

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

for REAFFIRMATION

To Scripps College

October 22-25, 2013

Team Roster

Chair: Carol T. Christ, President Emerita, Smith College

Assistant Chair: Marianne B. Sheldon, Mills College

Brian T. Harlan, California Institute of the Arts

WASC Staff Liaison: Barbara Gross Davis

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University Commission Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WASC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	Page
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution’s Self-Study Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report	4
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review	6
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS	
A. Theme I: Enhancing the Culture of Teaching and Learning	10
B. Theme II: Co-Curricular Assessment	16
C. Student Success	19
SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	20
APPENDICES	
Student Complaints Review	26
Marketing and Recruitment Review	28

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

Scripps College, founded in 1926, is a private, four-year, undergraduate liberal arts women's college with a distinctive interdisciplinary approach to the study of the humanities. It is located about thirty-five miles east of Los Angeles. With a student body of fewer than one thousand, the college aspires to provide an education that is academically distinctive, academically challenging, and morally engaging. It emphasizes educating women for leadership. Over 90% of Scripps students live on campus. Scripps is one of Claremont Colleges, a consortium of five undergraduate and two graduate institutions. The close physical proximity of the members encourages cross registration as well as shared programs and facilities, among them the library and multiple intercollegiate departments and programs.

Scripps was last accredited in 2002. The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR), designed to prepare for this review, was held in 2011, with a visit conducted on September 14-16 of that year. All of the members of the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team were members of the CPR team. At its meeting in February 2012 the WASC Commission received the CPR report; it continued Scripps accreditation, rescheduled the EER visit from spring 2013 to fall 2013, as recommended by the visiting team, and requested that the institution incorporate into its EER report its responses to issues raised in the action letter: Refining and implementing assessment and outcomes-

based program review, and strengthening institutional research; strengthening diversity; promoting student success; and leveraging the resources of the Claremont Consortium.

The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team conducted its review and prepared its report based both on the extensive materials provided by Scripps and on interviews and meetings held on campus between October 23 and October 25, 2013. Scripps was well prepared for the visit. The members of the team are appreciative of the extensive preparation and of the hard work and collegiality of the Scripps community during this review process. The team extends its sincere thanks.

B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

Scripps chose to organize its educational effectiveness report around two themes: enhancing the culture of teaching and learning and co-curricular assessment. An extensive series of appendices (30 in number) was attached to the report to supplement the narrative. The report was extremely impressive. In the two years between the CPR and the EER, Scripps developed a comprehensive framework for the assessment of both the curriculum and the co-curriculum. In the framework it developed for assessing the curriculum, the college defined institutional student learning outcomes, general education student learning outcomes, and departmental student learning outcomes, and created rubrics to assess students' progress in regard to each goal, which were rigorously and comprehensively applied. The report also described the process and schedule for academic program reviews. In regard to the co-curriculum, Scripps has developed a vision statement, a process and schedule for review, and conducted reviews of two of the

six departments in that area; all of these are well described in the report. The other four are in cycle and will be completed within the next few years. Finally, the report addressed the college's progress in addressing the additional external team and WASC commission recommendations from the CPR review. The report as a whole is well organized, and clearly written and presented. It portrays the condition of the college accurately and in great detail (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.7, 2.11).

There was extensive involvement on the part of faculty and staff in the review and in the preparation of the report. A steering committee, composed of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty, the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, the Associate Dean of Faculty, and the Director of Assessment and Institutional Research was responsible for overseeing the entire process. A WASC Faculty Task Force, including representatives from all four academic divisions (Fine Arts, Letters, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences), the Associate Dean of Faculty, and the Director of Assessment and Institutional Research was specifically responsible for developing and overseeing the assessment system for the curriculum. The team met with the faculty members of this task force on our visit and concluded that they were broadly and deeply knowledgeable about the report. In addition, all of the curriculum assessment results are given to the Faculty Executive Committee, with whom the team also met. They too were knowledgeable about the WASC process, both in general and in detail. The assessment of the co-curriculum was largely in the hands of staff, as is appropriate; there too, knowledge seemed broadly shared (CFR's 2.4, 4.6).

Scripps has approached the issue of assessment with rigor, using it to ask fundamental questions about educational effectiveness. The team was particularly impressed with the way in which faculty used assessment results to refine the rubrics themselves; there seems to be an effective feedback loop already embedded in the process. The methodology seemed appropriate, and in every case, evidence was used effectively, supporting the claims made by the institution in addressing the core commitment to educational effectiveness. In multiple instances, Scripps used the results of the assessment to make changes in programs to increase student learning. These issues are all addressed in detail in Section II of this report (CFR's 4.4-4.8).

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

In the CPR review, the team made six recommendations: to complete and implement a comprehensive academic and curricular assessment program; to shift Scripps' second theme from "educating women to be agents of change" to co-curricular assessment; to ensure that the devotion of funds to human resources are appropriately balanced with the laudable priority to maintain the physical plant; to focus the Board's attention on strategic, not operational issues; to implement with greater urgency the initiatives in the college's strategic plan for diversity; and to better leverage the resources of the Claremont Consortium.

Because the first two recommendations of the team match the two themes of Scripps' EER report, these will be addressed in Section II of this report.

In regard to the recommendation, that Scripps make sure to balance human resource priorities with those of the physical plant, Scripps has undertaken a fund-raising campaign, 78% of which is focused on investments in human capital; only 22% will be devoted to buildings. The apportionment of the resources anticipated from the campaign reflects the college's recognition of the need to invest even more in its people, with particular attention to financial aid and to reaching its goals for compensation of faculty. Scripps has significantly increased the capacity of its development office since the CPR review, evidence that gives confidence in the campaign's success (CFR 3.5).

In regard to the recommendation that the Board of Trustees refine its focus to one concerned with decisions primarily at a strategic rather than an operating level, the team found that the Board had successfully achieved this objective. Conversation with a selected group of trustees convinced the team that the Board was focused on the strategic issues not only critical for Scripps future but at the center of higher education over the next decade. Much of the Board's success in achieving this objective reflects their high level of confidence in the president and her team. The Board is involved in developing a strategic plan for itself; the administration, for its part, has been working with a consultant to present issues to the Board in a way that clearly frames the strategic issues the Board is being asked to review, discuss, and decide (CFR's 3.8, 3.9).

In the CPR report, the team recommended that Scripps implement with greater urgency all of the initiatives described in its strategic plan for diversity; the commission forcefully endorsed this recommendation, charging the college with strengthening diversity, particularly in regard to the student population. In response to the

recommendation about diversity, the college has developed a new strategic plan for diversity, with extensive involvement of many campus constituencies. The team found the plan at once powerful and appropriate, with goals for admissions and financial aid, student success, campus climate, academic program, and institutional capacity building, with recommendations in each area. The newly hired Vice President and Secretary of the Board of Trustees has been charged with oversight of the plan. However, only the future will demonstrate whether the college is successful in achieving its aims. The team believes that further increasing the diversity of the student body is particularly critical for Scripps; the numbers of women of color in the Scripps student body remain small, although there was a modest increase in 2012, the last year for which data were supplied. A greater investment in financial aid may be necessary to achieve this goal. Scripps believes that it has sufficient numbers of qualified applicants in its admissions pool to increase the diversity of the student body, but insufficient funding for financial aid to support them. If this analysis is accurate, the team urges the college to make financial aid a budget priority. Once students are admitted, it is equally critical to assure their success and to foster a climate of respect for others and engagement with issues of diversity and inclusiveness.

The team recommends that Scripps maintain an urgent and strong focus on diversity and inclusivity. The team particularly encourages the college to work to increase the diversity of the student body, making the financial aid critical to achieving this goal an institutional priority. The team also urges the college work to ensure the success of the students it enrolls, foster a respectful and inclusive campus climate, develop the capacity both inside and outside the classroom to engage issues

of diversity in their many dimensions, and work on increasing the diversity of faculty and staff. Scripps should maintain clear lines of responsibility and accountability for progress in this area, using the metrics it has identified (CFR's 1.5, 2.13, 3.2).

The team's final recommendation, endorsed by the WASC Commission, was to leverage the resources of the Consortium. Since the CPR review, Scripps, with the other members of the Consortium, has developed a more adequate governance plan for the library, which was the source of great unhappiness among faculty on the CPR visit. Scripps has also embarked on a project to create a shared office for disability services, and it is developing a valuable partnership with the other undergraduate colleges in the Consortium in assessment. These successes are praiseworthy, but there is still more potential in the Consortium, particularly in regard to developing a comparison group for assessment purposes and in more shared administrative services.

The team recommends that Scripps continue to explore new ways in which it might benefit from Claremont Consortium. As a relatively small college, Scripps has much to gain in efficiency and enrichment from the Consortium. The team believes that particular opportunities exist through the Consortium for establishing a comparative data set for assessment purposes and for greater efficiency in administrative support. The team believes that consortia will become increasingly important in higher education over the next decade; Scripps' membership in Claremont Consortium is a strategic advantage; the team urges the college to make full use of it.

Section II: Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness Under the Standards

A. Theme I: Enhancing the Culture of Teaching and Learning

Scripps College has developed a comprehensive assessment system that measures educational effectiveness at all levels of the institution. This system is driven by the faculty and strongly supported by college leadership, including the Board of Trustees. At the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2011, the college received a recommendation from the WASC Commission to implement what was then an emerging assessment program, to develop Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), to ensure program review processes integrated student learning, and to enhance the college's capacity to support assessment through a robust office for institutional research and assessment. Through its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) report, and throughout the EER site visit, Scripps demonstrated deep engagement with and commitment to outcomes-based assessment both inside and outside the classroom. The team was profoundly impressed by the high-quality assessment work being conducted, and particularly by the earnest approach through which it was being undertaken (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

Learning outcomes are actively being measured at Scripps at the institution, general education (including the Core Program, Writing Program, and other liberal arts requirements), academic department, co-curricular department, and course level. Assessment plans for academic support and administrative services are also being developed. At the highest level, the ILOs were developed out of the college mission in

consideration with existing program learning outcomes by the Dean of Faculty, Dean of Students, Associate Dean of Faculty, and the Director of Assessment & Institutional Research. In what appeared to the team as a typical Scripps protocol, the ILOs were shared widely with faculty governance and college leadership, and then presented to the faculty as a whole and the Board of Trustees for final approval. Once approved, an institutional assessment plan was developed, as was a schedule to assess each ILO on a rotating basis. Assessments conducted on senior theses against AAC&U VALUE rubrics in the 2012-13 academic year showed significant academic achievement by Scripps students, but also led to faculty considerations of changes to thesis preparation, consideration of the possible use of portfolios, and a recommendation to the Faculty Executive Committee for new expected performance standards for graduating students (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

The college deliberated over its General Education student learning outcomes (GESLOs) at great length, and has implemented an assessment plan and schedule that integrates all components of the program. These components include courses that all students must pass such as *Writing 50: Critical Analysis*; *Core I*, *Core II*, and *Core III* on interdisciplinary humanities; competencies in mathematics and foreign language; as well as breadth requirements in fine arts, letters, natural sciences, and social sciences. Each component is supported by student learning goals and outcomes approved by the faculty, and courses proposed to fulfill these requirements are approved, in part, based on their alignment with the GESLOs. *Writing 50*, and *Core I, II, and III* were rigorously assessed using student papers and detailed rubrics developed by Scripps faculty. The results showed writing confidence dropping in the first semesters and improving with new skills

by *Core III* (consistent with national writing studies). The results have led to recommendations for ways to improve local rubrics and assessment training processes such as evaluator norming. Other GE requirements will be assessed in the current academic year, and an audit of all courses is planned in order to ensure curricular alignment for courses developed prior to the establishment of the GESLOs (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

All academic programs have established learning goals and outcomes, which students encounter both through syllabi as well as on departmental websites. Program assessment plans include a schedule for assessment, the assessment method, the student work selected to assess, and the tool or type of measurement. Annual Assessment Reports are required of all programs, and include summary results, faculty reflection on results in comparison to previous results, a formal response, and a plan of action. Scripps's EER report included results from numerous well-designed assessments from academic disciplines across the college. Although some areas in need of monitoring were found, results provide evidence to verify that Scripps students excel from psychology and English, to fine arts and neuroscience. Academic programs also regularly cycle through a systematic program review process overseen by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). Program review incorporates student learning, and makes use of best practices in its design and implementation. Importantly, the process concludes with a formal action letter from the FEC, which is then taken into consideration for academic and financial planning decisions (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

In addition, it was clear to the team in the report and during the visit that the institutional knowledge base for assessment and capacity for institutional research had been greatly enhanced since the time of the CPR. Much of this is due to the recent hiring of a Director of Assessment and Institutional Research, whose collaborative style and proactive outreach was noted by Scripps faculty on many occasions during the visit. Yet, it was equally evident that faculty, staff, and administrators throughout the college have gained considerable understanding and expertise in the areas of assessment and data literacy. The Office of Assessment and Institutional Research is also supported by well-qualified research associates. Working with the new director the office has streamlined workflows, increased access to available data, and developed new strategic reports (such as the *Student Success Strategic Indicators*). The office has also shown leadership among its Consortium peers in facilitating a professional learning group of assessment and institutional research directors (CFR 4.5).

The team found much to commend during the visit regarding the college's efforts to ensure educational quality. The team strongly encourages Scripps to maintain its momentum while continuously improving its assessment system, simplifying the process wherever possible, and unifying activities from all areas of the college. The team discussed the need to ensure clear alignment through curriculum mapping from the course level to the program level during the visit, a step the college anticipates taking this year. Such mapping will be particularly important to ensure alignment between GESLOs and ILOs. The complexities of assessing general education requirements taught in non-Scripps courses within the Consortium (e.g., Gender Studies), is another process that needs further refinement. The team also discussed the apparent overreliance on senior

projects and theses, an issue Scripps had already identified. Although senior work is a natural place to assess many of a program's learning outcomes, other student work completed within a major will be helpful to capture all of the program's learning expectations. The college is discussing portfolios for this purpose; the team encouraged this as one possible solution. The team also urges the college to make use of available survey data in its assessment of student learning; although colleges and universities participate in multiple surveys providing measures of student learning, they do not always utilize the results in their own assessment efforts; judicious use of such data can make the process of assessment more efficient, and provide a comparative set of institutions (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

Finally, it will be essential for the college to have clear organizational structures for the oversight of assessment work as well as the dissemination and use of assessment results. The institutional report's Educational Effectiveness Indicators stated that the "WASC Faculty Task Force" is responsible for reviewing assessment findings. The college explained during the visit that the former "WASC Faculty Task Force" would become a stable committee with recognized responsibilities, and this reassured the team. Furthermore, the Faculty Executive Committee is responsible for reviewing all assessment reports and all program reviews, and for bringing any matters requiring action to the full faculty for discussion. The college should strive to extend this organizational stabilization for assessment throughout the institution, including high-level reporting on student learning to the Board of Trustees (CFR's 4.6, 4.8).

In summary, Scripps College faculty and staff have demonstrated deep commitment to the assessment of student learning, using the results for serious reflection

upon the curriculum and making changes to improve it. Scripps has developed a well-conceived system of learning objectives grounded in its institutional mission and extending from academic courses, co-curricular experiences and academic services to a broad set of comprehensive institutional learning outcomes. In its work on assessment, Scripps has clearly positioned itself to validate the achievements of its exceptional students as well as the value of its pedagogical model. However, Scripps must sustain this admirable system it has created in order to yield the results it hopes to achieve.

The team recommends that Scripps College continue its impressive work on assessment, with particular attention to efficiency and institutional sustainability. Although commitment to the quality assurance of Scripps’s educational effectiveness is incontestable, assessment methodology (from design to analysis, reporting, and dissemination) appears to be substantially complex, and to rely heavily on administrative support from the offices of the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research. In order to be sustainable, such a comprehensive system must be efficient, supported by multiple organizational structures throughout the college, and bolstered by continuous collaboration between departments, divisions, and Consortium programs. The team urges the college to continue its exemplary work in establishing its assessment frameworks, but that it do so with an aim to streamline procedures, make the best use of available survey data, and reduce redundancies wherever possible so as to achieve its aim without too burdensome an impact on day-to-day operations and activities (CFR’s 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

B. Theme II: Co-Curricular Assessment

In its CPR report, submitted in June 2011, Scripps proposed in its reflective essay, “Educating Women to be Agents of Change,” to focus on the development and assessment of programs and activities designed to provide opportunities, both in the co-curricular and curricular realms, for the development of students as agents of change. The CPR team recognized that much work has already been done at the institution in support of this goal. However, the team was concerned about the breadth and ambition of this project and the difficulty of defining “educating women to be agents of change” and urged Scripps to consider “reframing this topic, focusing on assessment of the co-curricular, including programs designed to develop leadership.” The intention was to encourage Scripps to narrow its focus on assessing how co-curricular activities prepare Scripps women to be agents of change.

The Scripps EER report focuses on co-curricular assessment in its discussion of Theme II. It describes in detail Student Affairs’ approach to co-curricular effectiveness across all of its departments. The report indicates “much reflection and various initiatives” took place in response to the CPR team recommendation to re-focus Theme II. All Student Affairs departments conducted an assessment of at least one of their programs in the 2012-2013 academic year. The report provides examples of how Student Affairs assessed programs designed to develop leadership. Hence, the Tutoring Program, the Emerging Professionals Program, the Residential Advisor Topic Training Sessions, and the Tiernan Field House Personal Training Program were evaluated with respect to leadership development. The major conclusion appears to be, “Assessment findings revealed students gained various leadership knowledge and skills. . . . Each director

acknowledged the need for further data collection.” [p. 44] Most departments measured their outcomes with respect to leadership development indirectly. Some of the conclusions that were reached indicate that more work remains in connecting and assessing the development of leadership skills to Student Affairs activities:

- CP&R’s Emerging Professional Program: “assessment findings did not result in identifying what leadership skills participants gained...” (p. 37)
- Residential Life: “it was not conclusive evidence that the training increased or enhanced leadership and community building skills.” (p. 38)
- New Student Orientation: “Student development in leadership skills and the ability to work collaboratively will be integrated more deliberately into the training process of coordinators and mentors . . . “ (p. 39) (CFR 2.11)

In summarizing the discussion of Theme II, the EER report notes the twofold agenda for Student Affairs in 2012-2013: (1) conduct co-curricular assessment; (2) highlight the programs that offered leadership development and/or training. At times, this approach seems to have resulted in a forced connection between these two elements.

Thus the team recommends that the college use the lens of leadership development only as appropriate, thereby developing a more comprehensive frame that better fits the range of activities and desired outcomes of student services departments (CFR’s 2.11, 2.13).

Leadership development is an important theme that cuts across the academic and co-curricular programs of the college and is central to the Scripps’ mission. The recent \$5 million gift that Scripps has received to establish a women’s leadership center will allow for the creation of initiatives and programs in support of leadership development. The

LASPA Center for Leadership has been formed, and a search for a founding director has begun. The EER team observes that this is an ideal time for the administration to engage students, staff, faculty, alumnae, and trustees in a conversation about the skills and attributes of leadership and the mission and goals of the center. In particular, there appears to be a need for faculty discussion of the academic components of leadership as it relates to the curriculum. The center also offers opportunities to move beyond traditional definitions of leadership as well as to expand the college's commitment to diversity and inclusivity. The success of the center rests upon the development of a shared understanding of its vision, collaborative planning and implementation of its initiatives, and integration of its programs across the breadth of the student experience.

The team was impressed with Scripps' development of a structure for assessment of the co-curriculum. Both the mission statement and the vision statement that Student Affairs has developed since the CPR visit seemed at once powerful and appropriate. In addition to the program reviews described above, focused on leadership, Student Affairs has implemented a new practice of conducting comprehensive reviews of each of its departments, similar to academic department program reviews. Two of the six departments in Student Affairs were reviewed in the spring of 2013—Scripps Communities of Resources and Empowerment and the Tiernan Field House, with two more reviews scheduled for 2013-14, and the remaining two in 2014-2015. The team was impressed with the care and thoroughness of these reviews (CFR's 2.11, 2.13).

However, the team was struck by the relative independence of the structures for curricular assessment and co-curricular assessment. Particularly because two of Scripps' Institutional Student Learning Outcomes—"Students will be able to demonstrate

intercultural knowledge” and “Students will be knowledgeable about leadership skills”—involve the curriculum and the co-curriculum, The team believes that Scripps would benefit from further integration of assessment of student learning inside and outside the classroom. One of the most powerful arguments for the value of a residential college like Scripps is the learning and the growth that students achieve from their entire experience of their years at the college.

The team recommends that Scripps consider opportunities for the integration and intersection of the curricular and co-curricular spheres of student experience at the college and develop comprehensive means of assessment in this area. Among the institutional learning outcomes that the college has identified for its students are at least two—intercultural knowledge and leadership skills—that bridge the curriculum and the co-curriculum. The team urges the college to think about the ways in which students’ work both in and out of the classroom helps them achieve these goals, and to develop integrated ways of assessing students’ learning in regard to them CFR’s 1.2, 2.11, 4.6).

C. Student Success

Scripps has identified several sets and types of data to measure student success. In addition to the extensive assessment data described in Section A above, “”Enhancing the Culture of Teaching an Learning,” Scripps collects and analyzes retention and graduation data, and the college participates in several national surveys—the CIRP Freshman Survey, the Frist Year College Survey (HERI), the Senior Survey (HEDS), and NSSE. It also collects information about graduate school admission and job placement

immediately after graduation. Retention and graduation data are disaggregated by race and ethnicity, encouraging analysis of student success for under-represented groups.

Scripps four and six year graduation rates have been steadily rising among entering first-year cohorts from the Fall of 2000 through the Fall of 2006 (the last year for which data were supplied). The four-year graduation rate has risen from 68% to 85%; the six year rate from 73% to 90%--Scripps strategic goal by the year 2012. First year retention is somewhat more uneven. In 2002 it was 93%, in 2011, 92%, but there have been more years recently in which it was been in the 90th percentile than in the 80th. First year retention rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity do not show lower retention for under-represented minority groups, although the numbers are very small. Six-year graduation rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity also do not show any sustained pattern of lower graduation rates for under-represented minority students, although, again, the numbers are very small in individual cohorts, so differences of a single student can have a substantial impact on percentages (CFR's 2.7, 2.10).

Section III: Findings and Recommendations from the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review

The college has made excellent progress in addressing recommendations from the CPR visit and Commission action letter. The team believes that Scripps has demonstrated a culture of inquiry and a commitment to gathering, analyzing, and using data to improve teaching and student learning. The team has concluded that Scripps College has in place the appropriate infrastructure and the ongoing support and engagement of faculty to ensure the sustainability of its educational effectiveness efforts

with the proviso (described in a recommendation below) that the institution seek ways to streamline and make more efficient its procedures and processes.

COMMENDATIONS

Scripps College faculty, staff, and leadership at all levels have demonstrated deep commitment to the assessment of student learning both inside and outside the classroom, using the results for serious reflection upon the curriculum and making changes to improve it. Scripps has developed a well-conceived system of learning objectives grounded in its institutional mission and extending from academic courses, co-curricular experiences and academic services to a broad set of comprehensive institutional learning outcomes. In its work on assessment, Scripps has clearly positioned itself to validate the achievements of its exceptional students as well as the value of its pedagogical model (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.4-4.7).

Scripps College has significantly improved its institutional research capacity both by the hiring of a new director of assessment and institutional research and by the office's efforts to work closely with faculty and staff in developing and formulating learning goals and assessment rubrics, to design innovative workflows and new strategic reports, to provide one-on-one outreach and training for faculty and staff, and to collaborate with Consortium peers (CFR 4.5).

Scripps College has made substantial progress in regard to diversity and inclusivity since the CPR review. It has developed a strong comprehensive strategic plan that provides a roadmap for how best to make significant and immediate progress in this critical area. The team was impressed with the commitment to this plan on the part of faculty and staff who were interviewed. The team particularly commends the First Generation @ Scripps program for its comprehensive effort to support first generation students throughout their first year at Scripps (CFR 1.5).

The Scripps Board of Trustees has successfully sharpened its focus to one primarily on decisions at a strategic rather than an operational level. This change reflects the Board's confidence in the college's leadership and the close partnership that has been built between the trustees and the administration (CFR's 3.8, 3.9).

Scripps College has built significant capacity in its development program, critical for the campaign that the college has undertaken. The development team's focus and energy were evident on the visit, as was the Board's engagement in fund-raising. The goals that the college has identified for this campaign are well conceived to help Scripps carry out its strategic plan, particularly in the areas of financial aid and endowment growth (CFR 3.5).

Scripps has made progress in taking greater advantage of Claremont Consortium. With other members of the Consortium, it has developed an administrative structure for the library that makes it more responsive to the needs of the academic program. It has

embarked on a partnership in disability services, and it has begun to collaborate on assessment and institutional research across the Consortium (CFR's 2.13, 3.6, 4.1).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The team recommends that Scripps College continue its impressive work on assessment, with particular attention to efficiency and institutional sustainability. Although commitment to the quality assurance of Scripps's educational effectiveness is incontestable, assessment methodology (from design to analysis, reporting, and dissemination) appears to be substantially complex, and to rely heavily on administrative support from the offices of the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research. In order to be sustainable, such a comprehensive system must be efficient, supported by multiple organizational structures throughout the college, and bolstered by continuous collaboration between departments, divisions, and Consortium programs. The team urges the college to continue its exemplary work in establishing its assessment frameworks, but that it do so with an aim to streamline procedures, make the best use of available survey data, and reduce redundancies wherever possible so as to achieve its aim without too burdensome an impact on day-to-day operations and activities (CFR's 1.2, 2.3, 4.4-4.7).

The team recommends that Scripps College broaden the focus of its co-curricular assessment beyond an exclusive focus on leadership. While the team understands the way in which Scripps came to assess co-curricular departments through the lens of

leadership development, the team recommends that the college use this lens only as appropriate, developing a more comprehensive frame that better fits the range of activities and desired outcomes of student service departments (CFR's 2.11, 2.13).

The team recommends that Scripps consider opportunities for the integration and intersection of the curricular and co-curricular spheres of student experience at the college and develop comprehensive means of assessment in this area. Among the institutional learning outcomes that the college has identified for its students are at least two—intercultural knowledge and leadership skills—that bridge the curriculum and the co-curriculum. The team urges the college to think about the ways in which students' work both in and out of the classroom helps them achieve these goals, and to develop integrated ways of assessing students' learning in regard to them (CFR's 1.2, 2.11, 4.6).

The team recommends that Scripps maintain an urgent and strong focus on diversity and inclusivity. The team particularly encourages the college to work to increase the diversity of the student body, making the financial aid critical to achieving this goal an institutional priority. The team also urges the college to work to ensure the success of the students it enrolls, foster a respectful and inclusive campus climate, develop the capacity both inside and outside the classroom to engage issues of diversity in their many dimensions, and work on increasing the diversity of faculty and staff. Scripps should maintain clear lines of responsibility and accountability for progress in this area, using the metrics it has identified (CFR's 1.5, 2.13, 3.2).

The team recommends that Scripps continue to explore new ways in which it might benefit from Claremont Consortium. As a relatively small college, Scripps has much to gain in efficiency and enrichment from the Consortium. The team believes that particular opportunities exist through the Consortium for establishing a comparative data set for assessment purposes and for greater efficiency in administrative support. The team believes that consortia will become increasingly important in higher education over the next decade; Scripps' membership in Claremont Consortium is a strategic advantage; the team urges the college to make full use of it (CFR 4.1).

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Scripps College

Date: October 23, 2013

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Policies are located in the <i>2013 Guide to Student Life</i> that is posted online: http://www.scrippscollege.edu/students/index.php	Yes
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: The following sections of the <i>2013 Guide to Student Life</i> describe the policies and procedures for filing complaints and grievances: Section 4.0 - Scripps Code of Conduct and Non-Academic Policies and Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.38-4.41 lists separate procedures for Sexual Misconduct Section 5.0 – Academic Policies and Hearing Procedures Section 6.0 – Judicial Hearing System for Non-Academic Policy Violations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.15 - Filing a Charge for an Alleged Policy Violation Section 7.0 – Sanctions Section 8.0 – Appeals Process	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: The first step is informal resolution, if possible.	

	<p>Student complaints and policy infractions tend to be low-level incidents that result in informal warnings or low-level sanctions. It is rare for Scripps to have to convene a hearing board for academic or non-academic infractions. For example, in the past three academic years there has been only one academic misconduct hearing and no non-academic misconduct hearings.</p>	
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where?</p> <p>Records are decentralized. Dean of Students Office maintains nonacademic complaints; Registrar's Office maintains academic complaints; the HR Office maintains Title IX complaints.</p>	Yes
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:</p> <p>Scripps is in the process of identifying a database management system that will enable the institution to move beyond files and spread sheets to a more centralized system for tracking this information. Two systems currently under consideration are Symplicity and Maxient.</p>	Yes
	Comments:	

Rev 9/2013

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Scripps College

Date: October 23, 2013

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Scripps posts its retention and graduation data on its website: http://www.scrippscollege.edu/offices/assessor/files/2013-scripps-fact-book.pdf Scripps posts its tuition and costs on its website: http://www.scrippscollege.edu/about/expenses.php	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments: The Career Planning and Resources website has a section called “Life After College” that provides information about job placement of Scripps College graduates who enter the workforce and the percentage who attend graduate school.	

*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.

8/2013