9 and the Policy on Independent Governing Boards)"

The team reviewed the institution's focused visit report and attached evidence, and met with the entire eight-member NSAD Board of Directors, with participation either in person, over the telephone, or through video conferencing. The team then met separately with the three Laureate-affiliated directors and the five independent directors.

NSAD provided in its focused visit report items of evidence summarizing the board of directors' learning and development program offered by Laureate ("Board On-Boarding"), and the agenda and other materials describing a February 2013 Board of Directors Symposium offered by Laureate for its institutions' board members, an event that was attended by the NSAD board of directors. The team commends the board of directors for investing in its ongoing professional development and its commitment to the orientation and training of new board members. While a formal assessment had not yet been undertaken to measure the effectiveness of the NSAD board of directors, the team observed that the members' commitment to the board's performance, as well as the

board's reflection regarding its stewardship of NSAD in the board's minutes, demonstrated a qualitative and documented account of the board's successful governance. (CFR 3.9)

The Laureate-affiliated directors and the independent directors have brought different levels of experience and diverse points of view to the board, and the team commends the growing, shared sense of stewardship and strategic vision among the board's members. The independent directors included one member with a long affiliation with the institution and a valuable understanding of the history and evolution of NSAD. More recent directors have brought relevant experience in academia and business, and a deep knowledge of contemporary practice in architecture and design. Considering the board's small size, the team was pleased to observe a rich diversity among the directors in age, gender, and ethnicity, and felt that this set a good model for the institution. The directors were familiar with the WASC Policy on Independent Governing Boards and used it as a guideline for best practice when revising their operating agreement (bylaws), structuring board committees, and training and developing board members.

The team observed that the relatively small size of the board required a considerable investment of time and energy by the independent board members. According to WASC Policy on Independent Governing Boards, board committees should have a minimum of three members, two of them independent, with four required committees to be staffed. The team also notes that two of the NSAD board committees had only two members at the time of the visit, with both members in these instances independent: the governance

committee and the student affairs committee. Interim position assignments account for these committees' smaller size: the former board chair was serving as interim president of NSAD, and she maintained an ex-officio seat on the board while planning to return to chair the board as a Laureate-affiliated member after the selection of NSAD's next president; and the interim chair of the board planned to return to her position as a member of the board when her position as interim chair ends. These two directors were absent from the list of board committee assignments, which accounted for the temporary decrease in the size of the two committees. The team was confident the board can ensure that the governance committee, which has nominating responsibility, would acquire an additional member in a timely fashion should it be required to take action. Regardless, with five standing committees, board service presented a logistical challenge to the current board composition, and the team suggests the board add additional independent members to the board of directors to allow each board member to participate on fewer committees and to accommodate any future, perhaps temporary, reconfiguration of role assignments more easily.

The team concluded that the NSAD board exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and operations of the institution.

E. Clarifying Budget Preparation and Management

From the Commission letter, July 9, 2012:

> "The team observed that campus stakeholders 'did not have a firm understanding of the budget process and its outcomes.' In particular, the faculty seem absent from participation in budget development. The Commission was pleased to hear that NSAD is putting in place procedures to make budget preparation and management more transparent. The Commission expects NSAD to continue to engage members of the campus community more broadly in the preparation of the budget and other planning processes. (CFRs 3.5, 4.1)

Budget and Planning Leadership

The budget and planning process that the team observed at NSAD – by way of its review of the focused visit report and through interviews during the site visit – included the participation of the institution's executive management as well as key administrators, standing committees and councils, and, most critically, chairs of departments and faculty leaders. This host of individuals was well positioned to represent larger constituencies of NSAD and was poised to communicate the process and its outcomes throughout the institution. With leadership transitions taking place in the form of the recently-hired provost, new program chairs and area leaders, and the interim president serving until a new president is selected, NSAD invested in a rigorous budgetary review process that

initiated dialogue to inform activities ranging from the provost's assignment of program teaching resources to NCAP's new academic program development and curricular review of collaborations within the Laureate global network of affiliated institutions. NSAD's leadership operated transparently, through implementing budgetary decisions via resource allocation, with its practices and decisions communicated to the team from informed sources throughout the institution. As a consequence, the team regards the budgetary process as having been both transparent and appropriately developed for the scale of the institution. (CFRs 3.5, 4.1)

Concerns the team harbored about the process focused on the relatively small size of the administration of the institution and how deeply saturated each key administrator and faculty leader had become through participation in the budgeting and management of the institution. Without such extensive involvement in planning, however, the institution seemed likely to suffer from a lower level of comprehension regarding the budgetary process and its outcomes. To ensure success, the process had to engage individuals throughout the institution and had to become a substantial part of these individuals' responsibilities in their positions of leadership. The team remains concerned that in the relatively small NSAD community, the committees related to budgeting, assessment, and program review had overlapping charges and were staffed by the same individuals, which could limit diverse perspectives and potentially undermine governance integrity. That the community was engaged, however, was not questioned. (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)

The Budget Process

The team learned the particulars of the annual budget process from reading the institution's focused visit report, studying additional budget materials provided in the team room, and meeting during the site visit with institutional leaders, NCAP, individuals representing critical moments along the budgetary path, and the board of directors. The annual budget development process was cyclical, with its initial phase inviting the participation of faculty and administrative staff, for their submission of budget requests through chairs and others "responsible for coordinating with corresponding constituencies." Input from meetings of the financial manager and chairs, data such as enrollment statistics, and other considerations informed the preliminary budget that was proposed. After an update of fall enrollment statistics, the preliminary budget was submitted to the board of directors, who coordinated the participation of the Laureate CEO in reviewing the budget. Feedback was provided to NSAD, and departmental budgets were distributed, updated, and finalized. Ultimately, the annual budget was approved and its details were communicated to department heads by the end of the calendar year, which served as the institution's fiscal year. (CFRs 3.5, 3.8, 3.9, 4.1-, 4.3)

Strategic planning, long-range resource planning, and annual budgeting processes at NSAD were diagramed to depict their interrelationships in the focused visit report. The annual revision of the Strategic Plan was submitted in April to the NSAD board, for that body's recommendations and adjustments. The Long Range Plan (LRP) was informed and renewed as a consequence, and the annual budgeting process was initiated by these

strategic planning findings, allowing for the consideration of initiatives based on financial and action plans. (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, 4.2)

Faculty Involvement in the Budget Process

When the team met with key stakeholders in the budget process, all were informed of the budgetary function, and they engaged easily in talking about their roles in the process. Monthly reviews explored the status of the budget, assessed the institution's performance to date, and projected any need for altering the budget's course based on enrollment, staffing, and goals articulated in the Strategic Plan and the LRP. Budget process participants reported that January 2013 was the first time that department budget managers saw their budget for the year, and there was significant training to help them interpret the data (both financial and non-financial) and engage in budget planning. NSAD entrusted program chairs, also referred to as "department budget holders," with autonomous control over their budgets, thus vesting ownership and responsibility for programs and faculty within each department. (CFRs 3.5, 3.8, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

The chairs reviewed monthly closings of profit and loss measures (e.g., counts of students, staffing levels, and expenditures to date). They briefed administrative leadership on the status of their budgets, met weekly with the Provost, and, in turn, informed the faculty and staff within their departments about its operations. The chairs utilized these monthly status updates to initiate conversations about resource allocation at the institution, specifically the financial health and status of their departments, as they had been given the

financial details of their budgets to share with their faculty members. (CFRs 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, 4.3)

This detailed analysis enhanced inter-disciplinary initiatives and realized efficient curricular planning. "Revenue pieces [were] projected by individual chairs," one budget participant noted, and this impacted "capital expenditures of the whole [institution]." The library coordinated with all departments supporting new initiatives and programs. (CFR 3.6) Capital expenditures for technology, equipment, digital and educational management, and staffing in particular informed budget considerations on an ongoing basis, "improving the magnitude of leverage." (CFR 3.7) When faculty and administrators were asked how budget matters determined criteria for programs, those attending the session said the budget "establishes a base of knowledge… visibility…," allowing for "more creative approaches and planning. They can see how it rolls up into institutional decision making." (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.6)

When the team further probed about how new programs were taken into account in the budgeting environment, the provost remarked that new programs are treated the same as established ones. Chairs reported that they are able to "draw on experiences of sister institutions to gauge faculty staffing [and] cohort size, and draw in professional support." The granular information that was gathered through assessment, program review, and the budgeting process "helps plan enrollment growth over time and academic support that will be needed five years out." The financial manager noted in one meeting how transparency makes everyone familiar with the process, and from the institutional perspective,

"everyone owns [the institutional] results." Instructional delivery budgets are transparent from the institutional finance manager to program faculty members and back to institutional decision making. (CFRs 3.8, 4.1- 4.3)

Full-time faculty members identified how a "proposal goes through NCAP." They understood that their chairs had control of their budgets and communicated budget information with them, and they indicated that budget planning was set by "where we want to go." Faculty members were imbued with responsibilities: they negotiated mapping of learning outcomes, were charged with immediate responses to retention issues, served as level coordinators and as representatives on standing committees, and were expected to use course evaluations and assessment metrics to improve teaching and learning. They also had access and support for faculty development, for advancing teaching, and for research and attending conferences. (CFRs 3.4, 3.8, 4.1, 4.7)

The team commends NSAD's transparency in budget and planning, and how the community has become involved in the institution's integrative planning

Budgeting, Assessment, and Program Review

The formation and refinement of learning outcomes alignments and assessment practices dovetailed with designating chairs as budget holders and giving these individuals responsibility to author budget requests from within their departments. It was in the

interest of NSAD's faculty to participate in crafting budget requests, using their own evidence of learning with which they were immediately involved. (CFR 4.6)

A chart provided by the financial manager to the team illustrated touch points between assessment and budget. Beginning in January, each program, working with budget submissions from the end of the previous year and the reporting and analysis from an Assessment Summit in February, prepared an annual program assessment report for July. The program review for the designated departments also began in January and included submitting a draft of the review in April, which coincided with the second Quarterly Summaries and the end of the spring term. The final program review report was due in August, leaving sufficient time at the end of the year to prepare budget request submissions for the following year. Each assessment and review process interlocked with the budgeting and planning processes of NSAD appropriately, such that the institution's maturing culture of evidence could best inform the institution's educational effectiveness effort. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Institutional Budget Management

Team members, in the segregated break-out meeting, pointedly asked members of the board of directors who represented Laureate about potential interference of the parent company in the educational direction of NSAD. Just as NSAD had entrusted "department budget holders" with responsibility to manage their programs within the institution – believing that approach was most effective by allowing for innovation, leadership, and

responsiveness directly – so Laureate expected the institutional budget managers to be directly engaged in effective leadership and management of the entity to which they belong. NSAD was expected to be "fiscally responsible." (CFRs 1.6, 3.9, 4.1)

SECTION III. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

The team commends NSAD's transparency in budget and planning, and how the community has become actively involved in the institution's integrative planning. (CFRs 3.5, 4.1)

The team commends NSAD for its ongoing development from being a single-purpose institution to a multi-focus architecture and design school as it adds new design programs through a process engaging the participation of the faculty and ensuring collaboration across disciplines. (CFRs 3.8, 3.11, 4.1)

The team commends NSAD's embrace of evidence-based decision making, which has been embedded into the fabric of the institution. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

The team commends NSAD's alignment of its academic enterprise into the three schools and its collection of student service and co-curricular functions into a single administrative

area, both reorganizations allowing the institution's structures to embody its stated goals. (CFR 3.8)

The team commends the Board of Directors of NSAD for its stewardship in a time of transition. (CFR 3.9)

Recommendations:

The team recommends that NSAD balance its enrollment growth with sound retention strategies, that it retain its continuing students while growing new programs. Developing sound retention strategies will involve understanding why students leave and what services and programs could be put in place to mitigate attrition. (CFRs 1.2, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

The team recommends that NSAD scale, integrate, and professionalize student services to an optimal level that enhances student experience and augments student retention. The continuous improvement offered by best practices in student services/co-curricular assessment and program review will tailor these functions toward the institution's greatest success in serving its students. (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.6)

The team recommends that NSAD engage in a reflective development process to examine its recent program review implementation, making changes as needed for the next round of program review. In particular, the team recommends implementing the external evaluation component of the comprehensive program review process. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

WASC Senior College and University Commission

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: NewSchool of Architecture and Design
Date: November 15, 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	**Questions/Comments (**Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	**Verified Yes/No**
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	Yes
	Comments: Procedure for appeals, grievances, and complaints is outlined in the Academic Catalog and Student Handbook document, as well on the institution's website (Registrar's page).	
Process(es) / procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: Academic Grievance: Complaints are addressed at the faculty/staff level first, escalating if not resolved to the program chair (in writing), then ultimately, if remaining unresolved, to the provost (within 10 days, in writing). Should the student feel that the complaint remains inadequately addressed, the student is directed to ACICS (in writing). Non-Academic Concern: Completion of confidential "student non-academic concern form" found in student services offices and the student portal (Registrar's website), and submission of the form to the Dean of Academic and Student Affairs. Ten-day review cycle with 45-day response with resolution and/or recommendations to the student from the date of the concern submission. Participation of the Student Concern Committee in review. Should the student feel that the complaint remains inadequately addressed, the student is directed to ACICS (in writing).	Yes

	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: The Dean of Academic and Student Affairs manages the course of all complaints being addressed at the institution, whether they are academic or non-academic grievances, if the form is completed and submitted according to the website form's directions.	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? A database system has been implemented to store complaints information and to allow for queries and reporting regarding the status of complaints. It is maintained on a secured drive that is backed up nightly. Records are kept confidential.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: The Dean of Academic and Student Affairs regularly generates reports and queries the status of complaints according to complaint type, date of complaint, status category, etc. The information system stores all complaints and enables access of historical data.	Yes
	Comments: Future database developments include linking triggers in the database to the calendar software used by administrators, as an automatic prompt for action. Currently, the system's scheduled reporting protocol functions as such a reminder and action-initiation feature.	

WASC Senior College and University Commission

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW: TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: NewSchool of Architecture and Design
Date: November 15, 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	**Questions and Comments:** Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	**Verified Yes/No**
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Tuition and fees are posted on the institution's website and published in the Academic Catalog; typical length of program is available from the institution's website, under "Consumer Information" and Academic Catalog. Consumer Information publicly posts retention and graduation data, demographic information about the student body, and plans for academic program improvements.	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments: Occupations and job placement rates are published on the institution's website in the "Consumer Information" section and in its Academic Catalog.	

*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.