

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM  
SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 1**

For Institutions Seeking Initial Accreditation

To California Institute of Human Sciences

May 2-May 4, 2018

**TEAM ROSTER**

Mac Powell  
Former President, John F. Kennedy University  
*Chair*

Karen McClendon  
Vice President for Institutional Research, Quality Improvement, & Assessment, California  
Northstate University  
*Assistant Chair*

Michael Barr  
Associate Vice President for Program Development, Review, and Online Synergy  
The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Richard Osborn, WASC Senior College and University Commission  
*Staff Liaison*

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

A. Description of the Institution and Visit..... 3  
B. The Institution’s Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 Report: ..... 3  
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Eligibility Review Committee Letter ..... 6

**SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC STANDARDS**

Standard 1..... 7  
Standard 2..... 8  
Standard 3..... 14  
Standard 4..... 20

**SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION UNDER THE 2013 HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION..... 42**

**SECTION IV. INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS ..... 45**

**SECTION V. FINDINGS & COMMENDATIONS ..... 56**

**APPENDICES..... 56**

Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form ..... 58  
Marketing and Recruitment Review Form ..... 59  
Student Complaints Review Form ..... 60  
Transfer Credit Review Form ..... 61

## SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 1

### TEAM REPORT SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

#### A. Description of Institution and Visit

The California Institute for Human Science (CIHS) is a small non-profit institution offering one undergraduate, three masters, and three doctoral level degree programs aligned with the teachings of the Institute's founder, Hiroshi Motoyama. Since its founding in 1992, the school has expanded on its vision to create a school in which students could explore the integration of scientific principles and spirituality. The programs in psychology, comparative religion and philosophy, and integrative health offer onsite, online, and hybrid courses to facilitate degree completion and educational engagement. CIHS is located on a leased campus with ample classrooms and public spaces and enjoys a unique relationship with a Japanese Foundation that provides for generous leasing terms, ongoing financial support, and a passive income stream from additional properties on the CIHS campus.

With the passing of the founder in 2015, and in support of creating an engaged and independent governing board, CIHS has undertaken to continue to advance its mission, which consists of eight principles:

- To Promote a Society which Enhances the Integration of Science and Religion
- To Understand Human Existence from the Total Perspective of Body, Mind and Spirit
- To Establish Guiding Principles for the Citizens of the Global Society

- To Establish Energy Medicine, which will Prevent Diseases and Promote Health
- To Elucidate the Mechanism of the Correlation Between Mind and Body, and to Actualize Mental Control over Body and Matter with a Resulting Better Life
- To Systematize Scientific and Objective Meditational Practices, which will Promote Spiritual Growth
- To Establish a Society which Satisfies both the Individuality (Freedom and Rights) and Sociality (Morality and Coexistence) of Human Existence
- To Establish a Creative Science which Researches the Mind and Soul as well as Matter.

CIHS currently operates under the oversight of the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE); however, the institution is seeking candidacy for initial WASC accreditation after being granted eligibility effective November 16, 2016.

**B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 Report: Alignment with the Letter of Intent and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report**

The visiting team found the Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 Report to be consistent with the Letter of Intent. CIHS made efforts to address each of the four areas of concern (Criteria 7, 8, 9 and 13) outlined by the WSCUC Eligibility Review Committee in the 14 December 2015 Eligibility Action Letter, which found CIHS to have met the "threshold qualifications for Eligibility." Section 3 of the institution's Seeking Accreditation Institutional Report clearly outlined basic steps taken to

address these issues, and the institution's response under the standards provided further evidence of their attention to these key areas.

Overall, the team found the report to be thorough in its summary of institutional changes and engagement with the accreditation process. The team requested, and received additional materials in advance of the visit that further clarified the institution's efforts around financial stability, fundraising, policy development, and board development that helped to better set a context for the visit and establish the lines of inquiry for team members.

CIHS addressed the required elements of the report, including a response to each standard and CFR, and provided appendices that were generally responsive. Given the institution's state of development and engagement with the WASC process, it was understandable that some of the evidence didn't fully respond to all of the CFRs, but the team believes that the institution provided evidence during the visit that it understands that its level of engagement and the need for systemization and quantifiable evidence for future reports to demonstrate full compliance with all CFRs is an important next step as the institution approaches accreditation.

Issues with compliance that were identified by the team and shared with the institution were received by CIHS board members and administration with acceptance, understanding, and a verbal commitment to engage and improve to align institutional practices with the standards and regional best practices.

Finally, the team found faculty, staff, students, and board members to be

engaged in the work of accreditation – and having a deep awareness and commitment to the institution and its mission and vision as well.

**C. Response to Issues Raised in the Eligibility Review Committee Letter**

The Eligibility Review Committee (ERC) acted to grant eligibility to CIHS and outlined the following recommendations for further attention in its letter of November 16, 2016. The team found each of the recommendations to have been addressed at a basic level, but further analysis and discussion can be found in subsequent sections of this team report.

*(1) Request review of revised Bylaws by WSCUC General Counsel prior to SAVI to determine compliance with WSCUC Independent Governing Board Policy.*

CIHS worked with WSCUC’s general counsel prior to SAVI to determine the institution’s bylaws’ compliance with WSCUC Independent Governing Board Policy and through the process of engagement, CIHS made significant changes to its board composition and bylaws to ensure independence. The team found the board to have deeply engaged and embraced the notion of independence and clearly understood its obligations under WSCUC standards.

*(2) Continue careful management of finances to ensure balanced budgets.*

CIHS has maintained balanced budgets thanks to the ongoing contributions of donors. During the course of the visit, the institution was provided additional ongoing funding to support operations and to continue the institution’s practices of balanced budgeting and positive monthly cash balances.

*(3) Continue development of strategic plan with more deliverables, timeline, and budgets going into long term future.*

CIHS provided the team with a strategic plan and a four year plan addressing budget expectations and proposed areas of increased expenditures to meet the needs of the institution going forward

*(4) Provide evidence of how Lead Faculty model has developed with continued evidence of meeting WSCUC faculty requirements at time of SAVI.*

The team found evidence that the lead faculty model has been implemented, but that while faculty have been identified with this designation, the faculty are generally unaware of duties beyond their previous teaching expectations. Ongoing clarification of the role of faculty in advising, research, teaching, and institutional service is beginning through the foundation of a faculty senate.

## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC’S STANDARDS**

### **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes & Ensuring Educational Objectives**

*The institution defines its purposes and establish the educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of the essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.*

**CFR 1.1.** *The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.*

CIHS's current mission statement consists of eight principles established by the institution's founder. The principles are widely understood by the community, reflected in their academic practices, guide decision-making by the board of trustees, and support administrators' daily work. These principles reflect the essential characteristics of the institution and reflect how the product of institutional efforts contribute to the public good:

- To Promote a Society which Enhances the Integration of Science and Religion
- To Understand Human Existence from the Total Perspective of Body, Mind and Spirit
- To Establish Guiding Principles for the Citizens of the Global Society
- To Establish Energy Medicine, which will Prevent Diseases and Promote Health
- To Elucidate the Mechanism of the Correlation Between Mind and Body, and to Actualize Mental Control over Body and Matter with a Resulting Better Life
- To Systematize Scientific and Objective Meditational Practices, which will Promote Spiritual Growth
- To Establish a Society which Satisfies both the Individuality (Freedom and Rights) and Sociality (Morality and Coexistence) of Human Existence

- To Establish a Creative Science which Researches the Mind and Soul as well as Matter.

**CFR 1.2.** *Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning outcomes.*

While the institution's overarching institutional goals are understood throughout the institution, they are not currently being quantified and measured in a way which could be evaluated by the team. In many cases, faculty, staff, and students articulated that syllabi and curriculum reflected the values imbedded in their mission statement, but a direct alignment wasn't available. The institution provided the team with a set of institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) that had been prepared prior to the visit by the CEO and Executive Dean after discussions in a faculty meeting, and with board, but the faculty wasn't aware of the ILOs, and they were not being utilized in the classroom or being assessed in accordance with common practice in higher education institutions. While course-level learning outcomes (CLOs) have been or, in some cases, are being developed, the assessment of student learning outcomes needs further development in order to meet WSCUC standards. Additional work by the institution is needed in order to comply with WSCUC standards, including a complete curriculum mapping for all programs of course, program, and institutional learning outcomes with direct and

indirect measures in such a way as to allow disaggregation of the data to demonstrate student achievement, programmatic effectiveness, and institutional quality.

**CFR 1.3.** *The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing.*

CIHS possesses a newly revised Statement of Diversity and previously-existing Academic Freedom Policy which is published in the CIHS catalog and in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty and students both noted freedom to pursue research and disciplinary knowledge in advancement of their own educational goals, and both students and faculty noted an awareness for how to address grievances, though a more formalized process to define and investigate grievances is recommended.

**CFR 1.4.** *Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity and society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices.*

CIHS recently adopted a diversity policy and has proposed a scholarship to support diversity recruitment in its student body. However, the board of trustees remains in need of greater gender diversity, as noted by the board in their own

deliberations – and ongoing work to increase the diversity of faculty and staff are needed and underway. Students noted that the lack of federal funding (requiring all students to pay out-of-pocket to attend) limited the opportunity for low-income students to attend, and representatives throughout the institution noted that additional work would be required to achieve their goals for a diverse community.

*CFR 1.5. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.*

In response to feedback from the WSCUC Eligibility Review Committee panel, CIHS took steps to more clearly define its relationship with its parent organization and to more clearly delineate its primary purpose and operations as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. A newly established governing board met on May 24, 2016 and is primarily composed of local members invested in the Institute's mission as an academic institution.

At the time of its first meeting, the new Board approved a new set of bylaws that clarified the relationship of CIHS with that of its former parent, Tamamitsu Jinja. Under the new bylaws, no more than one third of the voting members of the CIHS Board can be members of Tamamitsu Jinja, the religious organization formerly headed by CIHS Founder Hiroshi Motoyama. The bylaws state the Board shall have a minimum of one member representing Tamamitsu Jinja to assure continuity of adherence to the Founder's principles,

and to foster continued beneficial good relations between the leadership of CIHS and Tamamitsu Jinja.

The function and purpose of the Governing Board, stated in the Bylaws reads as follows:

“The CIHS governing board is responsible to oversee that the institution operates according to and in advancement of the Principles instantiated by Founder Dr. Hiroshi Motoyama, sustainably beyond the life or competency of any one director, administrator or supporting entity, and remains in compliance with all applicable laws and WSCUC requirements. The governing board is an independent policy-making body responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial sustainability of the institution and for ensuring the institution’s mission is being achieved. The board shall reflect constituent and public interest through its membership, activities, and decisions; and shall demonstrate responsibility for and involvement with strategic planning for the development of the institution through and beyond the period necessary for accreditation. Exercising appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, the board verifies that education and research is the primary purpose of the institution and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.”

The team found that the new structures align with WSCUC standards and clearly address the concerns from the 2015 Eligibility Review.

**CFR 1.6.** *The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid.*

CIHS has published policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds and does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies with the BPPE, its current recognizing agency. The team found that records of student complaints were available, though the team recommends that additional care is taken to assure a thoroughness of the record-keeping and process for a six-year period.

CIHS's academic program information is represented in each catalog section per program and degree level and on the institution's website. Program services and costs, including expected times of completion, are in the catalog, website, and on the Student Enrollment Agreement. The Student Code of Conduct is in the catalog, and CIHS students, along with faculty and administration, noted an awareness of the obligations under the catalog.

Policies supporting research and the establishment of an IRB are clearly defined, and the University publishes a disability statement, credit hour policy, and financial policies (including policies concerning refunds and financial aid) in its catalogs.

*CFR 1.7. The institution exists integrity and transparency in his operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and very responsive to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors.*

CIHS has existed as a small institution with an appropriately small staff – and has developed close personal relationships which shape the functioning of everyday operations. Through the process of accreditation, and through their approval by the BPPE, the institution has developed some formal policies and procedures that guide relationships between students and the institution. The student handbook clearly articulates the relationship of the student to the institution and the responsibilities and appropriate expectations from both parties. However, while there are formal policies for students, additional work is required to reach the level of initial accreditation. More formalized procedures around grievances, with appropriate record-keeping, is required. With respect to the implementation of sound business practices and the use of an outside auditor, CIHS employs a team approach with a CFO, bookkeeper, and outside

auditor and accountant. These efforts are supported by an engaged chair of the institution's Finance Committee. The team found the institution to be making sound financial decisions and to be clearly articulating its decisions to its auditor, and the process continues to achieve audits with an unqualified opinion and growing net assets.

***CFR 1.8.** The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.*

The team found CIHS board members, administrators, faculty, and staff engaged in the accreditation process and committed to honest and open communication. The institution demonstrated an awareness of the need for transparency between the institution and WSCUC, and at times demonstrated its willingness to identify areas where it could improve and more fully meet Commission policies and procedures.

### **Summary for Standard 1**

The team found the following CFRs to be sufficient for Initial Accreditation: CFRs 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.8.

The team found the following CFRs sufficient for Candidacy but needing more development for Initial Accreditation and recommends the following:

**CFR 1.2** Indicators of student achievement need to be more fully articulated in terms of measurable student achievement and outcomes; better aligned throughout

course materials and program descriptions; and measured and assessed at the course, program, and institutional level for appropriate and intentional communication to students and the public.

**CFR 1.3** Implementation of the diversity policy and diversity efforts to achieve the stated goals of a more diverse student body, faculty, and board of trustees.

**CFR 1.7** Increased documentation and operationalization of policies and procedures, particularly around student grievances.

The team found that CIHS meets the requirements of Standard 1 at a level sufficient for Candidacy, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

The team found the faculty, staff, administration, and board of trustees well-acquainted with the educational mission and with the vision of the founder. While additional work will be required to build systems for assessment and educational achievement; to expand diversity of its student population, faculty, and board of trustees; and to create more formal structures around its complaints procedures, the team found that CIHS meets the requirements of Standard 1 at a level sufficient for Candidacy, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

*The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.*

*CFR 2.1. The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered.*

Programs offered are aligned with the institution's mission and vision, and course content is aligned with the expected institutional learning outcomes. However, there is no clear articulation of program learning outcomes, published goals for student learning and achievement, or clear criteria for what constitutes appropriate levels of mastery of the program learning outcomes (PLOs).

Some admissions requirements and graduate degree requirements are not clearly articulated, and expectations for student performance and for processes that demonstrate the quality and integrity of degrees have not yet been identified and developed. WSCUC Core Competencies are not currently being assessed as part of the assessment cycle, yet their assessment is an agenda item for the newly formed faculty senate.

CIHS's faculty possess expertise in their fields of practice, which makes for a rich

learning experience for students. However, several key academic administrators and some faculty do not possess terminal degrees from regionally accredited institutions.

*CFR 2.2. All degrees awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees.*

*CFR 2.2a. Undergraduate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, undergraduate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Undergraduate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).*

**2.2a.** CIHS's undergraduate Integral Studies program serves as a bachelor's completion program; students are admitted who have already completed their general education courses. The undergraduate program was found to be generally of appropriate

depth and breadth to allow students to engage in cultural and aesthetic knowledge that college graduates. Social and political knowledge is appropriate for the mission and values of the institution. It is noted that alternate scientific and technical knowledge is of appropriate depth and breadth, yet while there is an emphasis on integrating Eastern and Western philosophies and sciences, there is room for building in more of Western scientific and technical knowledge to better prepare students for professional practice as well as board exams and licensing requirements.

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) at all levels need to be expressed in measurable terms and measured in all courses and programs (regardless of mode of delivery) across the curriculum, including at or near graduation, in a formalized assessment of student learning process that allows for changes and improvements in assignments, assessments, activities, practice opportunities, and pedagogy.

**CFR 2.2b.** *The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program.*

**2.2b.** Graduate programs foster students' engagement with the literature in the field and create a culture the emphasizes scholarship and graduate-level research and

writing skills. It will be an important first step for the faculty senate to establish clearly stated learning objectives that are differentiated from and more advanced than those from the undergraduate program in terms of standards of performance and student learning outcomes.

Learning outcomes at all levels need to be expressed in measurable terms at the course and program level (regardless of mode of delivery) across the curriculum, including at or near graduation, in a formalized assessment of student learning process that allows for changes and improvements in assignments, assessments, activities, practice opportunities, and pedagogy.

*CFR2.3. The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment.*

CIHS faculty have developed student learning outcomes at the institutional but not the programmatic level (PLOs) and have not yet developed a plan for assessing achievement of the PLOs. Faculty have created course-level learning outcomes (CLOs) but need to articulate these outcomes in measurable terms and need to create well-developed assessment tools that will determine students' performance level with respect to each learning outcome.

CLOs are published in most syllabi; however, these course-level learning

outcomes are not clearly linked to the PLOs, and many are not expressed in measurable terms. Expectations for student learning outcomes' performance have not yet been established. The ways in which learning outcomes are assessed is not identified in syllabi.

While many resources and key texts are aligned with the mission and educational objectives of the institution, CIHS has not yet determined the extent to which faculty and students are satisfied with library and technology resources; this is particularly important due to the distance education delivery of courses. Once this assessment becomes part of the institutional and educational effectiveness assessment process, the results will help the institution understand which specific types of resources may be needed and which ones are sufficient. The institution's current technology resources, which were utilized for distance faculty and students to communicate with the team during the visit revealed some glitches and challenges, which may be improved with updated software or practices.

*CFR 2.4. The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards.*

While the institution is in the earliest stage of developing formalized assessment processes, CIHS's faculty regularly engage in formative assessment of students' writing

skills; students report satisfaction with faculty feedback. The ways in which course learning outcomes are assessed are not identified in syllabi, nor are these course-level learning outcomes linked to the program learning outcomes (PLOs). Faculty have developed an assessment tool pertaining to expectations for student writing but have not developed assessment tools for other learning outcomes, nor does the current rubric contain indicators of achievement or dimensions of SLOs and does not describe performance levels for student achievement.

While there are some key summative assignments in certain courses that allow for the direct assessment of student learning, the assessment of student learning at CIHS is primarily focused on indirect, rather than direct, assessment. For instance, CIHS assessment practices include the compilation and use of course evaluation data regarding students' perceptions of their learning rather than on the results of direct assessment of student learning.

It will be important for the faculty senate to develop a faculty-driven process for establishing appropriate standards for student performance, identify and publish in syllabi the type of summative assessment for each learning outcome, and develop appropriate assessment tools that identify indicators of achievement of learning outcomes and that describe performance levels.

*CFR 2.5. The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice,*

*generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.*

CIHS actively involve students in learning through experiential learning activities, labs, internships, and interactions within class sessions with faculty and other students. Students report that they are challenged and that they are satisfied with faculty's feedback on their learning—particularly with respect to their writing skills. While faculty and students describe some examples of formative assessment, it will be important to create more opportunities for the formative assessment and an enhanced summative assessment of students' research and writing skills.

*CFR 2.6. The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning out- comes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work.*

All of CIHS's programs have culminating experiences such as capstones, theses, qualifying examinations, and dissertations. General guidelines regarding these experiences expectations have been created and are published.

CIHS has not created curriculum maps that indicate which courses introduce, allow students to practice and develop, and eventually master learning outcomes. CIHS does not compile data on graduates' achievement of learning outcomes at expected levels of performance nor have expected levels for learning been established. Goals for student learning beyond the passing of courses have not yet been established. CIHS has not developed assessment rubrics which identify indicators of achievement of PLOs and descriptions of performance levels

for PLO achievement. It will be important for the faculty to plan the assessment student learning at or near graduation in order to establish that graduates in all programs, regardless of mode of program delivery, are meeting the stated goals.

*CFR 2.7. All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.*

The team suggests that the faculty develop a formalized assessment of student learning process that includes the direct (in addition to indirect) assessment of learning outcomes and a plan that indicates context for assessment, including sample size and methodology. The institution should clearly articulate expected levels of student learning that are required for graduation, engage in direct assessment of student work to ensure that students' achievement of PLOs are at the expected performance levels, and ensure that faculty are consistent in their rating of student work.

### **Scholarship and Creative Activity**

*CFR 2.8. The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character.*

CIHS's talented faculty have published multiple books and scholarly journal articles. CIHS demonstrates intentionality in hiring faculty with research interests and expertise in subject areas valued by the institution and aligned with the programs and curriculum. While faculty are encouraged to be prolific writers, the institution does not provide financial backing nor dedicated protected time for faculty publication or participation in scholarly activities. Further, CIHS has not developed policies or clear expectations for scholarly activity and has not embedded scholarship into expectations for faculty performance and promotion. Assessment of scholarly activity is not included in the faculty evaluation process.

CIHS students are provided with regular opportunities to learn about subtle energy research and to participate in conferences, including the Society for Anthropology of Consciousness conference and an annual student research conference. However, the institution does not provide funding for participation in other outside conferences or organizations.

CIHS has expressed its intention to provide enhanced support for both faculty and students to engage in scholarly activities and participate in conferences. These plans have not yet been formalized or incorporated in current or projected budgets.

*CFR 2.9. The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service.*

CIHS has a rudimentary faculty evaluation process, which is outlined in the strategic plan. This evaluation does not define expectations for or linkages among

scholarship, student learning, and service.

### **Student Learning and Success**

**CFR 2.10.** *The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.*

CIHS tracks graduation rates but has not yet drilled down through meaningful disaggregation of survey and student success results in order to identify additional support needs for students in varying demographic groups. Only aggregated data have thus far been gathered and analyzed, without a mechanism to help the institution identify specific needs for planning for educational effectiveness and student success.

Due to the strong focus on writing skills in students' theses and dissertations, CIHS has developed an academic writing and research skills course, which is offered every quarter for all entering graduate students.

Information regarding climate for students and faculty and staff have not been gathered, nor has student engagement been assessed.

*CFR 2.11. Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement.*

CIHS has created supplemental and complementary learning opportunities for students outside of the curriculum via its Subtle Energy and Science Research conferences. These conferences are of high quality and importance to all constituencies and to the greater interested communities beyond CIHS. There is not, however, a formal program or expected learning outcomes for the co-curriculum.

The team suggests that the institution identify and assess co-curricular outcomes. Additional professional development for those providing student support services will also be of value. CIHS does not currently assess student satisfaction and campus climate. Disaggregation of such data would allow the institution to make decisions that promote student satisfaction and achievement.

*CFR 2.12. The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements.*

CIHS demonstrates integrity with students, and marketing brochures generally provide sufficient information for students to make informed decisions about the institution and programs. General information advising is provided. Distance education

options are not fully explained in promotional materials. Students report understanding of general requirements yet there is room for clearer description and more information regarding procedures for some of the policies as well as information regarding expected standards of performance and learning outcomes.

*CFR 2.13. The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers.*

The size of the student body has allowed the institution to work with individual students through informal processes to support students outside of class in various ways. These efforts include the interventions by the Dean of Students regarding non-academic matters and the academic tutoring provided by the Director of Student Services.

CIHS recognizes the need and indicates its intention to expand student support services to include a clinical training director, alumni services, and career services. CIHS is encouraged to formalize policies and processes for students seeking learning accommodations.

CIHS does not currently have a formalized mechanism for assessing student satisfaction with services offered.

*CFR 2.14. Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such*

*students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process.*

CIHS advises students on the limitations of the acceptance of transfer credits from other institutions. Additionally, CIHS has sufficient transfer credit policy. The team further found that transfer policies are being followed. CIHS has not yet assessed the degree to which transfer students feel that they are well integrated into the CIHS culture nor the extent to which they feel supported and have access to needed services.

### **Summary for Standard Two**

The team found the following CFR to be sufficient for Initial Accreditation:

#### **CFR 2.14.**

The team found the following CFRs sufficient for Candidacy but needing more development for Initial Accreditation and recommends the following:

**CFRs 2.1 and 2.3:** Develop appropriate program and course learning outcomes that are expressed in measurable terms; define and clearly describe performance levels for student achievement of program learning outcomes; and link course-level to program-level learning outcomes.

**CFRs 2.2 and 2.2b.** Develop and implement both a long-range plan and well-developed rubrics for the assessment of program learning outcomes and clearly articulate admissions and graduate degree requirements.

**CFR 2.4.** Develop a faculty-driven process for establishing appropriate standards for student performance.

**CFR 2.5.** Develop formalized summative assessment processes which include the direct assessment of student learning outcomes and ensure timely and appropriate interactions with and formative assessment for students taking courses online.

**CFR 2.6.** Plan for the development of program learning outcomes across the curriculum; assess student learning at or near graduation in order to establish that graduates achieve the expected student learning outcomes; and compile and analyze data on graduates' achievement of learning outcomes.

**CFR 2.7.** Develop a comprehensive and systematic program review process that includes the assessment of student achievement of program learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates, board pass rates and licensure, and an external review component.

**CFR 2.8.** Identify expectations for faculty research and scholarly activity and demonstrate commitment to and provisions for support of these activities.

**CFR 2.9.** Clearly define expectations for and linkages among scholarship, student learning, and service within the faculty evaluation process and procedures.

**CFR 2.10.** Collect and analyze both aggregated and disaggregated data related to student satisfaction and achievement in order to identify needs and make improvements in student support and achievement.

**CFR 2.11.** Develop and assess learning outcomes for co-curricular activities.

**CFR 2.12.** Formalize the academic advising process to ensure that all students receive advising and understand the requirements of and performance standards for their academic programs.

**CFR 2.13.** Develop and implement a process for assessing the quality of student support services and identifying students' learning support needs and use these assessment results to improve and enhance student support. At this initial stage of beginning to develop of an educational effectiveness framework, the institution recognizes and indicates understanding of the need for further development and refinement of the learning outcomes and for faculty ownership of this process. CIHS has created a new faculty senate, which will work on articulating and refining learning outcomes and alignment of these outcomes as well as the creation of signature assignments at or near the end of each program that will formally directly assess the program learning outcomes. Further, the faculty recognize the need to develop rubrics to measure the learning outcomes and mechanisms for systematically gathering data and analyzing these data as part of a robust program review process.

The team found that CIHS meets the requirements of Standard 2 at a level sufficient for Candidacy, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

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

*The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological,*

*and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

### **Faculty and Staff**

*CFR 3.1. The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered.*

The institution utilizes a recently deployed system of identifying “lead” faculty who are regularly assigned coursework and is in the process of implementing a faculty senate model to clarify the roles of the faculty within the institution. The faculty demonstrate a passion for students and teaching, as well as an excitement for potential research opportunities in the years to come. Faculty do not currently participate widely in program development or curricular review and oversight, and do not play a widespread and active role in program assessment – however, the institution notes that the newly formed faculty senate intends to take up those responsibilities.

While there is a sufficient number of faculty to teach the offered courses, the team had some concerns about the qualifications of faculty without a terminal degree from a regionally accredited institution. While WSCUC Standard 2 does not explicitly address

the issue of faculty qualifications, it is in the team’s professional judgment that entering into the collegial space of regionally accredited institutions and offering degrees at commonly understood levels, it is important that faculty possess degrees and credentials on par with comparable institutions. Thus, the team encourages CIHS to continue to expand its faculty ranks to include faculty with regionally accredited terminal degrees. Also, the team believes that academic diversity would be valuable to achieve the institution’s educational objectives – and the practice of relying heavily upon graduates of the institution as faculty should be evaluated in light of academic integrity, diversity of thought, and the expanded research identified by faculty as an important institutional priority.

*CFR 3.2. Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning.*

While the faculty reported appropriate on-boarding on an ad hoc basis by administrators, there remains significant need for formal policies and handbooks that address faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices. The institution’s current practice in evaluating faculty is to review students’ reflections from final course evaluations on an ad hoc basis, but this practice lacks the formalization and systematic requirements of CFR 3.2 and fails to include

direct observation and other direct assessment methods to provide deep engagement in the evaluation process. The institution noted that it understood that more formalized processes around recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation were needed to evolve into a more formal institution aligned with WSCUC standards and has undertaken these efforts by engaging the board and faculty – and developing the beginning of formalized governance bodies to advance those discussions.

*CFR 3.3. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes.*

Currently, CIHS offers new faculty an introductory meeting with senior leadership and a Moodle training on navigating the online platform. There is no formal program for faculty and staff development, and thus, there are no formalized and assessed efforts to improve teaching, learning, and institutional experience. Additional resources and activities are needed in order to meet WSCUC standards

### **Fiscal, Physical, & Informational Resources**

*CFR 3.4. The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives.*

In reviewing CIHS's audited financial statements, cash reserves, and operational

budget, the team found an ongoing and pervasive commitment to balanced budgets and transparent financial reporting. While the institution lacks a traditional endowment, its lease agreement and outside funding support operations and ongoing growth activities. The board expressed enthusiasm for moving from a “financially fragile” institution to a self-sustaining and thriving institution through its efforts around enrollment growth and fundraising.

The institution has limited cash reserves but has a long-term (50 year) lease of its buildings for \$1 per year, along with rental income from the adjacent properties. The ability to purchase the building at the expiration of the lease is a tremendous opportunity for growing CIHS’s assets, and the steady flow of revenue support the ongoing operations of CIHS.

The institution participates in an annual budget process and quarterly reviews of the budget to adjust to changing conditions and has maintained a positive cash balance without the need for short-term or long-term lending. The institution has created enrollment projections which project modest growth over the next four years and aligned that growth with increases in key staff and services.

The team found that while the process of budget allocation and approval was timely, CIHS lacks a formal structure that systematically involves stakeholders and aligns ongoing needs around educational objectives. As the institution formalizes its student achievement and assessment efforts, the team supports the board of trustees’ expressed desire to align resource allocations to the achievement of programs and

academic activities.

Finally, the institution has projected significant annual fundraising goals to support operations and has retained the assistance of an outside consultant to support that work. At the time of the visit, CIHS received news of several pledged gifts that total over \$750,000 over a four year period. These commendable efforts are planned to be part of integral fundraising activities going forward to ensure that CIHS is able to achieve its educational mission. The team recognizes the historic and ongoing support of Tamamitsu Jinja, a Japanese non-profit founded to support the Shinto teachings of its founder, Dr. Motoyama, which is currently headed by Dr. Motoyama's second son and current board member of CIHS.

*CFR 3.5. The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.*

CIHS offers a unique hybrid model of instruction with all courses being synchronously offered both online and onsite. This innovative approach allows students from around the world to access the educational programs and to interact with faculty and peers. Faculty are allowed to use Skype/GoToMeeting/Zoom to supplement their online Moodle platform. Students and faculty both expressed

satisfaction with the existing technology in instructional delivery, though a survey of courses by the team found many classes where the technology had not been utilized to its fullest potential (lack of timely responses, tracking of assignments, and posted grades). While faculty are given an introductory course to using Moodle, there are no additional professional development in online instruction/delivery.

CIHS utilizes LIRN and a small physical space housing a limited collection of works to support student learning and research. A list of additional resources is maintained by the CEO/Academic Dean. Students identified the lack of electronic resources and access to scholarly works as a primary area of improvement for the institution. As the institution continues to expand its interest in doctoral research, additional online databases will be required to supplement that work.

### **Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes**

**CFR 3.6.** *The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.*

The team found the leadership at all levels to behave with integrity and forthrightness in all of its engagement with the team before, during, and after the visit. As the institution has transitioned throughout the WSCUC process, roles have been clarified and performance has begun to be measured. The size of the school and the staff were noted by many of the individuals as being a challenge – with many people performing multiple roles to support ongoing operations. As the institution grows, it will be helpful to more clearly identify lines of authority, responsibilities,

and performance measures to assure compliance with CFR 3.6.

**CFR 3.7.** *The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.*

As stated above, greater attention has been placed in creating lines of authority, and continued improvement is encouraged to reduce any confusion around roles and or accountability. The members of the team have generally worked with one another for many years, and the consistency in personnel has led to what appeared to be smooth operations for existing functions. As the campus grows, and as systems are created to advance the institution's mission, more organized and formalized structures will be required to support decision making and ensure that key stakeholders are engaged in the decisions that will sustain institutional capacity and assure educational effectiveness.

**CFR 3.8.** *The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.*

CIHS has a unique model of leadership with a CEO/academic dean and an executive dean/CFO handling many of the administrative functions. Both are full-time employees and both are supported in their duties by a dean of administration and

admissions and an administrative manager and financial controller. All are full-time employees and CIHS reports that it has plans to add administrative staff as the institution grows.

The team noted that the staff was supported by engaged board members and additional outside consulting for financial/audit functioning, but as the complexity of the organization grows, it will be important to gain additional expertise around financial reporting and the institutional research required to demonstrate compliance with WSCUC standards. Finally, the potential burden for managing a growing and complex organization, and the challenges with succession planning that are created by such a small staff pose ongoing risks to CIHS.

***CFR 3.9.** The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.*

Efforts since a May 24, 2016, change to CIHS bylaws have created an independent governing board that is able to exercise appropriate oversight of the institution. At the time of the creation of the new independent board, outside members were recruited with expertise in finance, fundraising, non-profit leadership, and scientific research. The founding sponsor of the organization, Tamamitsu Jinja, were assured a “minority” position with no more than one-third of the membership being composed of representatives from Tamamitsu Jinja.

The board adopted a traditional committee structure, with a finance, academic, fundraising, principles & reserve powers, nominating, and audit committee. The board has the power to hire and evaluate the two executive officers (CEO and Executive Dean), and it plans to continue to evaluate both on an annual cycle.

The board meets quarterly and reviews institutional finances, programmatic offerings, and the alignment of the institution's strategy with the efforts of management. The board members shared that they were in the process of more fully developing the activities of the academic committee to include a review of program effectiveness and student achievement to better fulfill its duties of oversight over institutional integrity.

The board appears to be sufficient in number, well-qualified, and engaged in a way that supports the faculty, staff, and students of CIHS.

**CFR 3.10.** *The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained.*

CIHS has recently created a faculty senate in order to better engage faculty in the decision-making and quality assurance activities of the institution. Faculty noted a comfort with academic freedom in their coursework and research, but there appeared to be no existing formal structure to engage faculty in decision-making, review of programmatic activities, or overall institutional performance. The board, administrators, and faculty all noted that additional work was underway to create manuals and protocols to more clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of the

faculty in governance – and the team encourages CIHS to continue these efforts to clarify roles and responsibilities to comply with CFR 3.10.

### **Summary for Standard Three**

The team found the following CFRs to be sufficient for Initial Accreditation:

#### **CFRs 3.6 and 3.9.**

The team found the following CFRs sufficient for Candidacy but needing more development for Initial Accreditation and recommends the following:

**CFR 3.1.** Expand efforts to attract and retain high-quality faculty with a diverse and qualified academic background.

**CFR 3.2.** Develop and implement faculty and staff policies, practices, and evaluation procedures to ensure the achievement of institutional mission.

**CFR 3.3.** Develop, implement, and assess a formal faculty and staff development program.

**CFR 3.4.** Continue efforts to fund ongoing operations through sound enrollment management and fundraising activities.

**CFR 3.5.** Expand resources around information technology and learning and assess these activities in support of student learning and student achievement.

**CFR 3.7.** Assess the planned implementation of more formal structures around decision-making and processes to support educational effectiveness.

**CFR 3.8.** Continue to develop expertise around financial reporting and the

alignment of budgets with educational outcomes.

**CFR 3.10.** Continue efforts to create greater alignment of budgets with educational outcomes.

The team found the institution to have developed a plan for financial stability and growth, in addition to a history of annual positive net assets from operations. In addition, the institution has created formalized structures, revised its bylaws, and established an independent board of trustees to comply with WSCUC standards. While additional work is required to build institutional capacity supporting growth and build an academic community supportive of the institutional research goals, CIHS has made key improvements since the time of its eligibility review.

Additional work will be required, particularly around the hiring and retention of qualified faculty to support graduate education and research, the creation of faculty development programs, the engagement of faculty in decision-making, and the creation of more formalized structures to support the oversight of financial, operational, and assessment activities.

In conclusion, the team found that CIHS meets Standard 3 at a level sufficient for Candidacy, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

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

*The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.*

In reviewing CIHS's compliance with this standard, the team looked for a set of comprehensive processes that provide for the systematic collection and analysis of assessment of data indicating students' progressive mastery of learning outcomes across the programs' curricula and the effective performance of the organization on key indicators. The team reviewed evidence of the portions thereof that have been implemented to date as well as the plans for those that remain to be further developed and put into practice.

**Quality Assurance Processes**

**CFR 4.1.** *The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and*

*interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results.*

CIHS does not have in place a process for the systematic collection of either formative or summative assessment of student learning that is organized by program learning outcomes. There thus appears to be no method for tracking student achievement across time as students progress through the curriculum, which would provide data for decision making regarding modifications or improvements to curricula or program administration.

The team found some elements of a quality assurance process. The BPPE School Performance Fact Sheet, which tracks completion rates and offers some job placement information, while minimal, is a good first step. The team also found that faculty informally and periodically discuss suggestions for the improvement of courses and support services in faculty meetings, and using this information as a basis for making changes to program offerings, with a strong and important emphasis on academic writing skills.

The institution also has in place culminating experiences for each degree program such as a capstone, thesis, comprehensive examination or dissertation. These are good foundational summative measures of student learning. There is an opportunity here to evaluate these assignments based on program learning outcomes, and to aggregate the data to find patterns in student achievement that can indicate strengths or opportunities in

the program curriculum.

The team appreciates the introduction of the concept of the signature assignment and encourages the further development of this as a process for the systematic collection of formative assessment data by program learning outcome. The team encourages the faculty to develop rubrics that allow for direct assessment of student learning rather than to use the grade on the assignment as assessment data.

The team found that program learning outcomes presented in the CIHS academic catalog are not measurable and do not articulate clearly what a student will know how to do upon graduation. For example, standard learning outcomes in a clinical psychology program would include expected learning outcomes such as assessment, treatment, and intervention skills. Further, course learning outcomes in syllabi are not explicitly linked to the program learning outcomes they advance, and curriculum maps do not show in which class in the curriculum each program learning outcome is addressed or at what level of learning.

In its self-study, the institution initially identified what it considered to be the need to upgrade and modernize data collection methodology for the purpose of quality assurance. Between the submission of the self-study and the site visit, the institute demonstrated a growing awareness of the need to develop curriculum structures that would support the processes and methodology for the assessment of student learning by providing the team with an outline for the revision of learning objectives.

It is incumbent upon the institution to develop a systematic program review

process. To support the implementation of such an assessment system, the faculty must clearly articulate measurable program learning outcomes that align with stated institutional learning outcomes, which can then serve as framework for course learning outcomes. These linkages should then be made clear to all constituencies and appear within curriculum maps and published in syllabi. It is expected that included in the program review process would be a mechanism for the faculty to analyze the data and make recommendations for quality improvement to the school's programming.

As CIHS grows and seeks to add additional academic programs to its offerings, the institution should develop a process for the development of new programs and the evaluation of their viability to be sustainable over time.

**CFR 4.2.** *The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated.*

The evidence presented by CIHS for this CFR was the budget and the BPPE report. While both of these documents are important, the budget itself, without derivative indicators presented against industry benchmarks is not what is generally considered to be the output of an office of institutional research. While the BPPE is a required report, it does not comprise what the institution itself considers to be key performance indicators for the purpose of evaluating organizational effectiveness.

CIHS currently has no staff member designated with the responsibility to collate and report internal and external data for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the institution.

### **Institutional Learning and Improvement**

*CFR 4.3. Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes.*

The team found that the leadership and faculty of CIHS have a strong commitment to continuous improvement. Currently, CIHS has taken the step of collecting course evaluations from students at the conclusion of each quarter. While that is an important component of the quality assurance process, and student input into the assessment of teaching and learning is essential and expected, such as system must include other methods of assessment. Further, the evidence presented as support for CFR 4.3 was that faculty assesses student achievement against course learning outcomes in each course. The team agrees that this is important for the evaluation of student mastery of course material. It is not, however, an assessment of the effectiveness of teaching within the context of program learning objectives, nor does it constitute an evaluation of the effectiveness of the teaching methods of the instructor.

The team did not find evidence of the systematic assessment of the campus

environment or student satisfaction/engagement with student support services or personnel. Co-curricular activities, where they occur, should include an assessment of participant learning as a required component, and these data should be considered for the purpose of decision making regarding development of student services and allocation of resources.

*CFR 4.4. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology.*

CIHS does not currently have institutionally supported programming around the scholarship of teaching and learning. This might include support for faculty in the development of curricula, learning outcomes, assessment methods, online teaching methods, pedagogy, or other subjects that would improve the effectiveness of teaching. Faculty are not currently engaged in a process for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes that would support the use of those evaluations for the improvement of student learning and success.

*CFR 4.5. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the*

*assessment and alignment of educational programs.*

CIHS has indicated the intention to empower the faculty senate with the task of curriculum development and oversight, and this designation by corollary includes the responsibility for the quality assurance of educational programming that must engage the learning community. When developing the formal program assessment procedure, the roles and engagement of the various members of that community must be considered.

**CFR 4.6.** *The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution.*

As CIHS begins accruing student learning and program effectiveness data by the implementation of its program review process, it must then use the data to support strategic planning, the allocation of resources, and the provision of support services and staff functions.

**CFR 4.7.** *Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.*

CIHS has engaged a consultant to support the development of a strategic growth

plan and has sent representatives of the institution to the WSCUC Academic Resource Conference (ARC). The team finds this to be an indicator that the institution values professional associations and external experts as important sources of information for the formulation of long-term strategic plans.

#### **Summary for Standard Four**

The team found the following CFRs needing more development to be sufficient for Candidacy and recommends the following:

**CFR 4.1.** Develop and implement a process for academic and institutional quality assurance to include periodic program review and assessment of student learning, and a process for new program development.

**CFR 4.2.** Establish a position responsible for the function of collecting, organization, and presenting institutional research for the purpose of planning and decision making.

The team found the following CFRs sufficient for Candidacy but needing more development for Initial Accreditation and recommends the following:

**CFR 4.3.** Collect and analyze data reflecting the systematic assessment of teaching and learning, and the campus environment, and use the data to support improvements.

**CFR 4.4.** The institution must further develop the support for faculty inquiry and training around the scholarship of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on assessment of student learning, pedagogy, and curriculum development.

**CFR 4.5.** Ensure that the process of assessment of institutional effectiveness must formally include appropriate stakeholders such as board members, staff, faculty, students, and community members.

**CFR 4.6.** Include multiple stakeholders in the development of strategic plans based on data and evidence.

**CFR 4.7.** Further develop support for the methodical evaluation of trends and changes in higher education and consider them when developing new programming and allocating resources.

The team finds that CIHS is at the very beginning stages of developing a comprehensive process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness. The team notes that the institution has some basic elements of the system in place, but CIHS must focus on developing the infrastructure for data collection in the assessment of student learning, the evaluation of student achievement, the need for and effectiveness of co-curricular activities, campus climate, and the effectiveness of student services in supporting the success of students. This will involve further refining of the program learning outcomes, developing curriculum maps and assessment plans for each program, and collecting formative and summative data on student learning and expanding institutional research capabilities.

The WSCUC team finds that CIHS meets Standard 4 at a level sufficient for Candidacy, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the WSCUC

Standards.

### **SECTION III. PREPARATION FOR ACCREDITATION UNDER THE 2013 HANDBOOK OF ACCREDITATION**

CIHS demonstrated to the team that they wish to make institutional changes and improvement in order to comply not only with the standards but also the spirit of accreditation, and faculty, staff, and board expressed enthusiasm for the process of accreditation and a willingness to embrace the standards. The institution is prepared to hire for key positions which will greatly enhance their ability to create the educational and institutional effectiveness framework and mechanisms needed to create a culture of data-driven decision making.

#### **A. Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees**

With educational objectives such as “establish[ing] guiding principles for the Citizens of the Global Society” and “establish[ing] energy medicine...[to] promote health,” the institution cultivates a distinct and pervasive world view for the cultivation of practices and skill sets designed to promote healing and wellness as well as to integrate mind, body, and spirit. While the institution has not yet articulated the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees, faculty, staff, administration, and board all expressed enthusiasm for this process. The board has plans to discuss this topic at their next meeting, and it is a planned discussion for the faculty senate as well. The team feels confident that the institution will begin to address the development of and

framework for ensuring MQID in the coming months.

**B. Educational Quality: Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation**

CIHS has adopted the WSCUC Core Competencies yet has not assessed these competencies. However, the newly formed faculty senate is slated to establish plans for the assessment of Core Competencies through careful curriculum mapping, embedded signature assignments, and well-developed and appropriate assessment processes. CIHS has not developed appropriate program learning outcomes (PLOs) but has established learning objectives and will develop appropriate PLOs through the work of the faculty senate. The institution demonstrated its commitment to assessing Core Competencies and to developing and assessing PLOs. The institution has not yet identified standards of student performance beyond grades, but faculty discussed plans to establish these standards as part of their newly developing assessment process.

**C. Sustainability: Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment**

As CIHS begins to formalize student achievement and assessment of student learning efforts, the team appreciates the commitment that the board of trustees expressed to the appropriate alignment of resource allocations in support of educational programs and academic activities. As the institution brings on an institutional researcher to assist with data compilation and analyses, CIHS will be able to improve

its efforts as a learning organization—one that will continue to make improvements based on assessment results. Already plans are in place for the start of two centers: the Center for Integral Leadership and the Center for Sound in Healing. The Center for Integral Leadership has as its goal to “develop leaders who are dynamically aware and adept at bringing innovative products, services, processes, strategies, and meddles into the world” (Overview: Center for Integral Leadership, CIHS, 2018). The center seeks to help leaders develop systemic practices which allow for the “emergence of new structures” and helps to develop leaders “with greater awareness of the habits, assumptions, and systemic energies that can constrain or help unlock the potential of the organization” (Overview: Center for Integral Leadership, CIHS, 2018). The Center of Sounds in Healing has proposed and obtained a Memorandum of Understanding with a provider to develop a certificate in Sound and Healing to be offered at CIHS.

While the institution needs to develop its capacity to use data to inform decision making, CIHS has demonstrated its commitment to responding to societal needs. These two centers and the certificate program(s) they are planning to offer demonstrate CIHS’s responsiveness to two perceived needs in society. One is the need for innovative, effective practices in psychotherapy for enhancing the well-being of patients. Another is the increasingly researched notion of a deficit in leadership that spans many organizations and society—the need for leaders who are situationally and systemically aware who can inspire trust, collaboration, and co-creation for the betterment of organizations and also for society. In this way, CIHS demonstrates its

intentions to act in ways that support the public good.

## **SECTION IV – INVENTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS**

CIHS's Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators are under development; the institution is not yet able to demonstrate development and usage of an overarching framework for assessing educational effectiveness or the development of assessment tools and processes for assessing student learning in a formalized way. CIHS has identified institutional learning outcomes yet has not yet articulated these clearly and in measurable terms for each programs. Each program has yet to identify program learning outcomes. Courses do have learning outcomes, but syllabi do not articulate the type of summative assessment that is utilized for assessing each learning outcomes.

At this initial stage of beginning to develop of an educational effectiveness framework, the institution recognizes and indicates understanding of the need for further development and refinement of the learning outcomes and for faculty ownership of this process. CIHS has created a new faculty senate, which will work on articulating and refining learning outcomes and alignment of these outcomes as well as the creation of signature assignments at or near the end of each program that will formally directly assess the program learning outcomes. Further, the faculty recognize the need to develop rubrics to measure the learning outcomes and mechanisms for systematically gathering data and analyzing these data as part of a robust program review process.

CIHS has stated its commitment to creating an institutional research position; once hired, this person will assist the institution with institutional research processes and data compilation, presentation, and analysis within the next six months. To date, course evaluations are the primary tool for assessing course, program, and instructional quality. While the results of these assessments are widely shared with faculty and are utilized to make changes and improvements in teaching and learning, this process has been informal. Faculty are able to provide some examples of changes made due to the results of these assessments.

Samples of student dissertations were made available at the time of the visit, yet there was no analysis of the results of the assessments of these. Due to a lack of formalized assessment processes or analyses of results, the institution was not able to show a data-driven decision-making process. However, CIHS was able to share the informal process by which identified needs for resources are linked to budgeting and are able to describe changes based on initial assessment results from course evaluations.

## **SECTION V – FINDINGS & COMMENDATIONS**

The team encountered a learning community built on shared values and the pursuit of integrating science and religion to improve health and wellness. The team found that the goals, values, and guiding principles of the institution are widely understood by the community, reflected in academic practices and co-curricular offerings, and key to decision-making by the board of trustees and administrators. Further, the team found faculty, staff, students, and board members to be engaged in the

work of accreditation—reflecting a profound commitment to the institution and its mission and vision.

Finally, the team wanted to recognize the important work of CIHS’s founder (Dr. Hiroshi Motoyama), the continued support of his son, and the generous contributions of Tamamitsu Jinja in the evolution of the institution.

### **Commendations**

The team wishes to commend the California Institute for Human Science in the following areas:

1. The engagement of the institution with the WASC process and the expressed commitment of the administration, board, faculty, and students to continue to engage in the institutional journey toward accreditation.
2. The demonstrated commitment of the institution to the principles of independent governance and the establishment of a qualified and engaged board of trustees.
3. The excitement exhibited over institutional efforts to build research capabilities to fulfill its mission.
4. Finally, CIHS is to be commended for engagement during the visit with their understanding of the meaning, quality, and integrity of the degrees granted by the institution – a discussion that will prove ever-more important through the process of accreditation and institutional quality to guide future decision-making.



*Senior College and University Commission*

## **DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW**

CIHS offers a hybrid mode of instruction, with all courses in all programs being synchronously offered both online and onsite. Faculty utilize Skype, GoToMeeting and Zoom to supplement the online Moodle platform. Per federal policy, the team reviewed various aspects of the distance education programs—including viewing course materials, syllabi, assignments and pedagogical approaches utilized, assessments, and discussion prompts and forums on Moodle.

CIHS verifies that students who participate use a secure login and passcode into Moodle. Videoconferencing, which occurs at the same time that on-ground students are attending the class, allows for identification of students and also for virtual interaction with the instructors and other students.

The types of assignments utilized include essay prompts with required scholarly responses, discussion topics, writing assignments, group projects and activities, and individualized activities. CIHS students reported that they receive academic support of various types easily in their distance education courses. They cited the responsiveness of faculty when needs arise.

Most of the courses viewed on Moodle set reasonably high expectations for student participation and assignments and activities which seem appropriately rigorous (such as requiring students to respond a certain number of times to others' posts with an academic-quality response of a certain length and prescribed quality. Assignment prompts were of high quality as well.

CIHS is encouraged to establish standards for faculty engagement with students in the course as it does for students and student engagement. It will also be important for faculty to enforce standards of participation and engagement to ensure that students receive a high-quality educational experience in online courses. Further, it will be important in skills-based courses for the institution to be able to document students' demonstration of the skills they are acquiring through videotaping summative performances and utilizing well-developed assessment rubrics to assess student learning.

CIHS must continue to comply with state laws regarding legal authority to grant degrees to students who attend via distance learning. The team encourages CIHS to review WSCUC's *Distance Education Review Guide* and to pursue the development of online and hybrid course good practices going forward. CIHS is further encouraged to provide faculty development around topics such as best practices for distance education (such as a flipped classroom format, etc.).

## FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

### OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
- 3 – Student Complaints Form
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Form

During the visit, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

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

#### Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

- (1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
  - (i) It reviews the institution's-
    - (A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
    - (B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework;and
  - (ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.
- (2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

**Credit hour** is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

- (1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
- (2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other

academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

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

**Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)**

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor’s degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master’s degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length. Rev 03/2015

**1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM**

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</b>
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? On the school’s website ( <a href="http://www.cihs.edu/index.php/credit-hour-policy/">http://www.cihs.edu/index.php/credit-hour-policy/</a> )
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The institution should ensure that each syllabus references this policy. Additionally, each syllabus should specify the number of credit hours earned by the completion of the course.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Most courses are offered as a combination of onground and online delivery (“hybrid”). The policy, the schedule, and the syllabi do not specify the credit hour compliance requirements for the online component of the courses.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	How many syllabi were reviewed? 6
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? This was somewhat unclear and had to be inferred.
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral – some courses are attended by students from multiple programs and degree levels.

<p><i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	<p>What discipline(s)? BA Integral Studies, MA Integral Health, PhD Psychology</p>
	<p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments: The amount of outside work for each contact hour is specified as 2:1 in the policy, however, this is not clearly evident in the online components of the course, is it clear how "contact" hours are determined for those weeks in which the class does not meet in person (or synchronously via videoconferencing software over the internet).</p>
<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)</p> <p><i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	<p>How many syllabi were reviewed? Not applicable. These experiences are integrated into classroom activities.</p>
	<p>What kinds of courses?</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)?</p>
	<p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>
<p>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</p>	<p>How many programs were reviewed? All programs were reviewed.</p>
	<p>What kinds of programs were reviewed? All programs were reviewed.</p>
	<p>What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral</p>
	<p>What discipline(s)? Integrated Science, Integrated Health, Psychology.</p>
	<p>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

Review Completed By: Michael Barr, Ph.D. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology.  
Date: May 4, 2018

**2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

<p><b>Mater ial Revie wed</b></p>	<p><b>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</b></p>
---	--

**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:  The institution passively recruits students, relying mostly on students inquiring after having discovered some information about the institution (website, conference presentation, workshop). Students who have inquired but who did not pursue application are placed on a mailing list and sent periodic newsletters and course schedules unless they opt out.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Most of the students enrolled at the institution are older adults who are already working within a profession, often a licensed profession, and tend to continue in that profession as employees or in private practice (Marriage and Family Therapists, Social Workers, Registered Nurses, and others).

\*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

\*\*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.

The team found no evidence of recruiting practices that would violate this regulation in its review.

Review Completed By: Michael Barr, Ph.D. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The

Chicago School of Professional Psychology.  
Date: May 4, 2018

**3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM**

Under federal regulation\*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</b>
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? YES. If so, where? Page four of the institution's academic catalog under the heading "Student Grievance Procedure." The catalog can be found on the institution's website.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>This is a brief policy that does not separate routine complaints from grievances (such as violation of policy or student rights). It does not separate out grade appeals.</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: The student is prompted to register the complaint with the Dean of Academic Affairs, who sets up a grievance review committee.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The institution may wish to revise the policy to provide an alternative pathway for student complaints in the event that the grievance or complaint involves the Dean of Academic Affairs. The institution may also wish to separate out grade appeals from this procedure.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES ✓ NO If so, where?</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input type="checkbox"/> YES ✓ NO If so, please describe briefly:</p>

	<p>Comments: The institution reports having received only one complaint within the period covered by this review. The claim and its resolution were reviewed and are properly documented. It is recommended that the institution establish a grievance log and a secure place for the storage of these records, with a disposal schedule.</p>
--	---

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Michael Barr, PhD, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology.

Date: May 4, 2018

**4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM**

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Page eight of the institution’s academic catalog under the heading “Transfer Credits.” The catalog can be found on the institution’s website.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ✓ YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:  Challenge exams (2 exams or 8 units) may be taken for equivalent coursework in the MA program. It is suggested that the institution clarify whether challenge exams count toward total transfer credits or not.

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

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By: Michael Barr, PhD, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology.

Date: May 4, 2018