

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW
TO CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

MARCH 21-23, 2012

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Members of the Evaluation Team

William P. Kelly, President
The Graduate Center, CUNY, Team Chair

Dawn L. Eastmond, Director of Education
The Scripps Research Institute, Team Assistant Chair and Team Editor

Harry M. Fong, Associate Vice President, Finance
Santa Clara University

Sarah (Sally) Pratt, Vice Provost for Graduate Programs
University of Southern California

Laura Schweitzer, President
Union Graduate College

Barbara Gross Davis
WASC Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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

A. Description of the Institution	3
B. Description of the Visit	5
C. Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Report	5
D. Response to Previous Commission Issues	6

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Reflective Essay: Transdisciplinary Studies	7
B. Reflective Essay: Research That Matters	11
C. Integrative Essay: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability	16
D. Other Issues Arising from the Review of the Standards	22
E. Student Success	22
F. Marketing and Recruiting Materials	24
G. Diversity	24

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Commendations	26
B. Recommendations	27

SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

A. Overview	28
-------------	----

SECTION V. APPENDICES

A. Credit Hour	29
----------------	----

CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution

Claremont Graduate University (CGU) is a private, non-profit, free standing graduate-only educational institution that began operating in 1925. Its mission is to ‘prepare a diverse group of outstanding individuals to assume leadership roles in the worldwide community through teaching, research, and practice in selected fields’ (Criteria for Review--CPR--1.6). The university thrives on a tradition that values inquiry and research across the disciplines, addressing significant societal issues with academic rigor (CFR 1.1).

Located approximately 35 miles from downtown Los Angeles, CGU’s 38-building, 19-acre campus is nestled between the boundary of the Pacific Rim and the Inland Empire, at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains.

The university has an operating budget of \$64 million and currently employs more than 192 staff and 114 full-time faculty, and enrolls 2,265 students in nine schools and one independent department. The university offers 38 master’s and 22 doctoral programs in more than 20 fields in the following schools: Arts and Humanities, Behavioral and Organizational Sciences, Community and Global Health, Educational Studies, Information Systems and Technology, Management, Mathematical Sciences, Religion, Politics and Economics, and the Department of Botany. Areas of study include art, education, English, history, economics, music, religion, philosophy, public health, business, and applied mathematics. No online, distance education or off-campus programs were reported.

The student body is approximately 52% female and 48% male; with the following racial and ethnic diversity: 46% white, 32% students of color, 18.4% underrepresented minorities (a subset of color), 16% international, and 6% unspecified.

CGU is a member of The Claremont Colleges: a unique consortium composed of five undergraduate and two graduate institutions and one central coordinating entity. The colleges and universities within the consortium are Pomona College, Claremont Graduate University, Scripps College, Claremont McKenna College, Harvey Mudd College, Pitzer College, the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Science, and the Claremont University Consortium (CUC). Each institution is an independent legal entity with separate governing bodies, endowment and other resources, property, and facilities.

The CUC is incorporated as a freestanding tax-exempt organization with a Chief Executive Officer, a Board of Overseers, and 350 full-time employees. With a budget of more than \$38 million, the CUC provides resources and opportunities that the seven colleges partake in as deemed appropriate by their leadership. Some of the different services include: campus safety, a four-location library system, health and counseling services, ethnic centers, central bookstore, theater, art galleries, physical plant and facilities support, payroll and accounting, information technology, human resources, real estate, risk management, and employee benefits.

The consortium model enables students to cross-register in over 2,000 courses throughout the member institutions at no cost to the student. CGU works with its sister members to serve the needs of its students. Faculty members at the other campuses participate, to a minor extent, in teaching at CGU: offering courses, grading students' qualifying exams, and serving on dissertation committees.

Recent Accreditation History

Originally named Claremont University College, CGU received initial accreditation in 1949, followed by many five-year reaccreditation visits and cycles. In 2001, as WASC was transitioning between the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation* and the *2001 Handbook of Accreditation*, CGU elected to conduct its review under the *2001 Standards of Accreditation*. In June 2002, the Commission acted to reaffirm the accreditation of Claremont Graduate University for a period of ten years. The Institutional Proposal for the current reaccreditation was due on October 15, 2009, the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit was scheduled for spring 2012, and the Educational Effective Review (EER) visit slated for spring 2013. This would be

the first and only review to be conducted under the *2008 Standards of Accreditation*. The CPR report was submitted on January 10, 2012.

Description of the Visit

The purpose of this visit was twofold: 1) to review the data and evidence in CGU's CPR report about its institutional capacity (clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures to fulfill its purposes); and 2) to assess CGU's readiness to proceed with the EER in spring 2013. The visit was conducted on March 21-24, 2012, by a team of five evaluators. The team was warmly welcomed and appreciated the hospitality and pleasant accommodations provided. Staff was uniformly helpful throughout the preparation of the review, and the visit schedule included meetings with key members of the university. Senior administrators and a number of faculty, students, and staff were readily available for consultation during the visit. The team commends the President for assembling an exemplary leadership team in the short period of time since assuming the presidency (CFR 1.3). Although few members of the existing leadership team were involved in the formulation of the Institutional Proposal, they firmly support its themes and goals. It was also evident that many of the students, faculty and staff with whom the team met were seriously engaged in the accreditation process.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

The team commends CGU for its work in preparing the CPR report and appendices. The team notes the quality, rigor and candor that characterize this effort. A wide-range of useful data was available in the team room. Additional materials and data were requested for review during the visit, and those materials were provided expeditiously by the ALO or other members of the CGU community.

CGU's Institutional Proposal artfully outlined the process by which the university identified its path forward. The university embraced the WASC review process as a way to achieve its mission and to maintain rigorous standards in its academic processes. The proposal pledged a systematic approach to addressing the issues identified in the Commission's action letter and subsequent issues raised during institution's strategic planning and other reflective activities. This included

compiling an inventory of assessment of student learning outcomes for all degree and certificate programs at the university, inquiring into what is needed to expand and improve transdisciplinary studies at CGU, and supporting intercollegiate research collaboration.

Although these themes and issues continue to represent CGU's priorities, the university's context has changed since the submission of its Institutional Proposal. First, the entire senior leadership team has turned over except for the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration. Of particular note, the new President took office in November 2010, the Executive Vice President and Provost, assumed his position in August 2011, and the Vice Provost for Student and Enrollment Services and Dean of Students, came on board in December 2011. A search for a Vice President for Advancement is ongoing. Moreover, three of CGU's nine deans assumed office in summer 2011.

Second, the university, under the leadership of the new President, launched a realignment initiative to define its teaching and research missions in a more student-centered fashion. This decision yielded a third theme-based essay, one that integrates Transdisciplinarity, Research That Matters, and Student-Centeredness with CGU's mission, resources and priorities. The team commends CGU for embracing, through the realignment initiative, the need for a more efficient operational model and organizational structure. Further, the team salutes the skill and sensitivity with which the University has managed the transformational change that realignment represents.

Response to Previous Commission Issues

The Commission's 2002 Action Letter highlighted the following four areas for further exploration:

1. The relationships among teaching, learning, and research excellence (CFR 1.2, 2.4-5, 2.9);
2. Coherence and integration of academic planning in an environment of decentralization (CFR 3.8, 4.2-3);
3. Student learning outcomes and transdisciplinary (CFR 1.2, 2.1, 2.3); and
4. Achievement of diversity goals (CFR 1.5, 2.8).

The work to address the aforementioned issues was launched under CGU's then President in 2005. Involvement in the process was broad based and inclusive. Members of the CGU Board of Trustees, administration, deans, faculty, students and alumni convened to examine the CGU experience and identify its strengths. Two themes, common across schools and disciplines, emerged: Transdisciplinary Education and Research That Matters. CGU set itself the task of articulating and developing the vital connections that yoked these defining tropes.

During the visit, the team returned to these themes in its discussions with administrators, deans, faculty, and students. While the evidence suggested that CGU's embrace of Educational Effectiveness was in its early stages – and that compliance was uneven – the team concluded that CGU had made significant progress, particularly in the last eighteen months, in satisfying the mandates of the 2002 Commission Action Letter. Specific information about the extent to which CGU has addressed the Commission's recommendations related to planning, student learning outcomes, transdisciplinarity, and diversity is provided in sections of this report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

This section of the report evaluates institutional capacity and preparedness according to the themes selected by CGU. It also highlights areas or criteria in the Standards that the team felt were not sufficiently addressed in the theme essays.

Reflective Essay: Transdisciplinary Studies

Introduction and Description of the Theme

CGU's Capacity and Preparatory Review report lists Transdisciplinary Studies, along with Research That Matters, as themes around which the school has organized its endeavors since 2005. The facts that the school has a Vice Provost and Director for Transdisciplinary Studies, and that Transdisciplinary is one of the clickable headings at the top of the school's home page, suggest that CGU takes the concept of transdisciplinary studies seriously in terms of both its brand and its investment of administrative energy and focus.

Goals

The stated goal of the Transdisciplinary Studies Program is “to provide students with opportunities to engage in high-level discourse, research, and inquiry with colleagues from different fields” (CFR 2.1). All doctoral students are required to complete at least one transdisciplinary course and may take additional transdisciplinary courses as electives. They may participate in transdisciplinary reading and working groups and may apply for funding related to their transdisciplinary work. Faculty may also receive funding for work connected with the program.

The team’s discussions with students, faculty, and administrators revealed a series of strengths and weaknesses that sometimes seem to contradict each other. On the one hand, a number of students passionately asserted that they came to CGU precisely because of the opportunity to engage in transdisciplinary studies. Some stated that they didn’t believe they would have had the same opportunity for this kind of study anywhere else. These students often took additional transdisciplinary courses beyond the single course requirement. On the other hand, a number of students resented the requirement and the fact that they had to pay for a course they believed did not serve their academic goals or enrich their studies. Some students and faculty felt that the choice of courses was too limited. Still other faculty and students felt that a number of courses that should count as transdisciplinary did not, and that inclusion was based more on technicalities than on substance. While there may be mitigating circumstances connected with these and other examples, it is clear that the transdisciplinary course requirement evokes strong emotions on both sides, and that there is work to be done if the program is to function as a fruitful aspect of the CGU identity (CFR 2.1-3).

The CPR report states that CGU offers approximately ten transdisciplinary courses each semester and another four courses over the summer. Such courses “must be taught from the perspective of at least three fields and between two schools at CGU” and “must produce results not likely to be obtained by any one discipline.” Some of the Transdisciplinary courses listed for spring 2012 include: Transnational Feminisms, Evolution, Economics, & the Brain, and Leadership Organization & Society.

The CPR report lists eighteen measurable outcomes as ways of documenting the success of the Transdisciplinary Studies Program including: the results of student evaluations, financial awards given to students and faculty, events hosted at CGU and, transdisciplinary papers presented at national conferences (CFR 2.3). Cultural changes, such as the improvement of relations among faculty in The Claremont Colleges, which are less easily quantified, are also a desired outcome (CFR 2.4). The CPR report lists the following student learning outcomes:

1. Recognizing a problem conducive to or requiring multiple disciplines;
2. Organizing a transdisciplinary team;
3. Understanding fundamental aspects of other disciplines;
4. Communicating effectively across those disciplines;
5. Analyzing, synthesizing, contrasting, and evaluating research findings;
6. Recognizing when a research outcome may have occurred only as a product of transdisciplinary work.

The team noted that WASC generally favors the kind of rubric for learning outcomes that is in place for transdisciplinary courses (CFR 2.6). However, the extent of the actual use of this rubric at CGU is unclear. Syllabi and other materials connected with the courses vary considerably. Further, detecting statistically the effect of a four-unit course within a seventy-two-unit doctoral degree is unlikely. The team recommends that CGU address the measurement of transdisciplinarity's effect on research and study in the program review. However, it will be a number of years before the data become statistically significant because of the small number of dissertations completed and jobs accepted in any given year. Analysis based on multi-year increments, rather than yearly cohorts, will yield the most relevant data. Even then, it is unclear whether there is sufficient data from the period before the inception of the transdisciplinary program to provide a useful comparative basis for judging the success of the program with respect to that particular outcome.

Findings

While CGU's commitment to a concept of transdisciplinary studies is successfully demonstrated, the specific nature of transdisciplinary studies and effective practices related to transdisciplinary

studies – nationally and at CGU – are far less clear. Doctoral students typically benefit from exposure to modes of thinking outside their home disciplines, and the kind of narrow, monographic studies that were prevalent through much of the twentieth century are no longer regarded as the apex of scholarly research. At the same time, several factors – specifically, the depth of knowledge required for the doctorate and the requirement that the degree be completed within a reasonable amount of time and at reasonable expense – necessitate a very clear primary focus. The team by no means intends to undercut CGU’s vision of transdisciplinarity, but does suggest that the role of transdisciplinarity be examined carefully as the program moves forward.

Some programs across the country have abandoned plans for transdisciplinary studies amongst confusion and polarization of opinion related to the implementation and management of such highly-collaborative, yet complex programs. To this end, self-studies and program review should engage all constituents on how to best move forward with this program. The review would logically involve both current and former doctoral students, as well as faculty affiliated with the transdisciplinary program – core faculty, research faculty, active faculty, and adjunct faculty – and faculty who teach and advise doctoral students but do not themselves participate in the program. The review should be a “full 360 degrees,” and not related solely to those affiliated with the program. External reviewers and benchmarks should also be considered (CFR 2.7).

CGU’s capacity as an institution also plays a role in the way transdisciplinary studies function. The fact that transdisciplinary courses require the perspective of at least three fields distributed across two schools at CGU raises a significant question of faculty resources (CFR 2.4). The rule related to schools will change with realignment, but the situation will not be mitigated unless the ratio of faculty to doctoral students changes. If the courses are essentially taught by one faculty member with occasional guest lectures by others, is the course truly transdisciplinary at the doctoral level, even if students come from different disciplines? And if multiple faculty members are fully engaged in the transdisciplinary courses, how can the institution support a full and rigorous curriculum in the basic disciplines? The CGU core faculty are small for the tasks it faces in master’s and doctoral programs, even with help from research faculty, active faculty, and adjunct faculty (CFR 2.1).

It may well be difficult to draw statistically significant, data-based conclusions about the transdisciplinary studies program at this point. Data inevitably emerges from doctoral programs at a glacial pace simply because the course of study is long and the impact of research takes even longer to be known. In addition, the program is small, which means that small changes in the data will be magnified, possibly skewed out of proportion. Nonetheless, the theme has already become a hallmark of CGU, and the consequential conversations already generated by the program have played a significant role in the way the university has shaped and continues to shape itself. The rigor and thoroughness of the coming program review will be crucial because it is likely to determine a major part of CGU's academic profile and distribution of resources for years to come (CFR 2.9). **The team recommends that this review be regarded as a critical piece of the larger process of realignment and undertaken in scrupulous detail.**

Reflective Essay: Research That Matters

Introduction and Description of the Theme

Research That Matters is an organizing theme for CGU's research agenda. Research That Matters was initially defined in the CPR report as research that is "relevant and applicable to challenges faced by individuals, our nation, and our global community." Throughout the essay various clarifying definitions are provided (e.g., "issues that address social problems and values", research that has "heightened potential to contribute directly to society in ethical, political, economic, aesthetic, or technological dimensions"). Operationally, one might interpret this as research that someone beyond the investigator believes is worthy of resources, including the time and effort to study. Functionally, this is a theme that provides a useful focus in most units (although it is less useful in the arts) for CGU's research assessments, hires and other institutional investments. It should be noted that promotion and tenure reviews are not limited by viewing applied research as the only type of sanctioned scholarly achievement (CFR 1.4).

Goals

Three primary goals of the research efforts at CGU are to impact positively student learning, their post-graduation employability, and their job-ready skills to perform research in their fields

(CFR 2.9). Indeed, CGU has developed a draft of five Institutional Learning Outcomes and number four is: “Graduates will engage in and conduct Research That Matters in the context of the discipline. Graduates will be able to engage in and conduct original research using rigorous quantitative and qualitative methodology to produce relevant results. Graduates will synthesize knowledge, use theory in the design and execution of independent research and practice. This includes the ability to write scientific and scholarly manuscripts or create other work that can be submitted to peer-reviewed publications or venues.” The next step for CGU is to develop assessments to determine if these outcomes are being achieved (CFR 2.10). The team expects these to be developed before the EER (CFR 1.2).

A serious threat to success in achieving these three goals is the ratio of faculty to student research advisees, especially for doctoral students (CFR 2.1). Advising loads are high especially in the School of Education. Delays in providing students’ feedback and a dilution of attention to individual need are almost inevitable results of these heavy mentor loads (CFR 2.12). The team urges CGU to rebalance its master’s and doctoral portfolios in an effort to improve student learning and success. The team also suggests that CGU review WASC’s policy on graduate education as it provides guidelines for faculty roles and workload.

A related issue, the availability to students of research unit resources and opportunities has not been thoroughly analyzed to date, but there is an interoffice collaboration between the Faculty Research Committee, which reports to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to study this matter. Motivating researchers to cross disciplines is one of the stated goals of Research That Matters and the institution recognizes that resources must be provided to incentivize investigators. The institution has made a significant effort to remove obstacles to interdisciplinary research. For example, when developing compatible research methodologies emerged as an obstacle, the institution recognized the problem and brought in expertise to assist. In addition, CGU has made grants and awards available to promote cross-disciplinary initiatives. While more institutions do not return all indirect costs to the unit of the investigator, CGU currently returns 100%. If the administration captures a portion of the indirect costs, perhaps additional extra-unit research initiatives could be funded. **The team recommends that this indirect fund return policy be analyzed** (CFR 1.8).

Critical Self-Evaluation

By CGU's own admission, the definition and assessment of Research That Matters is not fully formed. A community-wide survey should have helped further inform the definition, however, there was low participation with only 54 faculty members (38% of core faculty) submitting responses. On-campus interviews did provide support for Research That Matters as an organizational theme of value to the institution.

The CPR report mentions student learning outcomes assessment as an area for improvement. The essay's section on "Measurement and effect on learning" conveys an effort that is in progress; this is not an easy task for an institution with such a broad research agenda. A new Assessment and Effectiveness Steering Committee has been formed and will continue to move this agenda forward (CFR 4.3). In addition, a university-wide, but flexible, rubric that captures the major components of the research process (literature review, statement of a hypothesis, experimental design, etc.) has been formulated and is being implemented to assess student learning as it relates to research in all capstone experiences (CFR 2.10). Research skills, such as designing research methodologies that address questions, analyzing data, and thinking critically using data are fundamental skills planned for assessment relevant to Research That Matters. These skills have begun to be, and should continue to be, assessed by direct measures of student learning (CFR 2.6). However, only in some schools do student assessment rubrics include items explicitly related to the theme of Research That Matters such as "work contributes to the field", "work provides proper context for the problem" and "study demonstrates relevance"; other school's rubrics seem to be devoid of such items. The CPR appendices included an analysis of educational effectiveness indicators by program and school; the table required each program to report data on the following: publication or availability of learning outcomes, evidence that there are being achieved, and who is responsible for reviewing these data. Specific details about how the data will be integrated into assessment plans and used to inform strategic planning were not provided (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). The team encourages CGU to continue this analysis, and connect institutional goals, programmatic goals, course goals to student learning outcomes, and allow it to provide a foundation for continuous improvement and strengthen CGU's commitment to institutional learning (CFR 1.2, 4.4, 4.7). The team expects that CGU will make substantial progress in assessment by the time of the EER.

Capacity for Research

Research receives good support at CGU. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) process is well structured with sound policies and procedures in place. It serves several support functions such as helping students with proposals and developing FAQs related to compliance. A concerted effort is in place to automate and decrease the time needed to approve all types of proposals. In addition, the institution provides infrastructure to protect animal and human research subjects, and has intellectual property and research integrity policies in place.

ORSP, headed by a Vice Provost, supports pre-award efforts by both faculty and students to develop and submit grant proposals, as well as providing post-award support in such areas as ethics and research conduct. Policies related to indirect cost recovery, copyright and intellectual property right policies are in place. Expansion of ORSP's capacity through increased technology for supporting grant and IRB functions is being considered by the President for this budget cycle (CFR 3.5, 3.8).

Funding of Research

Research efforts at CGU are robust. Intramural funding sources in support of faculty research are available and fundraising efforts for new funds and university central budgets support these intramural sources. There has been a significant increase of extramural grant submissions (over a hundred percent increase in 2010 alone) and funded grant proposals grew by eighty-nine percent since 2005-6. Research expenditures based on audited financials show a steady increase from just over \$5 million in 2008 to almost \$10 million in 2011. More than twenty percent of faculty members have scholarly activities supported by extramural sources. Such external indicators of approval support the contention that the university faculty is engaged in Research That Matters (CFR 2.8).

Many research universities have selective doctoral programs that admit a limited number of students with significant financial aid packages; these packages typically include full tuition and a stipend that may take the form of a research or teaching assistantship. In contrast, according to the CPR report and meetings with administrators and students, CGU admits a large number of students per class and provides very little financial support. Some financial support for student

research in the form of student fellowships and research assistantships is available; however, it is unclear to some students how these funds are distributed (CFR 3.5). Limited funding to support dissertation work is also available. And beyond funding, support services in writing and statistics are provided along with a website where students can share research ideas and ask for peer assistance. The team urges CGU to increase funding opportunities and financial aid for students.

Findings

Research That Matters has served as a useful organizing theme to focus CGU's research efforts and investments. **However to further its success, the team recommends that CGU reexamine its research culture, most particularly the flow of research-related funds, including indirect recoveries, so that strategic investments can be made by the central administration.** New areas of research, especially those that cut across disciplines, are best supported in this manner.

The team encourages the institution to continue to develop a common definition, language, and metrics, which will indicate success at achieving excellence in Research That Matters. For example, in preparation for the EER the institution might complete an analysis of how post five-year graduates and hiring employers believe CGU's graduates are prepared to carry out research required in their new, post-graduate positions. Job placement rates are an important indirect measurement of student success.

The 2002 Commission Action Letter stated that "*the University has committed itself to actively defining benchmarks and indicators for the achievement of teaching, learning, and research excellence.*" While an at-a-glance, institutional scorecard including key metrics such as peer-review approval of publications and grants as well as citations is presented in the Appendix (although it is shown by school as a pie chart and absolute productivity across years is not easily deciphered) the team suggests that such scorecards be actively monitored. The team expects that by the EER, the institution will provide evidence of how these data are used, and explicit examples of improvement processes put in place as a result of the analyses of these data.

Invitations by external agencies for CGU's faculty to serve as evaluators or speakers are also consistent with this theme and are good metrics to track. An explicit analysis of how the

definition of Research That Matters serves annual faculty reviews, promotion and tenure considerations, awards of intramural support funds and other reward structures, such as merit evaluations for raises should be considered (CFR 3.3). If Research That Matters is to serve a useful construct to guide institutional self-improvement, such metrics and tracking mechanisms are important.

In summary, the data collected to assess Research That Matters, who collects the data, who receives the data, who analyses the data and how it is used to improve the research operations of the university, needs to be systematic and an area of focus for the EER.

Integrative Essay: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structure to Ensure Sustainability

Introduction and Description of the Essay

In its proposal for WASC re-accreditation, CGU identified two themes, Transdisciplinary Education and Research That Matters. Both represent critical aspects of the institution's capacity to achieve its mission. In its CPR report, CGU addresses these two themes and includes an integrative essay entitled "Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Sustainability." This essay recognizes the themes must operate within the range of resource and institutional capacity given everything else the university does. The essay describes these resources as static.

Faculty and Staff

Faculty play critical role in the education, research, and governance functions of CGU and senior administration recognizes the importance of having them involved in discussions of academic standards and student success. Faculty size has grown modestly in the last two years. In fall 2011, CGU employed 114 full-time and 27 part-time faculty members, supplemented by 79 adjuncts. Average faculty to student ratio is 1:10 (CFR 3.1, 3.2). Given the current mix of master's and doctoral programs, the team expressed concern about the relatively small size of CGU's faculty cohort, particularly regarding doctoral student advisement. In most CGU schools and programs advisement loads far exceed national norms. Faculty from the other Claremont

Colleges supplement, to a minor extent, CGU's teaching capacity. This involvement, however, tends to be arranged on an ad hoc basis, and in any case, does not significantly redress the advisement problem that confronts the university (CFR 2.12). Ensuring the adequacy of its teaching and advisement capacity, particularly in its doctoral programs, must be a high priority for CGU as it plots its future course.

The number of staff personnel increased steadily in the past six years rising from 150 in 2006 to 222 in 2011 (CFR 3.1). CGU, as with all colleges within the consortium, is directly responsible for many of the services it provides, including facilities maintenance, custodial care and food services. The Claremont University Consortium does, however, allow for fewer staff at an individual institution because of the services it provides, at a cost, such as the library, risk management and campus safety (CFR 3.6).

The team learned in meetings with faculty and the Faculty Leadership Committee that faculty members have a strong voice in university decision making (CFR 3.11). For the most part, the faculty members the team met viewed realignment as a necessary change, but they were attentive to the difficulties implicit in consolidating largely autonomous schools.

Financial Resources

The essay provides very little evidence of CGU's fiscal resources, but it did affirm the institution's fiscal stability (CFR 3.5). CGU's balance sheet shows net assets in excess of \$200 million, the majority of which are registered in investments and net plant assets. A review of key financial ratios documents steady improvement from the depths of the recession.

As a private university, CGU is tuition dependent with net tuition averaging 56%, gifts and private contracts 13%, federal grants 12% and endowment payout 12% and other 7% of total revenues over the last four years. Financial aid averages 22% of gross tuition which consists mainly of fellowship awards. Net tuition grew from \$32 million in 2008 to \$37 million in 2011; however those returns have remained flat the last two years. This stasis reflects a slight decrease in enrollment coupled with a modest increase in tuition rates. Expenses have also risen over the last few years; institutional support has increased more than other expenditure categories. This

rise is due primarily to start- up costs associated with the School of Community and Global Health.

During the peak of the recessionary period beginning in fiscal 2009, CGU made decisions that reduced expenses in order to mitigate the financial impact of revenue and investment losses. Salaries were frozen for two years and were increased only 1% in the current year. In addition 16 positions were eliminated through unfilled vacancies or layoffs. These efforts reduced expenses by \$1.2 million.

During this recessionary period investments declined from a peak of \$213 million to a low of \$161 million. The latest fiscal year end value of \$182 million indicates a good recovery of value which is typical of most institutional endowments. Endowment investments are outsourced to a professional investment management firm with asset allocation guidance and oversight by the Trustee Investment Committee (CFR 3.9).

Revenue from private gifts, foundation grants, and non-Federal contracts and grants to the university in excess of \$10 million appears sustainable. The President has been very involved in fundraising. The university recognizes that gift revenue needs to increase significantly and that the Board of Trustees needs to be more actively engaged in development, both giving at higher levels and making connections with other potential donors. A search for a new Vice President for Advancement is underway.

The institution's self-evaluation notes that most schools within CGU and the university as a whole have generated annual operating surpluses. It also notes that some schools have accumulated deficits. Overall, there is an operating surplus, meaning schools with a surplus indirectly support the schools in deficit. As part of the realignment efforts, the university is developing strategies to address school level deficits through accountability mechanisms. Each program must complete a decennial review to evaluate its effectiveness, strategic fit and financial sustainability (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.8).

During the preparation of an annual budget, each school develops its own projections of revenue and expenses. The schools' budgets are then consolidated into a university wide budget that is ultimately brought forward for Board approval (CFR 3.5, 4.2). This process assures broad participation and oversight by the governing body (CFR 3.9).

The financial operations are led by the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration who, as the only senior administrator from the prior administration, brings consistency and institutional knowledge (CFR 3.10). Functional responsibilities of this Senior Vice President include finance, human resources, information technology, risk management and facilities. In conversation with the independent financial auditor, the team was encouraged to learn that there were no concerns regarding the internal controls and unqualified audits have been issued (CFR 3.5).

Physical Resources

The institution has classrooms, offices, student housing, service and administrative space that are functional but less than optimal. While there is little deferred maintenance, some buildings are showing their age. In more recent years, there has been a deliberate effort to improve and build more facilities utilizing bond financing.

To address the facility needs, a campus master plan spanning at least the next decade has been drafted. The campus community has been involved in identifying future facility needs (CFR 4.2). Some of the priority capital projects will include main administration building renovation, new residence facilities, new academic buildings and property acquisition.

Information Resources

Library resources are provided by the Claremont University Consortium whose library services are accessible by all campus communities (CFR 3.6). The cost paid to the Consortium for library services and acquisitions by CGU is approximately \$1.7 million annually. Generally, this arrangement has been well received by the university community as it has made more information resources available than a small institution could afford on its own. There is some disagreement, however, about the adequacy of the collection for doctoral research. Many CGU

faculty believe the library does not rise to the standards of a Carnegie Research One University. Conversely, the CEO of the Consortium characterizes the Claremont Library as a lower tier one collection. What is beyond dispute is that graduate faculty and students need access to materials that support the work they undertake.

Recently, the Council of Presidents adopted new principles and policies for the governance of CUC's main library, The Honnold Mudd Library. The hope is that this action will raise the profile of the library as a rich resource, and its Vice President (search ongoing) will have direct input into the university's budget and planning efforts (CFR 3.6). The team urges CGU administration to work tirelessly with CUC to ensure the adequacy of the library's collections and that all libraries are recognized as a preeminent academic resource on campus.

Information Technology

CGU maintains its own technology support along with some support provided by the Consortium for infrastructure such as underground conduit. A review of the faculty and staff technology surveys found overall satisfaction with technology support. A student survey noted several aspects of technology that needed to be improved, especially in students' ability to connect to the web. In response to these concerns, last academic year almost \$4 million was spent to improve technology, including replacing aging desktop computers on a scheduled basis, increasing wireless access, and improving to classroom technology (CFR 3.7). This is evidence of utilizing survey data to identify and address a problem (CFR 4.2).

Realignment

CGU is engaged in an ongoing process of realignment that evaluates how strategies, structures and resources align with the objectives for student learning (CFR 3.8, 4.1, 4.2). Through the Steering Committee on CGU Excellence, the university developed a strategic plan and identified a realignment concept to improve institutional capacity.

Several initiatives identified by this realignment process are underway in areas of strategic hiring and marketing of the university. Additional efforts to refine budgeting models at the institution and school levels have started. The realignment will include the consolidation of schools from

the current nine to a smaller number and an examination of those services that are currently housed in the schools that could be provided centrally.

In conversations with several groups, the team found relative consistency in the realignment message. There was also agreement among faculty and staff that the process of realignment has been collaborative and communicated through town hall meetings and other venues. Students are somewhat more apprehensive about possible impacts to their programs. Trustees have embraced the realignment initiative as a long overdue renewal of the institution.

Much of the realignment initiative focuses on CGU as a unified institution rather than a confederation of nine schools with different policies and procedures. This unification will enable the university to operate more efficiently and consistently across the schools. Plans include the capture of all tuition revenue centrally with expenditure budgets allocated to each remaining school.

The university recognizes this realignment process is a work in progress that will be continuously refined and improved. Helping to guide decisions is a recently developed business intelligence model which captures data from different systems, such as financial, advancement and student records, and generates meaningful and flexible reports. The team commends the institution for its realignment efforts, an initiative focused, at its core, on student learning (CFR 4.3).

While a statement outlining the qualitative goals for realignment has been developed, the team recommends the creation and broad distribution of a sharper matrix of measurable goals and assessment against which the progress and success of this initiative will be gauged (CFR 4.2).

Governing Board

The team was struck by the Board of Trustee's deep engagement with CGU (CFR 3.9). The Board recognizes the importance of the university's educational mission and is committed to

supporting its goals through giving and fundraising. The Board has several oversight committees whose members are fully qualified to fulfill the responsibilities entrusted to them.

Board members are extremely enthusiastic about the new President and her senior administrators (CFR 3.10). They expect and encourage productive change and understand that such measures require time and resources. The team salutes the Board's embrace of the President's vision and urges them to extend that support to the full extent of their abilities. The team also notes that if the Board has not yet done so, it should consider, as a matter of good practice, a succession plan for key administrators.

Other Issues Arising from the Review of the Standards and Criteria for Review

Student Success

Objectives and indicators of achievement are consistently available at the course and program levels; however, the application of these data to institutional achievement is not as obvious, nor is the way in which these data are used to improve programs (CFR 4.1).

The team recommends that CGU redouble its current efforts to develop an academic plan that connects institutional goals, programmatic goals, course goals and student learning outcomes (CFR 1.2). Educational goals and outcomes, and their assessment, should serve as the driver for a complete mapping of efforts at all levels that will enhance the effectiveness of the programs and schools and provide a basis for decision making and continuous improvement.

Graduate programs should collect and review data on student enrollment, attrition, persistence, graduation rates, and other measures of success appropriate to institutional mission. Data should be disaggregated for various subpopulations of students, including gender and racial-ethnic groups and any other group that is specifically recruited or might be considered academically vulnerable. Analysis of rates should be used in evaluating and refining the recruitment, curriculum, pedagogy, and student support services.

Data on graduation and retention rates should be made widely available. Each graduate program should develop and publicize an account that specifies its time-to-degree and placement outcomes, particularly on recruiting and marketing materials. Comparative data drawn from national sources as well as from peer and aspirational universities should also be collected (CFR 2.6, 2.10, 2.12).

Because graduate education is not typically cohort-based, graduate retention and graduation rates are difficult to track and best practices are just being developed; CGU is participating in those important national discussions. The CGU retention (or attrition) and graduation data are collected centrally and has been since 1999. The attrition, completion, and enrollment rates are calculated for collective groups of entering cohorts. Tracking is accumulated university-wide and is tracked for ten years for each entering cohort. The data are then aggregated to calculate the total percent of students who have left/completed/continued after 1, 2, 3, up through 10 years. Data are disaggregated by degree type, ethnicity and school. Scorecards by school have been developed. Systematic calculations of average time to degree and analyses of these data for meaning and application are just beginning at this time. In its self-study, CGU reported first year retention rates of 77% for master's students and 87% for doctoral students. The six-year graduation rate for master's students is 87% (from fall 2004 cohort). The ten-year graduation rate for doctoral students is 55% (from fall 2000 cohort), with 11% of the doctoral students from that year still enrolled.

Data disaggregated by gender showed that there was no difference between the first year retention rates for female (77%) and male (77%) master's students, while there was a significant difference in the six-year graduation rates between female (83%) and male (93%) master's students (from fall 2004 cohort). Analysis of data by citizenship revealed a similar trend for international students. The first year retention rate for international and domestic students from the same 2004 cohort is 77%. The six-year graduation rate for international master's students is 95%, while the ten-year graduation rate for the same sub-group of doctoral students is 48% (from fall 2000 cohort), with no students still enrolled in either the master's or doctoral programs. These data show that there is a significant difference in the attrition rates of international students versus domestic students. Retention and graduation data disaggregated by ethnic groups

also illuminated interesting trends. Cohort retention rates by ethnicity steadily improved from 2002 to 2004. The six-year graduation rates for Black master's students is 40% and the ten-year graduation rates for the Black doctoral students is 67%, with 7% of students from that year still enrolled.

The institution has demonstrated the capacity to collect and analyze these data. The team urges CGU to examine the graduation and retention trends for various subpopulations of students, including gender and ethnic groups. Their use for institutional self-improvement will likely be realized by the time of the EER (CFR 2.10). Once an accepted methodology is chosen, these data should be publically available to all CGU constituents and prospective students.

Accuracy in Marketing and Recruiting Materials

The team reviewed sample recruitment materials from various departments and schools which describe the culture and ethos of their programs in broad terms. The messaging seemed to be school specific. Many of them feature a quote from a student in one of the programs. They do not describe the admissions process, degree requirements, or course descriptions, nor do they provide information about students' time-to-degree, average cost of degree, or salaries of graduates. On the other hand, the university brochure describes the career options of CGU's alumni. Some alums are "university presidents, members of Congress, MacArthur fellows, heads of major corporations and educators."

Diversity

Diversity on a university campus involves representation of different ethnic and racial groups in its student body, faculty, staff, and governing board. The site team appreciates CGU's broad view of diversity and inclusion which subsumes socioeconomic status, gender, sexual orientation and disability. There is great value in students and faculty with their own contextualized viewpoint exchanging ideas and collaborating to generate and advance knowledge and human value. Many of CGU's faculty members have made the topic of diversity their life's work; therefore, CGU possesses a wealth of creativity and innovation needed to impact all dimensions of diversity (CFR 2.8).

It was encouraging to see that women currently comprise more than half (52%) of the graduate program's total enrollment as of fall 2011, and women faculty are involved in mentoring, teaching and leading many of CGU's schools and programs.

The team was disappointed, however, by the low number of underrepresented faculty, staff, and students. CGU will be well served to reevaluate its definition of diversity and consider other strategies for increasing the number of underrepresented minorities in its faculty, administration, and student body. The team acknowledges that the pool of minority students qualified to matriculate into CGU's graduate programs is small; however, the team challenges the institution to show leadership in identifying, selecting, and educating underrepresented minorities and underserved populations. This would include African-Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, Pacific Islander/Hawaiians, and Native Americans.

As educators, CGU's faculty and administration understand their role and responsibility in improving the culture at their university. Each school developed a plan for increasing and enhancing diversity of its faculty and students. Although the plans provided evidence of integrity and analysis of diversity data, they read as reports or commentary of the statuses of CGU's schools and programs. There was little evidence to support that CGU was utilizing data to enhance its community and improve the environment for underrepresented and underserved students and faculty (CFR 4.1). It was unclear from the CPR report or meetings with faculty or administration if faculty of color who have left the institution complete an exit interview. One of the plans espouses that students and junior faculty from underrepresented groups can be helped by role models and/or mentors. Although there are many mentoring programs offered through the Office of Student Life and Diversity, the team could find no evidence that such programs exist for faculty on a consistent basis (CFR 3.4). Very few of the diversity plans provided alternatives or next steps to address these and other issues.

The team recommends that CGU bend every effort toward advancing racial and ethnic diversity in the student body, the faculty, and the University as a whole. CGU should develop a multi-faceted diversity plan that offers initiatives for broadening participation in graduate education by federally-designated categories of underrepresented students. This

should be a high priority of the CGU administration. Such a plan would include goals and strategies for both short- and long-term success. Of particular importance are targets for recruitment and admissions, retention and graduation, and campus climate. In addition, the plan should outline mechanisms for measuring the success of the plan. The team encourages CGU to continue to invest the necessary resources into the co-curricular activities that support all students, but particularly to students from diverse backgrounds (CFR 2.11) and to continue to collect data to ensure retention and support of the student body CGU seeks.

SECTION III – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. The team commends the President for assembling an exemplary leadership group in a short period of time. This group has served, and will continue to serve, the institution extremely well as it confronts the challenges ahead (CFR 1.3).
2. The team commends CGU for its outstanding work in preparing the CPR report and appendices. The team notes the quality, rigor and candor that characterize that effort.
3. The team commends CGU for embracing, through the realignment initiative, the need for a more efficient operational model and organizational structure (CFR 4.1). Further, the team salutes the skill and sensitivity with which the University has managed the transformational change that realignment represents. The transparency of the process, to date, has fully engaged all of the University's constituencies. The team encourages CGU administrators to nurture this openness, not only among faculty, but also among staff, and students, as the process advances toward full implementation (CFR 1.7).
4. The team notes and commends CGU for the striking culture of inclusion that permeates the University. Significant numbers of students, faculty and staff are actively engaged in the life of the University at a level not typical of many institutions (CFR 4.8). The passionate embrace of CGU and its values by so many members of the community is inspiring.
5. The team commends CGU for its commitment to diversify its revenue streams and to rebalance its master's and doctoral portfolios (CFR 1.3, 3.5). As its leadership wisely

recognizes, these initiatives are critical to CGU's current and future well-being. The team further notes, with admiration, the University's plans to enhance the value of its fellowships, and thereby, to address the level of student indebtedness. The team commends CGU's Board of Trustees' firm commitment to supporting and advancing these goals (CFR 3.9).

6. The team commends CGU's identification of Transdisciplinarity and Research That Matters as defining institutional themes. While these themes are inflected in different ways across the University, their resonance as sites for consequential conversations is profound.

Recommendations

1. While a statement outlining the qualitative goals for realignment is in place, the team recommends the creation and broad distribution of a sharper matrix of measurable goals and assessment against which the progress and success of this initiative will be gauged (CFR 4.2, 4.6).
2. The team recommends that CGU redouble its current efforts to develop an academic plan that connects institutional goals, programmatic goals, course goals and student learning outcomes. Educational goals and outcomes, and their assessment, should serve as the driver for a complete mapping of efforts at all levels that will enhance the effectiveness of the programs and schools and provide a basis for decision making and continuous improvement (CFR 1.2, 4.4, 4.7).
3. The team recommends that CGU bend every effort toward advancing racial and ethnic diversity in the student body, the faculty, and the University as a whole. The development and implementation of a diversity plan that specifies measurable targets for broadened participation in graduate education by federally-designated categories of underrepresented students should be a high priority of the CGU administration. The team recommends that such a plan should include both short and long-term goals and strategies (CFR 1.5).
4. The team notes CGU's significant data-gathering efforts and recommends that the University make more focused and consistent use of this information to guide its academic and administrative operations (CFR 2.10, 4.5).

5. Transdisciplinarity is clearly important to CGU – to the structure of its curriculum and to its self-representation. At the same time its curricular manifestations are the source of occasional confusion and polarization of opinion. For these reasons, the team recommends that the upcoming program review of Transdisciplinary Studies be regarded as a critical piece of the larger process of realignment and undertaken in scrupulous detail (CFR 2.1-6, 2.12).
6. Research That Matters has served as a useful organizing theme to focus CGU’s research efforts and investments. However to further its success, the team recommends that CGU reexamine its research culture, most particularly the flow of research-related funds, including indirect cost recoveries, so that strategic investments can be made by the central administration (CFR 3.5, 4.2). New areas of research, especially those that cut across disciplines, are best supported in this manner.

SECTION IV – PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The team finds that during the CPR, Claremont Graduate University provided strong evidence of institutional capacity (clear purposes, institutional integrity, and fiscal stability) and the development of structures and processes to support educational effectiveness. On the other hand, CGU has not integrated many requirements of the 2002 Commission Action Letter including articulating the relationships among teaching, learning, and research excellence (CFR 1.2, 2.4-5, 2.9), defining transdisciplinarity (CFR 1.2, 2.1, 2.3), and achieving diversity goals (CFR 1.5; 2.8).

Through the WASC process and CGU’s strategic plan and self-study reviews, the campus has begun extensive work on a realignment of its institutional capacity to be more student-centered and academically successful. Although the realignment process will take some time, the team is confident that the institution will be able to produce evidence of its effectiveness at the time of the EER, including findings and results of assessment of student and organizational learning (CFR 2.10, 4.3, 4.5)

Team Report Appendix

CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	Yes
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ periodic review	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)?	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? Yes, but review is school and not centrally based	
	Comments: Registrar notes and queries any anomalies that surface in school-based credit policies	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	Yes
	Comments: Instruction information provided to all coordinators to insure compliance	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)? Currently no online instruction offered at CGU	N/A
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	N/A
	Comments:	N/A
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the	What kinds of courses? Registrar reviews all contracts for independent study to insure compliance with credit hour policy and keeps contracts on file How many syllabi were reviewed? All are reviewed every semester for all MA and PhD courses. What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	

prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	Yes
	Comments: Review process for independent study is exemplary	